

January 5, 2007
Volume 1, Issue 9

Lacanian Compass

Psychoanalytic Newsletter of Lacanian Orientation

Contents:

- Editorial
- Beacon
- Log
- Sentinel
- Chart
- Resources

Editorial Committee

Consultant:
Pierre-Gilles Gueguen

Director:
Maria Cristina Aguirre

Co-editor:
Gary Marshall

Secretary:
Liliana Kruszel

Distribution:
Juan Felipe Arango

Display:
Patricio Aguirre



To subscribe: lacaniancompass@yahoo.com



Editorial

The 2006 calendar year is coming to an end. It has been a year of many changes both in the psychoanalytic world and in the US panorama. Eric Laurent the current General Delegate of the World Association of Psychoanalysis, presented his candidacy and began a world tour, establishing contacts with the different schools and groups of Lacanian Orientation throughout the world.

In the northern hemisphere he came to Montreal in November 2005 to give a Seminar and what we called a master class¹ in reading Lacan. In the English-speaking world he traveled², among other places to Tel Aviv, to give a seminar and to participate in the NLS 4th Congress. You can read reports of these two events in this issue.

2006 was also the 150th Anniversary of Sigmund Freud and many events were organized all over the world. In this context Eric Laurent was invited in April to New York by the Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine to participate in a symposium entitled "The Dead Father" which was held on the magnificent campus of Columbia University.

In July we had the 5th World Congress of Psychoanalysis in Rome, where the brilliant work of Graciela Brodsky during her 4 years as Delegate General was highly praised and recognized by the members of the WAP, and Eric Laurent was elected as the new General Delegate. You can also read a report about the Rome Congress in this issue.

In Rome, we met with Laurent to discuss plans for the transmission and development of Lacanian psychoanalysis in the US. We received his strong support and were energized by his enthusiasm for our efforts.

We thank Jacques-Alain Miller for authorizing the publication and translation of the text he presented at the Rome Congress. The text, which is the lead piece in this issue, is entitled "AMP 2008: Objects a in the analytic experience."

The members of the WAP in the US have been very active this year in participating and organizing events, seminars, and workshops in Miami, Omaha, Houston, New York, and Atlanta³. A report of the New York seminar which featured Marie-Helene Brousse, held this past September can be found in this issue. New cartels have been formed both for ongoing work and in preparation for the upcoming NLS Congress in Athens. The WAP continues to use advances in technology for videoconferencing, virtual communication and publications. We now have a list serve for the US with information about upcoming events and interesting texts. You will find the



Editorial cont'd

information on the Resources part of this newsletter.

As this issue "goes to print" we are preparing with enthusiasm our next Clinical Study Days 2, which will take place in Miami Beach in January 12-13, 2007. You will find information also in this issue. Finally, we welcome Gary Marshall who has agreed to become co-editor of the Lacanian Compass.

In closing, while, Lacan's work is well known in the field of cultural studies and in other parts of academia, it is our strong belief that the clinical teachings of Lacan are invaluable and need to be made accessible to a large part of the mental health workforce in the US. This is our challenge and our commitment for 2007. To all the readers of Lacanian Compass we wish you happy holidays and a great 2007.

¹ Published in the NLS Messenger.

² A report of his Seminar in Bergen, Norway was published in a previous issue of LC.

³ also published in a previous LC.

Beacon



AMP 2008. Objects a in the analytic experience¹

Jacques-Alain Miller

I am going to bring an end to the secret: the title of the next Congress of the WAP. I will bring this to an end with the indulgence of the Delegate General. After the "Name-of-the-Father," it will be "The objects a in the analytic experience." From One (the Name-of-the-Father) to others (the objects a), this is a good sequence. No less good because it is the flip side of the sequence that is laid out at the end of the seminar L'angoisse and that goes from the "a," in the singular, to the "Names-of-the-Father" in the plural.

Freudian Father, Lacanian Father

The final pages of the seminar L'angoisse resonate in a very singular homage to the father, a very singular praising of the father. The Name-of-the-Father there embellishes a function that seems to be rather that of the analyst. You must reread it to believe it. The father—I cite Lacan in the final pages of his Seminar X—is that "subject who was far enough in the realization of his desire to reintegrate it with his cause," to reintegrate it "to that which is irreducible in the function of the a."² This phrase is sufficient to take note that the Lacanian father is not in any way the Freudian Father. The Freudian Father is he who appears on the scene in Totem and Taboo and who on this scene squashes the desire of everyone, dominates desire, annihilates it. It is truly a myth. Whereas the Lacanian father is meant to be something truly closer to experience. The Lacanian Father is he who accomplishes normalization, the humanization of desire in the paths traced by the Law, and that supposes in effect that he had ceased to misrecognize the function that the object a takes in his desire. Is it scandalous to say this? The Father that rises at the end of L'angoisse is he who we now call the Analyst of the School. Nowhere is it said that Lacan did not conceive of the Analyst of the School as a Father of the School, in the sense that there are Fathers of the Church. It is an homage to the place where we are, in Rome. It isn't at all necessary to take it literally, but as for this "subject who was far enough in the realization of his desire to reintegrate it to his cause," I do not see a better definition of that which we hope of those that we name the Analysts of the School.

At first, Lacan encountered and extracted the Name-of-the-Father from anthropology under the standard of Lévi-Strauss, as the support of the symbolic functions which, from the beginning of historical time, was identified with the figure of the Law. One retained that, but we see what that implies in a short-circuit when one remembers that desire and the Law stick together. The father of the Law is also necessarily the father of desire, and the Law at stake

Beacon cont'd

is that which is the condition itself of the prosperity of desire. Certainly in evoking these phrases of Lacan that we read today, we are truly far from the calling into question of the paternal function that has been noted for so long in our societies.

Lacanian formalism

Who doesn't know that the Name-of-the-Father was inserted by Lacan in a linguistic formula of his invention, that of the metaphor? This inscription has the value, as such, of a formalization. Certainly, this formalization is, if you like, still in power, but it already leads to the distinction between place and element. First, the place denotes the function; second, the element can be substituted for, at the same place, by any other element. And one might say that already we find there the potential inscription of the Name-of-the-Father as a function of the sinthome. Thus, the Name-of-the-Father, if we were able to make a sign out of it, with the little dashes that make a signifier "blocal" out of it, it is because it is already a formalized function.

It is there that it is necessary to notice that in the seminar *L'angoisse*, where the five primordial forms of the object *a* are deployed in the fourth part, one finds a theory of formalism that is truly made to shake up the common notion of formalism. Formalism, Lacan says, would be, for us, absolutely nothing other than that part of our flesh that remains necessarily taken in the formal machine. This part, if you want, circulates in a formal logic. It is a point of oneself that is taken in the machine and that finds itself forever irretrievable.

This part, that we name *a*, calls into question all of formalism as such. It delineates an irreducible internal limit to the powers of formalism. We say in our language that this part—*a*—inscribes itself in formalism, in logic, in as much as it is extimate, that is to say that *a* means the informalizable of structure.

This limit, that he had posed, that he had demonstrated—in spite of that, Lacan went beyond it. And one might say that the ten seminars that followed, from Seminar XI to Seminar XX, were dedicated to the edification of a logic proper to the object *a*. What a reversal!

And I said to myself that I might surely show that Lacan lost his way after Seminar X, that this seminar designated a limit to the powers of formalization that were imprudently superceded. But I don't say that, because that isn't what I think.

In the seminar *L'angoisse*, we already have the coordinates of a possible formalization of object *a*, that would be by the intersections of the circles of Euler that he uses to distinguish the five forms of the object *a* and about which Lacan will give in Seminar XI, with the construction of alienation and separation, the properly logical form of that which is



Beacon cont'd



already brought together in Seminar X.

Nevertheless, up to Seminar X and especially in this seminar, the object *a* in its five forms shines in a particular light precisely because it still is not caught up in the system of the logical machinery and, to the contrary, represents the irreducible part of that formalism.

You know that the object *a* was used in Seminar XVI and XVII in a permutative game of discourse where all the heterogeneity of *a* disappeared, and that Lacan will pay the price in his teaching with a vacillation, a repudiation, that consists in finding, when all is said and done in Seminar XX, *Encore*, that *a* is a function too pale, too shrunken, too signifying, too feeble to designate that which is the *jouissance* in it. I gave a course on that chapter in Seminar XX where it's there to be read in black and white that object *a* is insufficient to account for *jouissance* and thus that, in the middle of a triangle, a protuberance will come to inscribe itself, a shapeless protuberance on which is written solely "*jouissance*." And the seminars that follow this Seminar XX will no longer have recourse to the formalization patiently constructed during the twenty previous years. There remains only parts of it, scattered pieces, as if Lacan took up again a perspective that he sketched out in his Seminar X.

Logic incarnated in the objects *a*

Thus, for our next Congress, we will be in the midst of this collection of writings, since it is in Lacan that we are going to find what to do with the symbols that he left us.

Well, I propose that for this Congress, we let ourselves rather be guided by the seminar *L'angoisse*, and in particular by the fourth part, "*The five forms of the object a.*"

There, each of its forms is spelled out, but each is spelled out in the body. Each of these forms of object *a* is spelled out as a part of the body. The *a* does not appear as the product of an articulated structure, but as the product of a fragmented body. Without doubt, these objects respond to a common structure, a structure of the rim, a structure of cuts, but in the seminar *L'angoisse*, they are rooted in the body.

One might go further still noting that the body is cut up by linguistic structure, one might note the isomorphisms between the body and the structure, but it is in the seminar *L'angoisse* that one sees the objects *a* captured by Lacan right on the body. Thus, if we are going to talk about the objects *a* in analytic experience, we are going to take account of the presence of the body in the discourse of analysis.

It is not less logical, but an incarnated logic.

Seminar XI that I alluded to proposes a formalization of object *a* and

Beacon cont'd

a division that places on one side the symbolic functions of identification and repression (that's what I recognize in the term alienation), and on the other side responds the inscription in the intersection of the object *a*. It is from there, in this construction of alienation and separation which is like the summary of the results of the seminar *L'angoisse* and of its Eulerian circles, that the saga of a logified object *a* begins.



The five natural objects *a*

In the seminar *L'angoisse*, if we take ourselves before this limit, the list of the five objects is made up of the three Freudian objects—oral object, anal object, phallic object—and the two Lacanian objects—the scopic object and the vocal object—and these five are the group that Lacan calls the “natural” objects *a*. Lacan shook up our comprehension of nature so much that one has to specify what is understood by that, without losing the advantage of this word “natural.” It is necessary to understand that they come from a fragmented body, of which they are the scraps. Here, I am not going to redo the list of these five objects with my own grain of salt, I will content myself with identifying in Lacan’s elaborations a few spots that are out of focus, since it is often the interstices that we draw from in identifying something new.

For example, the oral object. In the seminar *L'angoisse*, the cleavage is made for Lacan between the nipple, the point of the breast, and the breast as nourishing. There are two original points: linked to the nipple, the point of erotic desire, and linked to the nourishing breast (I add “nourishing,” but in the end it goes without saying), the point of anguish that arises from the satisfaction of the nourishment hoped for of the breast. Thus it is here the lack of satisfaction that distinguishes the point where anguish will surge from the point where desire finds itself caught. You can find this in its place in the seminar *L'angoisse*, but in the written version that Lacan gave of this passage in his text “Position of the Unconscious,” one no longer finds the nipple, but it is the breast as such that appears as that part of the body that the infant latches onto at the moment of weaning and from the perspective of castration. These two versions don’t exactly match, and besides I want to still delineate that as far as the list of objects *a* is concerned, the nipple in as much as different from the breast, continues to figure in the preceding text, “Subversion of the Subject and the Dialectic of Desire.”

As for the anal object, I will only recall here that Lacan privileges an approach to it from the perspective of the ideal, that is to say, sublimation. For the phallic object, it is so much a part of the body that Lacan presents in *L'angoisse* a physiology of the penis and links its construction to the evanescent nature of erections.

The two other objects that we owe to Lacan are, themselves, situated in the dialectic of desire and not at the level of demand and as being, in

Beacon cont'd



some way, directly in sync with the division of the subject, in the sense of a body effect of this division, as making the libidinal part that evaded it present in the field of perception. It is necessary to note here a vacillation between the eye and the gaze: it is the function of the eye that is privileged in *L'angoisse*, while in Seminar XI, it is the object as gaze that is detached, as immanent object of the scopic drive. That includes for Lacan a critique of the mirror stage, for the value of the gaze, as well as that of the voice, is covered over by the specular relation. And if Lacan, with a sort of predilection, so often comes back to the scopic, it is because it is there that we see—I dare to say—the most deceptive relation of the subject with regard to the object *a*, which finds itself vanished, eclipsed in vision, and in such a way that more than ever the subject fails to recognize that he is lost in that which he believes to be contemplation.

And thus Lacan, from seminar to seminar, pursued this scopic object, immanent to the drive, and this object, in the most open field, that of vision, finds itself to be truly its hidden part. One also finds with Lacan a precise critique of the specular position, the position where I recognize myself, me, in the mirror, and where I recognize myself with an other sharing the qualities of similar beings. This recognition that we take part in as our quality of being similar beings has as a logical consequence the misrecognition of the *a*, of the “I don't know what object I am for the Other.” On this point, I send you back precisely to the last chapter of *L'angoisse*.

And there is also the vocal object, about which Lacan indicated that the major example, the guide for its exploration, is given by the psychotic voice, precisely by the inaudible voice.

Well, there are the five objects *a*, we say, of nature. There we find one of the registers of the objects *a*.

Objects of culture, objects of sublimation

The second register is made of the equivalents of the first register in culture. Beside the natural objects of the fragmented body, each gives place to a fabrication of transferable objects which are made from the natural objects.

And it is just as one reproduces images, one stockpiles them; in the same way one transmits the voice, one records it, and great industries are built today on the basis of the eye and of the voice.

The anal object is the most transferable object, and one might say that all that is stockpiled, stored, and taken together in groups

Beacon cont'd

becomes the anal object.

As for the oral object, one knows well enough the derailing of the relation of the subject to the oral object introduced by the eating habits of contemporary modernity.

And finally, one might add now concerning the phallic object the complement that this list calls for: a great pharmaceutical industry is now being constructed on the phenomena of detumescence, which Lacan placed at the heart of his elaboration of the evanescent phallus.

In a third register, after the natural objects *a* and the equivalents of the first in culture, we bring forth all the objects of sublimation, the objects that fill the place of the object as lost object, that is to say that can come to the place of the Thing. There, it is necessary to recognize in Duchamp the genius of the concept of the ready-made³ that shows that art must be recognized in a context.

These are the three registers that seem to me to distinguish themselves in the approach to the object *a*.

The object cause

And the object cause, where is it? That which Lacan called the "object cause" in its difference with the object of intention, which maintains its value at the level of consciousness, at the level of that which in Freud is named the erogenous zones. In contrast to the object of intention, the object cause is by structure hidden and misrecognized.

And, one will also speak of the analyst. If the analyst might be assimilated to the object *a*, it is as the object cause of an analysis and as far as he lifted the misrecognition of the object *a*, that is to say here the misrecognition of his act.

The object *a*, as such, has the priority in the field of subjective realization, and the first of the objects given up, concerning the act, is that which always, Lacan notes, in moral theology, is called the works.

Well, to return to the beginning of this presentation, for an analyst, his analysands, even if crowned with the title of Analysts of the School, are not his works.

The work, if there is one, the opus, the opus is in the beyond.

Thank you.

¹. Presentation, made in Rome, July 15, 2006, on the theme of the next Congress of the WAP. T. N.: This text originally appeared as "AMP 2008. Les objets *a* dans l'expérience analytique" in *La Lettre mensuelle*, Number 252, Novembre 2006, pages 8-12. English translation by Thomas Svolos.

². Jacques Lacan, *Le Séminaire, Livre X, L'angoisse*, Paris: Seuil, 2004, p. 389.

³. T.N. In English in the original.



Log

Reflections on the Fourth Congress of the New Lacanian School of Psychoanalysis

Nouvelle Ecole Lacanienne de Psychanalyse

"Paternity or Fatherhood"

Submitted by Pam Jespersen-Elliott



The Fourth Congress of the N.L.S. took place on April 2 and 3, 2006, in the beautiful Mediterranean City of Tel Aviv, Israel. There were approximately one hundred-seventy analysts present from Belgium, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, England, France, Greece, Portugal, Italy, Poland and the United States. The Conservatory of Music was chosen because it is a "place where young people are living with passion." Sessions were translated simultaneously in Hebrew, English and French. The work of the World Association of Psychoanalysis and the N.L.S. for this year has been "Paternity or Fatherhood." Israel was the perfect prelude to the Fifth Congress of the World Association of Psychoanalysis, "The Name of the Father doing without, making use of," to be held in Rome, July 13-16, 2006.

Israel vibrated with a distinct passion, from the music I heard to the exotic foods offered. I never felt fear but was aware that this was a country of religious strife. The Mediterranean Sea sparkling azure-green beckoned me to its shore on my first day. I picked up seashells and waded with my formal pantsuit rolled up waiting for the cab to take me to the Laurent Seminar. Three of my colleagues and I hired a guide on the second day of the Laurent Seminar and traveled to Jerusalem. Old Jerusalem was striking with its antiquity in the form of the immense stones hand placed to form "The Wall," to the cobblestones that formed its streets. Four hours we walked and did not see it all. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Garden of Gethsemane moved several of us to tears. We reluctantly left Jerusalem, to resume our study of "The Names of the Father." The significance of this topic, perhaps more pronounced with each one of us.

I listened intently to the discourse of the numerous analysts at this Congress. All seemed to speak from a position representing the call to go forth, and listen to the subjectivity of each analysand. Listen for the unique symptom, which represents the use he or she has made of the Names of the Father.

There were many case presentations at the Congress with discussions coming not from the discourse of the Master but from the discourse of the Analyst. The cases were diverse and represented each Subject's use of his symptom with his unique access to jouissance. The Names of the Father is complex to me. Owning my lack is very real. Ignorance became increasingly clear to me as a

Log cont'd

passion. The Congress has generated reading and re-reading for me with resulting perplexity and questions, which are useful. There are no precise answers, which separates psychoanalysis from psychotherapy. Miller's comment seemed particularly relevant that "there must be psychoanalysts that don't think highly of themselves, even though they think highly of their own operation. In short, psychoanalysts without pretensions."

The Congress led me to reflect on the new symptoms that present at our clinics here in this country. The social structure of family is changing so much with divorce, remarriage and the biology of reproduction that the concept of a family sometimes winds up determined in a petri dish. Global capitalism and the extensive use of the media, add further demands for what constitutes jouissance.

In the field of mental health, my observations are that symptoms become generalized into diagnostic categories with names like bi-polar, borderline, or addictive personality. The diagnosis covers over the uniqueness of each patient that has little value to him or to his treatment. They offer a form of identification with an absolute Father, but where is the lack or room for movement with a symptom identified in this way? I wonder if the ideals generated in this country; "if you just try hard enough you can have it all," led to this need for identification with an absolute Other. "I am bi-polar," becomes an identity for the subject explaining all of his behaviors. He has no need to wonder or embrace the passion of ignorance.

In the praxis of Lacanian psychoanalysis, there is a focus to listen to the unique discourse of each analysand. I have been wondering if the structure of the psychotic is what we, as Americans, offer to the world with the One Father of Capitalism. Jouissance is advertised here as limitless. If you just take this pill or buy this product, you can have instant gratification and happiness. Psychoanalysis is disappearing here and it is no wonder why! We have left the questions behind for Others, elsewhere in the world, to work on but not for us, here in this country, where you can have it all. It is no wonder so many are diagnosed here as bi-polar, chronically depressed, borderline personality disorder, and thus disabled. An absolute identity with the diagnosis establishes a place for the patient in the structure of our society with the promise of care forever. This categorization, of being disabled, is entrenched in our system of social security. "Social security" is certainly an oxymoron. Is this a direct result of the lack of family structure? Or has one of "The Names of the Father" become embodied in the drug companies' push to prescribe this creatively named pill to establish mood stability? Psychiatry becomes reduced to eating this pill not how to "eat one's words," through a psychoanalysis. Subjectivity gets destroyed? Is this why we are seeing more ordinary psychotics? Questions for psychoanalysis to ponder.

Leaving Tel Aviv with a passion for questions was perhaps a good result. Questions for the development of this psychoanalyst, who was moved by the experience of Israel's intense introduction to the study of "The Names of the Father."



Lacanian Compass

Log cont'd

On the Trail of the Hidden Names of the Father

Gary S. Marshall, Ph.D.

Circle for the Lacanian Orientation in Omaha

Introduction

This essay summarizes the key themes discussed by Eric Laurent in his two-day seminar "Where has the Name of the Father gone today?" given on March 31st and April 1st, 2006 in Tel Aviv prior to the Fourth Congress of the New Lacanian School (NLS). Paternal authority figures prominently in both the theory and practice of psychoanalysis, perhaps more so, right now, as we witness significant changes in social life and not surprisingly new symptoms in the analysis of today.

Paternal Authority and the The Akedah Parable

Jacques Lacan's 1963 essay Introduction to the names-of-the-father seminar is the point of departure that most Lacanians use for current discussion on paternal authority. In that essay, Lacan examines the particularity of the transmission of the paternal metaphor from father to son based on a complex reading of the Akedah story—the parable of the binding of Issac found in Genesis. Particularity (singularity) is central to Lacan's work. For Lacan it is particularity that is characteristic of human life rather than our persistent attempts to universalize it. Thus, the Akedah story is more than a powerful affirmation by Abraham of his fealty to God. It is also, the story of the unique way in which a father, Abraham, is revealed as "phallic". It is this notion of fallibility (I'll get back to the trope phallicity a bit later.) upon which Laurent builds.

Lacan begins with Introduction to the names-of-the-father-seminar in 1963 and fully develops his ideas during 1973-74 in Seminar XXI Les Noms Du Pere which is more frequently known by its punned title Les Non-Dupes Errent or "The Non-Naives That Err" (Ayerza, 1995). The argument hinges on Lacan's assertion that the paternal metaphor as developed by Freud in Totem and Taboo--the so-called "for all" father-- cannot sustain us¹. That is, it cannot remain as the guarantor of all social relations. The "for all" father might have been enough to sustain the social relations of the modern era but not these days. As Laurent reminds us, the psychoanalysis invented by Freud reflected the social experience of modernity with its emphasis on rationalism, empirical facts, legal-rational authority in the workplace and the nuclear family as the model of home life. Lacan's close reading of Freud and his development of a Lacanian approach to psychoanalysis reflects the impending post-modernity of the late 1950s and beyond; an era in which, as we are now fully aware, is characterized by heterodoxy in every area of social life.

What the "for all" father of Freud, the "names of the father" of Lacan and "hidden names of the father" articulated by Laurent all reflect is the way in which the paternal metaphor acts as a barrier to anxiety. For Lacan, anxiety is the symptom in psychoanalysis. Anxiety, Laurent reminds us is a radical



Log cont'd

helplessness, Hilflosigkeit in the Freudian lexicon. This radical helplessness is visible in the Akedah parable. Abraham as a subject does not know how to comply with the demands of the law that his son Issac be sacrificed. As we know the ram is sacrificed in Issac's place. However, staying with the "demand of the law" for a moment, the inability to comprehend what the law demands, according to Laurent, creates a moment of anxiety and in such moments the veil of the Real is lifted. That is, the law, writ large, underwritten by the paternal metaphor no longer guarantees protection against the jouissance of the Other. The "names of the father" constitutes a response to this anxiety, this radical helplessness. I will develop this later in the essay as it will require several pages and a discussion of the significance of the onset of the castration complex as a necessary veil against anxiety. At this point however, I want to go back to why the "names of the father" has particular relevance to our current social experience.



A New Pattern: Science, Law and the Market

Thus far, I've highlighted the significance of anxiety and the law in the Akedah parable as interpreted by Lacan with Laurent's amplification. In addition to the details of Abraham's experience, a parallel regarding the dimension of anxiety described in the Akedah can be drawn in the experience of Lacan and his protégés. Lacan interprets the fact that he is abandoned (the language in the essay has the tone of betrayal) by his colleagues and students in late 1963 as an "acting out" produced by anxiety. Laurent asserts in his discussion of this point that "their anxiety is the anxiety that as analysts or as training analysts, they might be impostors", thereby reflecting the commonplace notion that the analyst is not sure of the truth of his/her practice.

This latter point is crucial in explaining the history of psychoanalysis. Laurent argues that today psychoanalysis faces an interrelated two-pronged attack. One prong of the attack suggests that psychoanalysis, like Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT), should affirm the tenet of efficiency and modify its discourse to adapt to the logic of the market. The second prong, perhaps closer to home is that psychoanalysis should mirror—in its treatment aims—the work of neuroscience.

As we have discussed CBT extensively within the NLS, let me just briefly making a rebuttal to the demand that psychoanalysis join in the aims of neuroscience. It may be the case that neuroscientists are able to show how the limbic system functions and that such functioning proves the biological existence of an "emotional reward system". However, such a proof does not contribute to the core issue that human beings are not purely biological beings who seek pleasure and seek to reduce pain. Rather, human beings go beyond this presumed calculus, which for Lacanians introduces the realm of language and therefore, jouissance. In addition, one might make an opposite claim. That is, psychoanalytic constructs have been useful in energizing research programs in

Lacanian Compass



Log cont'd

neuroscience and cognitive science. A new book by two French scientists reflects such a dynamic. In their work they have sought to validate the contingent subject. This potential validation of Lacan's work can serve only to establish subjectivity as a kind of domain².

To continue with the broad themes of the market and science, our current social experience presents us with a new set of circumstances in which anxiety is more readily touchable. Facing us we have the demands of globalization and the logic of the market. What we are in the throes of-- for better or for worse-- is the world wide dismantling of the welfare state. At the level of social theory, the dismantling of the welfare state means the delegitimation of the ideal of distributive justice.

One can see this clearly in my field of public administration. For the past fifteen years, there has been a strong push to have decentralized market-driven systems supplant large scale public bureaucracies. This critique is legitimate in that the ideal implicit in the welfare state system—the attempt through public programs to realize a collective *das ding*—can never be completely successful. The result, and therefore the effort to dismantle the public sector, is evident in symptoms like the seeming inability to fire civil servants or the technocratization of policy goals.

The market model produces a different version of the same problem. As McSwatie notes:

In the case of public bureaucracy, the overdefinition or reification of the collective Thing that results in the fetishization of social progress and the institutions established to bring it about begins as an abstract exercise in "policy making." At the individual level, this would be approximately analogous to an individual's meditation on the question of "what kind of sex would be ideal for me" becoming a fantasy that possesses her and places her under its power by producing an attachment to a fetish object that appeared in the fantasy. In the case of market organizations, the fetish object is produced by a reverse process. Unlike the policy makers defining the collective Thing by thinking up an ideal set of conditions that can express the identity of the social group, the market goes to the concrete level of the individual and seeks to identify what the consumer wants. This process sets off a chain reaction of competitive product development that is driven toward the goal of more and more precisely making the Thing of desire that is contained in the consumer's fantasy (1996, p 11).

Thus with regard to the market model, in my field, public administration, some, myself included, hold the same concern held by the Lacanians. That is, social relations are ultimately reduced to the status of an exchange between producers and consumers. In this regard, anxiety surfaces more readily because the market logic has overwhelmed the process of collective

Log cont'd

identification. Instead of the social bond, we have the artificial nexus between individuals and products sustained through advertising. My aim here is not to defend bureaucracy via a facile critique of collective consumption. Rather, I am pointing to the challenge for psychoanalysis that was introduced by Lacan in the Introduction to the names-of-the-father-seminar essay. To repeat, the message of that essay is that constitutive dynamic of the paternal metaphor is enigmatic. For Lacan, parable of the Akedah is the particularity of its outcome. It is an affirmation of the particularity of jouissance. The “name of the father”—the “for all” of the totemic father is an impossibility. It has to be reformulated as the “names of the father.”

The prevalence of the market model—the so-called contract society—means that social experience is likely to be found within micro-symbolic environments. Laurent designates them as new communities of enjoyment which are incapable of inscribing themselves within the discourse of distributive justice. He suggests that these are communities that do not want to name themselves with the identity inherent in the paternal metaphor, but communities of individuals who want to invent their own name. The challenge then for psychoanalysis is to work with this upcoming generation and transmit through the clinic a discourse which allows the analysand to realize the manner in which each invented itself a father in the exception of the transmission. In other words, starting from the notion that anyone can stand in for our father, it is the task of psychoanalysis to show the hidden names of the father.

Although I've in part given away the conclusion of my essay, I promised also to develop the theme of science in relation to the “names of the father” and our current social experience. Laurent argues that science has taken a decisive step based on the new biological perspective. This claim reiterates the point that much has changed since 1963, when Lacan wrote the Introduction to the names-of-the-father-seminar. The critique of science that was likely on the mind of Lacan at the time he wrote the essay was of science and modernity. This was a critique of the prevalence of instrumental rationality, a critique elucidated by Habermas in books like *Toward a rational society and Knowledge and human interests* and in the student protests in Europe and the United States in 1968.

Science, and biology have equally if not more so than the logic of the market, changed our social experience. For the scientist, the pressure is on to produce biological certainty. That pressure is best evidenced by the recent case of the South Korean geneticist who was found to have falsified the results of his experiments. For if the scientist can give scientific proof of gender, viz., the search for the “gay” gene or proof of the neurological composition of the psyche through the use of MRI's and PET scans, then human beings will be freed of the burden of desire, or in Lacan's famous phrase “the anxiety to live.”



Lacanian Compass

Log cont'd



A Case in Point

Laurent argues that a new alliance between science and the law both generates the palpable anxiety we feel these days, but also creates the legal exceptionalism that can realize hidden names of the father necessary to guarantee social life. To develop this point requires sharing tales of new cultural phenomena.

Two subjects forming a gay male couple get married in San Francisco. They are married using an administrative document original to the city of San Francisco. Neither, the state of California, nor the federal government of the United States sanctions legally recognize the document. This couple wants to have children, specifically biological children—they were insistent on this point.

The couple “hire” two women: one is the egg donor the other is the surrogate mother. The child is conceived through in-vitro fertilization. A contract is drawn up which stipulates that the egg donor can see the child after the child reaches the age of 16 years. The surrogate mother has open access to the child beginning at birth.

A new frontier is reached. Tradition is displaced and a new definition of maternity is defined through this legal clause. As Laurent notes: “Once you open this ‘chain of mothers’ you can, by contract, multiply [in the biblical sense of the term] in plural. Each mother [within this plurality] is defined by her contribution to the technology of reproduction.”

Contrary to its Hegelian intent, the law of the Universal [the State] can produce and invent peculiarities in a way that opens up and preserves the specificity and invention of the subject. This case shows the anxiety produced by the particularity of the situation. Yet, the way in which a solution is transmitted through the contract, desire in its singularity can be saved.

There are other examples which also support the dynamic developed here. The case of the forced resignation of the President of Harvard over remarks he made about paucity of female faculty in the natural science is worthy of mention. The debate he introduced demanded an answer from science. In other words, “what is it that science says about women? How do they think? Are they capable of abstract thinking?”

Conclusion

Laurent suggests that the search for biological certainty to oppose the artefact of law and the anxiety produced in civilization by the failure to produce that certainty reminds us that we won’t have any guarantees as long as we stick to that subject/object logic. The “hidden names of the father” gives us a path for some other formulation. Laurent poses the following. In today’s world there seem to be three options: religion, science and psychoanalysis. The religious man stands for his beliefs and abandons to God his cause of desire. The scientist stands for his beliefs and abandons to Science--i.e., the eternal subject-supposed-to-know—the idea that Science

Log cont'd

will continue until the death of mankind. The psychoanalyst must stand with the rest of us who have to invent a name of the father with the radical transmission of the particular.



ENDNOTES

1. Lacan writes of the totemic father:

The primordial father is the father from before the incest taboo, before the appearance of law, of structures of marriage and kinship, in a word of culture. The father is the head of that hoard whose satisfaction, in accordance with the animal myth, knows no bounds (1990, 88).

2. The paragraph summarizes the contents of an informal conversation with Eric Laurent on September 31, 2005 in Bergen, Norway. A strand of the argument was previously published in the Lacanian Compass (Number 7) in a report on Laurent's seminar in Bergen.

REFERENCES

- Ayerza, J. (1995). To resume again...Retrieved May 10, 2006 from <http://www.lacan.com/lacinkX0.htm>.
- Habermas, J. (1968). *Toward a rational society: Student protest, science and politics.* (Jeremy J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests.* (Jeremy J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lacan, J. (1990). Introduction to the names-of-the father seminar. In D. Hollier, R. Krauss & A. Michelson (Eds.). *Television: A challenge to the establishment* (pp. 81-95). New York: Norton.
- McSwite, O.C. (1996). *Can Kafka take us beyond the Kafkaesque: A Lacanian analysis of the "bureaucracy versus the market" debate.* Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society Conference, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., November, 1996.

Lacanian Compass

Log cont'd

The Rome Congress—The End and the Beginning of Psychoanalysis

Thomas Svolos

11/7/06

Every other year, the Members of all the Schools of the World Association of Psychoanalysis convene for a Congress—the most recent one was held this July in Rome. For two years, the Members of the WAP have been working on the theme of the Congress—“The Name of the Father: Doing Without, Making Use Of,” and the Congress represented the culmination of this collective work. Before I remark on the Congress itself, however, I want to comment on the very nature of this type of work, indicative in so many ways of the singular approach of the Members and the Schools of the WAP. What struck me here is the way in which the Members throughout the world, from different Schools, without having direct collaboration before the Congress, nonetheless carry on a process of elaboration on the theme of the Congress in the time leading up to it. For example, the École in France produced a remarkable document—a CD-Rom “Scilicet du Nom du Père”—a dictionary of about 100 entries, all by different psychoanalysts, in which the relationship of various concepts (anxiety, desire of the analyst, democracy, feminism, etc) to the Name of the Father is developed in a series of entries of several pages each. Or, I would cite the work of the New Lacanian School, whose Congress in the Spring was on “Paternity or Fatherhood?” itself preceded by a Seminar of Eric Laurent on “Where has the Name of the Father Gone Today?” The Seminar was quickly released as a DVD (and is now available in book beautifully produced by our Israeli colleagues as part of the DORa project). The reason that I cite these examples is that one of the things that has struck me the most about the work of the Members of the WAP is the very collaborative nature of the work, in which a topic is explored by psychoanalysts in different places all over the world, all of whom will produce lectures and seminars, hold discussions and debates, and write papers and essays as part of this work. This type of group work is then punctuated by Congresses and other meetings where we gather as a larger group, and the results of this work are presented. It really is a remarkable process and strikes me as nothing less than an elaborate extension of the cartel to the School as a whole—in which small groups of subjects will work, each in their own way, without imposed direction but with the goal of the work agreed upon within the group, in a process extended to the successive grouping of cartels into larger groups, all of which culminates, as it were, with the gathering of all the psychoanalysts of the WAP at the Congress.

As for the Rome Congress itself, the city provided an extraordinary backdrop for a meeting on the Name of the Father. I was impressed by the great subtlety of the ways in which this theme of the Name of the Father has been developed within the WAP and was presented at the Congress. One very simple way of looking at this is as a successive refinement in the use we wish



Log cont'd

to make of this Name of the Father—a delineation of what we might simply call a father function from any genetic basis for paternity; of the father function from a socio-cultural organizing principle; of the father function from its actual incarnation in a person; of the father function from any single version of its functioning; of the father function from a merely Symbolic efficacy in ordering; of the father function from any particular register of Symbolic, Imaginary and Real; and of the father function from the father itself—in which at the final point of Lacan's work we might even view it as merely a specific form of the *sinthome*. At the same time as we articulate this successive process of delineation of the father function, however, discussed in various ways at Rome, especially in the initial series of presentations, we witness as well a process in which different aspects of this function are put to use—within psychoanalytic theory, but also in other discourses of our time (such as science, religion, and law) and, most importantly, by each and every subject. And, it is this very heterogeneous use of the Name of the Father—better yet the Names of the Father—that we are confronted with in the clinic, and which sets the conditions for the very possibility of psychoanalysis itself in our time. And it is here, at this precise point, where all the labor of this process of elaborate delineation described above will bear fruit, for as we encounter in subjects today the immense diversity of presentations (from classical Freudian neuroses and psychoses to Ordinary Psychosis and the New Symptoms and the varied treatment demands of our time), we see various ways in which the Name of the Father is used and not used by subjects, and the cases presented in Rome demonstrated both this diversity and the inventiveness of the analysts in taking account of this in their clinical work. It is in this sense that this topic of the Name of the Father sets the possibility for both a possible end of psychoanalysis—in the notion of the way in which a subject may make use of it (especially in the more general sense of the *sinthome*, but also in the specific ways in which subjects find ways to manage the father function)—but also the very possibility of the establishment of, or the beginning of psychoanalytic discourse itself, in the ways in which subjects' demands for treatment (or lack of demands) may be structured around this point.

I wish to highlight two further points about the Congress. One relates to the end of a psychoanalysis. Of course, within our orientation, we have a very particular way of constructing this end, in which we highlight a distinction of a possible therapeutic end of a psychoanalysis in its application to a clinical demand, from the end of psychoanalysis as pure psychoanalysis in the creation, as it were, of a new analyst, which is of course the passage of *analysand* to *analyst* testified to within the *Pass*. We had the opportunity on Saturday to hear three testimonies from the new Analysts of the School, very different singular expressions of their experience of psychoanalysis. This is unique within our greater *psy* field, in which the Lacanian orientation has an institutional specification about the evidence of our work which preserves the very subjectivity of the



Lacanian Compass

Log cont'd

work itself, unlike—it seems to me—all the other forms of evidence in the psy field for efficacy which intentionally (the usual project of science) or unintentionally (in the path of the IPA, with its reliance on the imaginary guidelines of the framework) cover over the subjective dimension.

The final point relates to the beginning of psychoanalysis, psychoanalysis as a specific social bond, a form of discourse. This Congress demonstrated the work of psychoanalysts confronting demands for help that are delivered outside of the private office. This refers to not just the place of psychoanalysts in institutions in a more general sense, but also to the more recent development in many Schools of the WAP of the CPCTs (Psychoanalytic Centers of Consultation and Treatment)—institutions set up to meet demands for affordable shorter term treatments in institutions administered by psychoanalysts. We had the opportunity to hear many cases presented from the work of the CPCTs. One of the things that has struck me about this work—and resonates with my own institutional experience in a VA and now at a University Clinic setting—is the way in which the psychoanalysts working in this setting are addressing the questions of the beginning of psychoanalysis: the question of diagnosis that can be complicated in many contemporary cases, the establishment of the properly psychoanalytic symptom, and the development of the transference. Of course, this is nothing other than Applied Psychoanalysis—psychoanalysis in its application to the clinical exigencies of the time—but in an era that is marked by a dramatic shift in subjective structures and social organization, these developments are a sign of the work of the Members in meeting those demands.

We have now the opportunity to work towards “The object a in psychoanalytic experience” for the Congress in Buenos Aires in 2008!



Log cont'd

THOSE SCARY OBJECTS

A Lecture by Marie-Helene Brousse

Transcribed and Edited by Ellyn Altman, Ph.D.



The 11th International Seminar of the Freudian Field on the Teachings of Jacques Lacan was held on September 16, 2006 at Fordham University in New York City. The keynote speaker, Marie-Helene Brousse gave a talk on the objects *a* which are introduced by Lacan in Seminar X, *L'angoisse* or Anxiety. The title of Brousse's talk was "Those Scary Objects"

Dr. Brousse addressed a pivotal question: "Where do these objects come from?" The gist of her answer is that the objects *a* come from the subject and not solely from the process of signification. Seminar X, as noted by Jacques-Alain Miller, constitutes a crucial turn in Lacan's work. For Lacan, up until this point, the practice of psychoanalysis revolved around a decoding of the symbolic world of the analysand, a world that was veiled by the imaginary. What one finds in Seminar X is the recognition of a limit: a limit to the possibility of decoding the totality of the relationship between the subject and Other. Instead there is an acknowledgement of the bodily dimension of the subject which both resists language but is also inscribed by it.

As a reminder, the natural objects Lacan delineates are: oral, anal, phallic, scopic and vocal. Take for example the oral object. In the beginning the breast -- the oral object -- is in the infant. That is, prior to coming under the law of language, the breast and the infant are conceptually inseparable. However, as the subject is also a signifier for the Other, the oral object is conceived as being cut from the infant's body and placed within the mOther. So it is too with the anal object. In the first instance the anal object is the body's satisfaction or the enjoyment experience. Then the subject loses the anal object. It is cut from the body's satisfaction or the enjoyment experience and placed in the Other.

Lacan emphasizes this point as it bears on the relationship between need, demand and desire. Brousse paraphrasing Lacan, explained that at the level of relationship with the oral object, "there is no debt for the Other". We could say then that there is no "need" in the Other. Since, from this point of view, when the objects are cut from the subject's body or experience of satisfaction, there is a separation between the subject and that part of himself. Thus, the subject locates the object or that part of himself in the Other.

The need, which becomes located in the Other, separates the subject from the object. In the new arrangement the object is perceived as the demand located in the Other. Brousse points out that there is a distinct formula for each of the objects *a*. For example, the phallic object, formalized as ϕ , is related to the *jouissance* in the Other. Similarly, the scopic

Lacanian Compass



Log cont'd

object is related to seeing and watching everything—omnipotence.

The bodily dimension of the objects we are discussing can be manifest both as bodily functions and as objects of desire. For example, when the mother wants the subject's feces (i.e., wants the subject to move his bowels) the object (the feces) is desirable. As long as the desire to produce feces is located in the Other, the Other's desire makes it (feces) valuable. Once it has been produced (obtained), it is manifest as merely waste. From the moment the object is located in the Other, the result of the cut is the beginning of both demand and desire.

In neurosis when the cut is made, the object which no longer belongs to the subject now belongs to the Other. Thus begins the endless desire of the subject to get these objects from the Other. This generates affects in the subject such as envy and anger with the Other for withholding those desired objects. In the relationship between the subject and the Other there is a circulation of these objects. The location of these objects in the Other is a fiction but nevertheless serves as the foundation of desire. In order to be the cause of desire these objects must be located in the Other.

Referring back to the crucial role of language within the Lacanian framework, as Lacan asserts, the Other is the Other of language. Moreover, it is at this intersection between the body and language that we see this dynamic. The following example is illustrative. A five year old child was learning to write. She learned how to both say and write "caca". As she wrote, she moved her bowels. She realized the difference between the writing and reality of the lived experience.

To further develop the role of the objects *a* within the dynamic of language and the body, Brousse notes that the cause of desire is related to the object and the effect is related to the capacity to desire. Between the two is the gap. The gap is due to the signifier of the object itself. The gap represents the transcendence of language and the attribution of the object to the Other. E.g., there is no way to enjoy "feces" if language and the Other have not produced a gap between the subject and the subject's lost object. Without language (the signifier) there is no gap, and there is no anxiety.

To illustrate, for very severely autistic children there is no Other into which the object can be located or to whom the object is dedicated. There is no way to locate what is going to be lost and be felt as the demand of the Other. The transcendence of the Other (language) allows what becomes a cause of desire and what becomes a satisfaction. The cause or the object is located somewhere else (not in the subject) but in the Other.

As his theory developed Lacan began and continued to speak in his teachings of the object *a* and the status of the real. In clinical work we do not have access to these objects directly. We have access to objects implying, for example, mother, brother, sister, friend, etc. Each time someone speaks of anxiety, it directs the search for which object this anxiety indicates.

Log cont'd

In the treatment the subject will locate the object in the analyst and the analyst will incarnate the object. The psychoanalytic treatment de-localizes the object located in the Other (analyst) and takes the object out of the Other so that the subject faces the object directly without imputation to the Other.

The psychoanalytic session can be cause and can produce anxiety. The role of the analyst limits, organizes, and reveals anxiety and the signification to the patient. The analyst is in the position of the object a. The object a stops being located in the desire of the Other. In the therapy and in the analysis there may be a change in the position of the subject to the Other. The object stops being at stake between the subject and the Other. The subject/patient has to learn to deal with his/her objects himself/herself without the game with the Other.

The (analytic) relationship with the Other is much simpler and calmer without thinking the "mother" doesn't want to give me what I want. The subject stops bringing mother into the process of continuous demands. By the end of analysis the relationship with parents usually calms down and the subject is not wanting so much from parents or reproaching parents so much. The subject is dealing with himself/herself.

The root is taken out of the Other. It is no longer at stake in the game with the Other. This confronts the subject with separation. The demand for analysis arises from the difficulty of separating from the mother, separating from the child, and separating from the lover. Separation in general is discontinuity which implies desire in relationships. There are no relationships without discontinuity. Separation is central in the relationship with the object a. The stuff of object a is separation.

Anxiety is about those scary objects. Anxiety can be illustrated with the praying mantis. You do not know what you look like yourself, and you do not know what kind of object you are for her. If you are her male, she is going to eat you. Lacan said that anxiety is what you feel in the presence of another, when you do not know what kind of object you are for this Other.

In conclusion, a final vignette is illustrative. An analysand describes herself as a chicken wing for the man. She felt she was the oral object for the Other who she believed was very greedy. The subject's objects organized the fantasy which organized her sexual life. On one occasion, she brought a flower to her analyst. The analyst not knowing the type of flower it was, the analyst went the local florist to find out. As it turned out, the name of the flower was "carnivorous axiom". The flower then was illustrative of analysand's own greed which she had located in the Other.



Lacanian Compass

Sentinel

SENTINEL

CLINICAL STUDY DAYS 2

Thursday, January 11, 2007: Evening Lecture on Psychoanalysis and Art

Friday, January 12, 2007: Workshop 'The Lacanian Orientation in Practice'

Saturday, January 13, 2007: Clinical Study Days 2 'Psychic Suffering and the Treatment Challenges in the Postmodern World'

Clinical Study Days is a program of the Members of the World Association of Psychoanalysis in the United States. CSD2 and associated events feature the participation of Marie-Hélène Brousse, Psychoanalyst, Paris, France, and Member, École de la Cause freudienne and World Association of Psychoanalysis.

Lecture on Psychoanalysis and Art

Presented by Marie-Hélène Brousse

Location

Miami Art Central

5960 SW 57th Avenue

Miami, Florida 33143

Thursday, January 11, 2007 at 8:00 pm

Workshop -- The Lacanian Orientation in Practice

Four Points by Sheraton Miami Beach

4343 Collins Avenue · Miami Beach, Florida 33140

Friday, January 12, 2007

Clinical Study Days 2 -- Psychic Suffering and the Treatment Challenges in the Postmodern World

Four Points by Sheraton Miami Beach

4343 Collins Avenue · Miami Beach, Florida 33140

Saturday, January 13, 2007

For a description of the Programs and the Schedules, please visit
<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/Lacanian-Orientation-US/message/14>

For Registration Information, please visit <http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/Lacanian-Orientation-US/message/15>

© 2007 Lacanian Orientation in the US



Chart

CHART

HOUSTON

Houston Freudian Field Library in-formation

On-going activities

Downtown Seminar on Psychoanalytic Studies # 5

Readings from Lacan's *Ecrits* A Selection

Dates: January 19, 2007.

Borders Bookstore (2nd Floor) 3025 Kirby -On Kirby near the corner of W. Alabama St.

Houston, TX 77098

Time: 5:30 to 6:45pm. Free admission.

Frequency: Every two weeks from January to June 2006.

Reading Circle 2007

Readings from Jacques-Alain Miller Seminar 2004-2005 "Pieces detachees"

Dates: January 24, 2007

Time: 2:30-3:30 pm. free admission

12026 Canterhurst Way, Houston, TX 77605

Library

Open 2nd and 4th Wednesday each month: 3:30-5:00pm

12026 Canterhurst Way, Houston, TX 77605

Responsible: Carmen Navarro Nino Carmennavarro11@hotmail.com. Tel/fax (+) 281 897 8295

MIAMI

NEL

On-going activities

Seminar Ordinary Psychosis, preparing for the 3rd American Encounter in Belo Horizonte, August 2007

Wednesday 6-7:30 pm clinical portion; 7:30-9 pm theoretical foundation

Responsible: Alicia Arenas and Juan Felipe Arango

Florida Center for Research and Development in Psychoanalysis- Institute

Fundamentals I, II, III until April 2007

Faculty: Alicia Arenas, Juan Felipe Arango, Maria Cristina Aguirre, Maria Eugenia Cardona, Liliana Kruszel, Amilcar Gomez

Advanced Courses: "The body and the scientific discourse"

Responsible: Alicia Arenas, Liliana Kruszel

NELFLORIDA@aol.com Tel/fax 305-4610999

NEW YORK

Lacanian Ink

Publications:

Lacanian Ink 28 – Profane Illuminations –autumn 2006

The Symptom 8 – Winter 2007

Responsible: Josefina Ayerza: perfume@lacan.com

New York Freud Lacan Analytic Group - NYFLAG

On-going activities:

Reading Group:

The Name of the Father: Concept and Uses in the 21st Century

Readings from Seminar XVII – The Other Side of Psychoanalysis (1969-1970)

Wednesdays 8 pm, January 10, 2007, every other week

Barnard Hall, Room 407, Broadway at 117th St., NYC

Responsible: Maria Cristina Aguirre, nyflag@yahoo.ca

Clinical Seminar

This Seminar is dedicated to the presentation of clinical cases focusing on our clinical practice and its many challenges.

Wednesdays 8 pm. January 17, 2007, every other week



Log cont'd

Barnard Hall, Room 409, Broadway at 117th St., NYC
Responsible: Maria Cristina Aguirre, nyflag@yahoo.ca

Special Event. Save the date!
12th International Seminar of the Freudian Field
Guest Speaker: Alexandre Stevens, Psychoanalyst
February 23-24, 2007
Lecture and Seminar: Further details forthcoming
Responsible: Maria Cristina Aguirre, nyflag@yahoo.ca

OMAHA

On-going activities:
Circle for the Lacanian Orientation in Omaha
Seminar "One and Two and..."
First Fridays of the month, 11:30-1:00pm
Responsible: Tom Svolos, tsvolos@radiks.net

Reading Group: Psychoanalytic Articulations: Working with Children, Psychotic Subjects and within Institutions.
Second Fridays of the month, 11:30-1:00pm
Responsible: Tom Svolos, tsvolos@radiks.net

Clinical Seminar –The Never ending Search for the Object
Monday evenings, December 11, January 8, 6:00-8:00pm
Responsible: Pam Jespersen-Elliot, pjespers@alegent.org

Film Seminar—"Commanded to Enjoy: Jouissance and paternal authority in post-traditional society"
Winter 2007, tba
Responsible: Gary Marshall gary.copenhagen@gmail.com

Special Events:
"The Unconscious as Social"
Wednesday Evening conversation, Center for Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis
Moderator: Tom Svolos, Pam Jespersen-Elliot is one of the presenters
December 6, 7:00-8:30 pm

Spring 2007
Visit to Omaha--Alexandre Stevens
Seminar on child psychosis and autism
Further details forthcoming
Responsible: Thomas Svolos, tsvolos@radiks.net 402-551-4712



Lacanian Compass

Resources

RESOURCES IN LACANIAN PSYCHOANALYSIS

(collected by Tom Svolos)

The World Association of Psychoanalysis: The aim of the World Association of Psychoanalysis is to promote the practice and the study of psychoanalysis following the teachings of Jacques Lacan. It was created by Jacques-Alain Miller in February 1992 and today has over a thousand members in Europe, America and Australia. The WAP creates Schools that develop and transmit psychoanalysis, ensure the formation of analysts, found their qualification and guarantee the quality of their practice. The World Association of Psychoanalysis holds a Scientific Congress and an Assembly of members every two years. It works in coordination with the Foundation of the Freudian Field and the Institute of the Freudian Field, sharing the responsibility for submitting psychoanalysis to regular criticism of its fundamentals and of its role in today's world. Information on the WAP-its activities and publication-can be found on the WAP website: <http://www.wapol.org/en/index.html>

New Lacanian School: NLS is the English-language School of the WAP. Information on the constituent societies and groups, as well as events and publications can be found at <http://www.amp-nls.org/>

New York Freud Lacan Analytic Group: NYFLAG sponsors regular activities in New York as well as Seminars and other special programs with visiting psychoanalysts. For more information or to get on the mailing list, contact Maria Cristina Aguirre at nyflag@yahoo.ca

NEL-Miami and LOGOS: These groups sponsor regular activities and special programs in Florida in English and Spanish. For additional information, contact Nelflorida@aol.com

Affiliated Psychoanalytic Workgroups: APW sponsors an Annual Conference as well as Workshops for the promotion of Lacanian psychoanalysis. APW also publishes the online journal ERR. For more information, go to <http://www.apwonline.org/>

Lacan.com: Online resources on Lacanian psychoanalysis:
<http://www.lacan.com/>

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS

Mental (published by NLS; French print journal and English online journal):
<http://www.mental-nls.com>

Psychoanalytical Notebooks (published by London Society of the NLS; print journal with selected online papers): <http://www.londonsociety-nls.org.uk/Welcome.htm>

Almanac of Psychoanalysis (published by the Israel Society of the NLS; print journal): information available from Yotvat Oxman, Editor,
yotvatt@zahav.net.il

International Lacanian Review (online journal published by Jacques-Alain



Resources

Miller): <http://www.lacanianreview.com.br>

Lacanian Compass (published by WAP; newsletter of Lacanian activities in the US): <http://www.wapol.org/es/lacanian/lacanian.asp>. For free subscription: lacaniancompass@yahoo.com

Lacanian Praxis: International Quarterly of Applied Psychoanalysis (online journal published by the WAP): http://www.mental-nls.com/LacanianPraxis_01.pdf

World Association for Psychoanalysis Letter for Europe (online newsletter of the WAP): <http://www.amp-europe-lettre.com/>

Journal for Lacanian Studies (paper journal published by Karnac Books; with select online articles): <http://www.jlsjournal.com/>

Lacanian Ink (paper journal published by Josefina Ayerza; online excerpts): <http://www.lacan.com/covers.htm>

The Symptom (online journal published by Josefina Ayerza): <http://www.lacan.com/thesymptom.htm>

(Re)-turn: A Journal of Lacanian Studies:
<http://www.missouri.edu/~raglande/Lacan/>

