

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

During its meeting of July 1-2, 2017, the ICG decided on the theme for the Study Day of the School that will take place during our sixth International Encounter of the School on Thursday, September 13, 2018, in Barcelona.

It will be on **The School and the Discourses**.

Here is the initial development of this theme by Marc Strauss.

We will decide on the form and the organisation of this Study Day during the meeting of our ICG that will be held in Toulouse on November 24 and 27.

On behalf of the ICG,
Anne Lopez and Marcelo Mazzuca

The School and the Discourses

Marc Strauss

2.9.2017

“... For you, there is – you have to want it – another way of thinking about your revolt of the privileged: mine, through example. I only regret that so few people who interest me are interested in what interests me.”

J. Lacan, Ornicar 49, p. 7.

Lacan's founding of his School of psychoanalysis is inscribed in a history of discourses. It is the latter that gives it its place in the social space, and assigns its responsibilities to it.

Certainly Lacan's founding of his School is anterior to his writing the mathemes of the discourses. But it is not anterior to his effort to realise the analytic experience in a discourse that was unprecedented until the time of Freud. His appearance responded to a reality, also unprecedented, in which a form of symptom became untreatable. Indeed, the symptom does not date from Freud; it is correlative to the very existence of speech. It must be recognised as such, in order to be able to retrospectively clarify its historical avatars.

Thus, the discourses of the master and the hysteric are united in their confrontation. The signifying order imposes this division, which responds to an irremediable cut between the representation and the represented. As a result, the discourse of the master, which rests on consenting to the One that is excepted, never goes without the shadowy part of the subject with which the hysteric attires herself in order to complete it.

At one time, these two were enough to organise the world, but in the face of the decomposition of the empire of the One, in order for the master to continue to speak in the name of all of us, he had to take refuge behind knowledge.

The university discourse is thus a “regression” in relation to the effort for truth that hysteria calls for. The subject is found there, cut off from the truth, in a suffering that is inarticulable and therefore, inaudible. Delegitimised, truth becomes more convincing to the extent that science, having become countable calculation, outdid its possible interlocutors, the priest and the doctor.

It is at this point that a new interlocutor is born for the subject – the psychoanalyst, of course. Suffering like the hysteric from the new master's forms of violence, the psychoanalyst knew how to hear the subject, and to restore his reason.

Freud's project was to make civilisation's new forms of violence more bearable, even to attenuate them. We could say that he succeeded in changing the way his epoch looked at human kind, its motivations and realisations, and in so doing producing attacks, perhaps excessive. Today, the discourse of the triumphant market increasingly undoes traditional links.

In reaction, Lacan never, in the name of Freud, promoted an ideal of the collective. On the contrary, he insisted that the link be one by one, but even so, he founded a School. A collective, thus, that he wanted to be unprecedented due to the

novelty of the analytic discourse, integrating its experiences into its practices and procedures, including the selection and the guarantee of analysts.

This attention to coherence was aimed not only at its internal functioning, but also at the function that it assigned to psychoanalysis: an operation against the malaise in civilisation, for which the School would be the base. But whether it is to defend and preserve its field, or conquer a larger one, whether the School is limited to the perpetuation of the experience or whether it wants to influence the choices of the city, its recourse must be to making itself heard.

Now, we know about the contemporary malaise: "thirst from the lack of enjoyment". Indeed, the originality of the capitalist discourse, hailed by Lacan as a performance, is to propose its own treatment in a course without end. Whether they know it or not, the subjects that it determines are in its grasp. How then can the analytic discourse point to a different solution for them? Why would anyone want to give up the thirst from the lack of enjoyment and its intoxicating torments, and in the name of what?

It is clear that today we are in a particular moment for psychoanalysis, and that we lack the models to respond to it. After having created an almost beatific credulity with the opinion makers, psychoanalysis is once again the object of a strong suspicion, if not a rejection, for charlatanism. Now neuro-behaviouralism with its methods based on the chemistry of molecular interactions and statistics disputes psychoanalysis's place in the market

The call for psychoanalytic intervention certainly suffers from this devaluation.

Some questions arise from this:

- What, in our function as a School, pertains to each of the discourses? How do we control our processes of selection and guarantee in the School? How do we situate them in the order of discourses, it being understood that none go without the other three with which it closes the orderly round of desire?
- How does the fifth discourse, that of capitalism, intervene there when it undoes this round in order to impose itself alone?
- How can psychoanalysis offer to treat the impasses of the subject if contemporary discourse is sustained by not allowing it in?
- Between monastic retreat, with its threat of fragmentation, and imposture destined for collective retaliation, what strategies can be adopted to keep the reconquest of the Freudian and Lacanian fields alive?

Translated by Susan Schwartz