

**THE INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL CARTELS OF THE
SCHOOL**

**FLYING PAPERS OF THE SCHOOL
N° 1**

**An aperiodic Bulletin of the Intercontinental and Bilingual Cartels
of the School of the CIOS**



**SPFLF
November 2022**

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION	3
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY DAY OF SEPTEMBER 17 2022	
Opening: Colette Soler (France)	4
1st table: The effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in intension	
Marc Strauss (France): Never that again?	5
Gabriel Lombardi (Argentina): The ‘to desire’ of analysis	7
2nd table: The effects of the Pass on the School	
Ida Freitas (Brazil): “Thinking with your feet”	10
Eliane Pamart (France): The clear-obscure effect of the Pass	13
3rd table: The effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in extension	
Beatriz Maya (Colombia): The crumbs of the act	16
Trinidad Sanchez-Biezma de Lander (Spain): The cartel: a possibility for a discreet link	19
4th round table: The desire of the analyst, its place	
Anaïs Bastide (France): The desire of the analyst, its place	21
Sandra Berta (Brazil): In search of something new	24
Nadine Cordova (France): The place of the buckle	25
María Jesús Díaz (Spain): An approach to the desire of the analyst	16
Patricia Muñoz (LAN): Aporias of the analyst’s desire	27
Camila Vidal (Spain): The analyst’s desire	28
Conclusion: María de los Angeles Gómez (Puerto Rico)	30
CATALOGUE OF THE CARTELS OF THE CIOS	31
3 rd LETTER OF PRESENTATION OF THE CARTELS OF INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL CARTELS OF THE SCHOOL	35

PRESENTATION

When introducing the cartel in his School, Lacan was always categorical: the products are not collective but specific to each individual. In return, the School is responsible for ensuring their presence in the field of work transferences. This is what these *Flying Papers* of the intercontinental and bilingual cartels of the School wish to contribute to.

During the two years of its mandate the CIOS [CAOE] 2020-2022 has taken the message given to it by the previous ICG seriously, which expressed regret that this body, which is supposed to animate and orient the School, had not yet really found its function. Hence our initiative of the intercontinental and bilingual cartels of the School which brings together members of the School from two different continents and who speak at least two different languages. It should encourage new and multiple links for the work on psychoanalysis at the base of the School.

For many members, bringing together these geographical and linguistic differences in order to think about psychoanalysis is a new experience, and many are delighted about already. If possible, these *Flying Papers* also open up a space for resonance beyond the limits of each cartel, and throughout the School.

This first issue of *Flying Papers* presents the work of the Study Day of September 17th. The second issue will include a few texts written for it. They will be regularly circulated on the list and posted on the site in our five languages. This first version in French will therefore be quickly followed by the other four. A special mention must be made here about the translations. We have entrusted five colleagues with the task of putting together and managing their own translation teams. We would therefore like to thank these team leaders, Sidi Askofaré, Diego Mautino, Beatriz Oliveira, Manel Rebollo and Susan Schwartz, who, by avoiding all the difficulties, have greatly facilitated the work of the two secretaries of the CIOS, Sandra Berta for America and myself for Europe.

Colette Soler, October 27, 2022

THE STUDY DAY OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2022

THINKING PSYCHOANALYSIS IN THE INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL CARTELS

OPENING

Colette Soler (France)

It's a pleasure for me to open this Study Day and I welcome everyone. I want to be brief and will say only a few condensed words to set the framework for our debate today. It is a product of course of our program which distinguishes the effects of the Pass as dispositive, in treatments, in the School, and in extension.

These three registers reflect the three facticities that Lacan distinguishes at the end of the Proposition, but we are so fixed on Lacan's words that I don't know if this has been perceived.

Effect on analyses: not only on the analysands' aspirations, which many rightly emphasise, but on the analytic act, the desire it supposes and its aims. Is it, as we say, the real proper to the unconscious that this Pass encourages as aim?

Effect on the School. With the School, the question we have reopened is of knowing in what way it differs from an ordinary group, and in what way it is different as a consequence of the community of forums in which it is lodged. On this point, we would be wrong to make 'transference to the work' our watchword, for transference to the work is everywhere; rather, it seems to me that we should ask ourselves how the dispositive of the Pass contributes to making this difference exist.

Finally, the effect on the extension of psychoanalysis. Here I believe that something merits being specified. It's not so much psychoanalysis in extension, as in the extension [*en extension, que dans l'extension*]. This is what the end of the Proposition speaks about, and justly so. Thus, it's not that psychoanalysts and the forums, for example, are multiplying, but rather how psychoanalysis places itself, or even makes itself heard, in what is not psychoanalysis but the discourse of the time, with its own real, which is not that of unconsciousness but that of science.

So, we are going to hear today some contributions from intercontinental and bilingual cartels of the School with regard to these three registers, before moving on at the end of the day to six brief commentaries inspired by Lacan's paragraph in his address to the EFP in 1969, on the desire of the analyst.

1st table:

The effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in intension

Marc Strauss (France) and Gabriel Lombardi (Argentina)

Coordinator: Mikel Plazaola (Spain)

Marc Strauss (France)

Cartel: Effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in intension (June 14, 2021)

Plus-one: Bernard Toboul (France), Chantal Degril (New Zealand), Matias Laje (Argentina, Leonardo Pimentel (Brazil), Agnès Metton (France), Marc Strauss (France)

Never that again?

With the Pass, we are sure of one thing: we are not there yet. We are not there means that in spite of our efforts something still remains incomprehensible to us. This incomprehension contaminates all of psychoanalysis, including its daily practice. With the Pass, from the work of the Secretariat to the nominations, passing through the non-nominations, in vain we seek the key to a logic that we postulate.

Indeed, we know that the logic of the not-all gives a special place to the missing key, but does that exempt us from aiming for a consistency that would guarantee we are on the right track?

Our participation in the work of the School suffices to show that it matters to us to believe we are on the right path, that of analytic discourse. In deciding to practice psychoanalysis we have chosen to inscribe ourselves there. Yet, how can we not get lost in the multitude of theoretical perspectives where no psychoanalyst seems to find a worthwhile interlocutor unless it is for invective? We certainly have the support of the founding texts of Freud and Lacan, two indelible proper names. But we also know the danger of ‘fetishization’ of proper names. Lacan denounced this with regard to Freud. In addition to his teaching, would he not have provided us with an antidote to vaccinate us against ritualization? He not only added his name to Freud’s as a theoretician, he also added a dispositive: the pass/Pass.¹This common noun, too common, has become a crossroads for us, where alternatives are decided with no possible escape route: named or not. And of course, the justifications, wherever they come from – cartels, passands, passers – are always insufficient to produce the logic of these decisions which would render the decision reasonable because understandable. The Pass is the place that reminds us that no one escapes the assertion of anticipated certainty and that, as far as verification is concerned, each one can only rely on luck. The Pass is the failure in action of the ‘Obviously!’, a deliberate failure, always renewed. For everyone in our group, it is the somewhat disturbing well-spring where the question of his desire of the psychoanalyst can be actualized, in its practice, with regard to the discourse he claims to support.

Of course, one could ignore the Pass, label it bullshit [*connerie*] as someone did in front of me, and in those words. He is the head of another Lacanian branch where indeed the Pass is not practiced.

¹ Editor’s note: In English translation we maintain ‘pass’ for the moment of the analysand passing to the analyst in the last stage of the analysis, and ‘Pass’ for the dispositive proper, the procedure of verification before a Cartel of the Pass. In French, ‘*passé*’ is always written in the lower case.

These colleagues certainly have procedures where the impasse of selection hits home, and we can be sure of one thing: it can only be resolved by less democratic procedures.

The Pass reminds the psychoanalyst of the School in which he is inscribed that he is not there yet. Reminds, because he knows that like everyone else, he asks only to be able to imagine being legitimately and thus quietly in his place. To produce an analyst never assured of not failing in his place, this, for me, is the effect of the Pass in psychoanalysis in intension, on the side of the psychoanalyst. A certain modesty, then, to put it in a nutshell, this reminder that there is only singular analysis.

Not being there yet is also what worries the analysand. He knows very well that he is not yet at the end of his effort to understand his behavior, to know his desires. He waits, if not for a revelation, at least for an assurance found in the truth.

It is on this that the desire of the analyst must have decided: he must remember that he can no more give this truth-assurance to himself than he can to someone else. Neither give it, nor reinforce it, nor even merely authenticate it. On this point, the analyst's ignorance must remain total; earlier, we called it modesty. This abstention is the only possible response so that, from the exhaustion of the saids [*les dits*] the 'saying of the demand' [*le dire de la demande*] emerges. To illustrate, the saying of the demand is when the answer to the question, 'What am I doing here?' begins to be articulated with a renewed clarity.

What then will be the effect of the Pass on the analysand, that is, if he is aware of the dispositive and speaks about it? We make sure that, for him, it will remain on the horizon, and I wonder if here there is not something of a sales pitch [*boniment*], to return to the term Lacan used in his lecture at Vinatier in 1967, where the marvelous effects of the Pass were stated with regularity. Obviously, sales pitches only function for those who want to believe in them, until the day when...complicity can no longer remain veiled in innocence. Then it either passes...or crashes [*ça passe...ou ça casse*].

This is why we must go easy with respect to the pass, to take care that it does not too greatly reinforce in analysands the hope of being able one day to say with confidence: 'Never that again!' [*Plus jamais ça !*]. The 'that' [*ça*] is obviously unique to each one. If this perspective in the analysand is supported by the very same belief in the analyst, when faced with the impossible he will break rather than pass. It is better that the 'Never that again' has lost its value as a hope, that the subject has arrived at 'the end of his roll' [*le bout de son rouleau*] (Lacan), such that his hope, his faith in himself, finally makes a symptom, that is to say, a question: 'Why did I believe this story? And why for such a long time?'. This formulation is the fruit of a conversation with Nicolas Bendrihen; each of us contributed a sentence. Indeed, why so long, what was I looking for with such obstinacy in this exercise which no one forced on me other than myself?

The effect of the pass on the analysand therefore depends on the meaning he gives to it: an ideal to come so long as he aspires to it, or a displacement realized in the *après-coup* of its operation and which makes him see things quite differently. The effect of disillusionment has passed, which does not mean that it did not exist, however, there remains above all the fact of having, over the long course of his sessions, experienced in their substance the traces that always signified for us that something happened (*s'était passé*) for us. Their series attests to a real which makes the being of each one. It is better that he finds satisfaction there, with the modesty it entails. And if, in certain circumstances, the responsibility proves too heavy to bear, the analyst will be able to go back again, which will remind him that the choice of the analytic discourse is not that of drama.

Gabriel Lombardi (Buenos Aires)

Cartel: Putting the notion of *lalangue* into perspective with the other levels of unconscious language. Interrogation of its conceptualisation and of its effects in the treatments (September 4, 2021).

Plus-one: Zehra Eryörük (Belgium), Léla Chickani, (Lebanon), Gabriel Lombardi, (Argentina), Ana Laura Prates, (Brazil) Bernard Toboul, (France)

The ‘to desire’ of analysis¹

I participate in an international cartel with Ana Laura Prates, Léla Chickani, Bernard Toboul and Zehra Eryörük (plus one). Our general theme: *Putting the notion of lalangue into perspective with the other levels of unconscious language. Questioning its conceptualisation and its effects on the treatment.* These levels are *grammar*, which limits the range of meanings of *lalangue* through writing and community judgement (*Télévision*), that of *logic*, without which interpretation would be imbecilic, without support (*L'étourdit*), and that of *discourse*, constituted by the elements and effects of language which serve to constitute the social bond (*Louvain*).

What relations do I find with the theme proposed for this round table, ‘The effects of the pass in psychoanalysis in intension’? Many, and I will try to articulate some of them from the point of view of grammar. It is where Freudian drives and their destinies are constituted, and the symptom as a real stop which nevertheless lies to the partner ‘until its pseudo-sexual spring is analysed’, under the forms of neurosis, perversion and psychosis (*‘I don't love the man, she loves him’, etc.*).

To define the analytic act, Lacan explains that the act takes place from a *saying* whose subject changes. It is the definition of the average diathesis that grammar has always situated. In it, the subject is neither the agent of the action nor only its passive object. The Latin *loquor* (‘I say’) is an action that transforms the subject, as opposed to its mere representation (Benveniste, *Actif et moyen dans le verbe*).

However, those who come to an analysis do so precisely because they are not in a position to situate themselves at that elective and transformative point of the middle diathesis which is the voice of the act. Inhibited, anxious or symptomatic, the patient ‘wants to say’, perhaps, but does not make up his mind, does not say, or disavows. Hence the interest of the Freudian method by which the sufferer is offered the possibility of exploring the modalities of the subjunctive, the optative, the conditional, without an assertive, decisive saying. Installed in the treatment, it replaces the saying by speech that is expressed in the modal variants of the demand: ‘I need that...’, ‘it is possible that...’, ‘it is impossible that...’; sometimes, contingently, it stops being impossible, but at the wrong time; ‘I want, but I cannot’, ‘you can give me, so I ask you to...’, etc.

The title *The ‘to desire’ of analysis* allows me to reflect on the *infinitive* promoted by Lacan in his ‘Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School’. What characterises the infinitive in the five languages of our School is that it is not defined by morphemes of person, number, tense, diathesis or modality. Indeterminate in these respects, it is not properly speaking a verb but only the noun of a verb; it never fulfils the function of the verbal nucleus of an utterance. In other, less neurotic times, the verb was designated by the first person of the present indicative.

¹ Translator’s note: In his title ‘*El desear del análisis*’ Lombardi uses the Spanish infinitive ‘*desear*’, ‘to desire’ in the function of a noun. Where he uses the noun ‘*deseo*’, the noun ‘*desire*’, is indicated in the translation.

Now it is designated by the infinitive in which the marks of person (first, second, third, singular or plural), of diathesis (passive, middle or active) can be added by ‘auxiliary’ verbs - literally ‘giving pleasure’ (*iuveo* in Latin) to the infinitive, helping it to express itself - (Benveniste, *Structure des relations d'auxiliarité*).

The ‘to desire’ of analysis, syntagma with infinitive verb, is actually compatible with what Lacan calls the destitution of the subject, but no longer in that middle voice which transforms the subject directly, but in the analytic act in its peculiarity, where the act and the subject are produced in separate bodies. This destitution is different from an ‘I desire’, even from a desire specified as ‘of the psychoanalyst’. The subjective destitution or de-designation is an effect of being that does not bear the mark of a first person, it is not a ‘strong I’, but an effect of ‘being strong, and singularly’ (*Discours à l'EFPP*). This destitution is the condition of the payments required by the ‘to desire’ of the analysis (‘Direction of the treatment...’): the payment of the person of the psychoanalyst to manoeuvre in the transference and the payment of his intimate judgement to redirect the teleology to the desire that orients the analytic treatment. This destitution also enables payment by means of interpretation, a half-hearted saying, yes, not modal but apophantic (*L'étourdi*), that is to say without marks of modality.

It is the analysand who provides, to the infinitives of the desire [*deseo*] of the analysis, the support that gives pleasure and specifies the modalities to come.

As a consequence of my personal experience of the passage at the end of my last analysis, I locate a specific effect of this destitution. It is an effect of relief and sometimes also of inspiration.

The morning before writing this text, on Saturday, September 3rd, still under the influence of a Shakespearean play, I dreamt that I was speaking in *Spanglish* and trying to make grammatical sense of an absurd and obscure sentence, which nevertheless seemed to me to have a certain value. What I was able to reconstruct when I woke up was the utterance:

The nature of the concern is the concern of nature, in which there is no concern.

(La nature du souci est le souci de la nature, dans laquelle il n'y a pas de souci)

This “no concern”, no preoccupation, no prevention, no care, a certain *sans souci*, is my exit from an almost permanent cognitive activity whose somatic effects distract me from the social bond. When I experience this exit, each time, the possibility of listening and intervening in another way opens up for me. The signifier provided by the analysand opens up in polyphonic equivocations, the statements reveal their pseudo-sexual spring where the grammatical gender supplants the logic of sex, and at the level of discourse I notice that the analysand is not only right, but also right, but also right, multiples, contradictory reasons, with which he argues as in the case of the leaky cauldron recounted by Freud, attacking the logical consistency of the system.

Unlike other colleagues, who often present themselves as pure psychoanalysts, ‘past’ once and for all, my position is rather one of oscillation between analyst and analysand, which does not prevent me – quite the contrary – from guaranteeing the progress of the analysis thanks to the subjective destitution learned towards the end of my own analysis.

This text follows on from another, which I read at previous ALS Study Day of Cartels, entitled ‘The pure psychoanalyst and the analysing analyst’, in which I oppose, to the static of the psychoanalyst hypnotised by a ghost, the dynamics of the transference illuminated by Lacan in his

‘Proposition of 9 October 1967’; the transference as the pivot of the oscillation between analysand and analyst in the manner of a final tango between the subject $\$$ and object a .

On the other hand, this text precedes another one that I will read in Salta next November 4th, also at the ALS Study Day of Cartels which I will call: ‘The grammatical sensibility of the subject of the unconscious’.

2nd table:

The effects of the Pass on the School

Ida Freitas (Brazil) and Eliane Pamart (France)

Coordinator: Julieta De Batista (Argentina)

Ida Freitas (Brazil)

Cartel: Theme – Body (March 20, 2022) Plus-one: Ida Batista de Freitas, (Brazil), Esther Jiménez (Spain), Alejandro Rostagnotto, (Argentina), Franc Estevez Roca, (Spain), Maria Cláudia Formigoni (Brazil)

The effects of the Pass in the School: “Thinking with your feet”

I start from Lacan’s 1967 Proposition for the Pass and the upheaval caused in the analytic community by the subversion provoked in terms of what was offered as a guarantee to the analyst until then. Proposing authorisation as a consequence of the analysis of the analyst, who authorises himself, pointing to the participation of the real in the formation of the analyst and marking the necessary distinction between hierarchy and gradus, Lacan situates the Pass as the dispositive for the verification of the formation of analysts of his time and of the generations that would succeed him.

With dysfunctional and obscene experiences previously, we learned how not to work, what not to repeat, we learned through the ill effects and here we are asking ourselves what are the effects of the Pass in our counter-experience, after 21 years of its effective operation in our community. To reflect on the effects of the Pass is to put the use we make of the analytic discourse to the test.

Tributaries of Proposition 67, we have been trying to “do better”, to reformulate past experiences, and to continue offering the dispositive of the Pass to assure the analysts who risk testifying about their analyses in it, putting them to the test without the guarantee of a nomination.

Current experience, since its beginning, has demonstrated the use and ethical application of the dispositive of the Pass that each time summons the members of the School, from the Secretariat to the Cartel, to the disposition to the work that does not happen without each one putting in check something of themselves, their body, their ignorance and knowledge in the game.

The effects of the Pass in the School are multiple, effects that move, make noise, wake up, scare, cheer, disturb, cause desire, but at times indignation.

The epistemic bias is perhaps the most evident and material effect, the gain in knowledge about analysis, its crucial moments, turns, twists, decisions, act, knowledge, content of such importance registered in *Wunsch*, where we find a new psychoanalytic literature that orbits around the pass and its several unfoldings.

The epistemic bias has a great range, reaching all those involved in the dispositive of the Pass, extending to the whole community of experience.

Starting with the AMS who must be attentive and sensitive to his analysands, who approach the analysand-analyst passage in order to know how to identify passers who are equal to their function, which implies being oriented towards real sense, qualified to handle the signs of the topological turn, and who hold, in a certain way, the doctrine of the end of analysis proposed by Lacan and elaborated by the Cartels of the Pass.

For passers, the epistemic gain is immeasurable, starting with the surprise, an indication without warning that disconcerts, questions, points to something of their analytical path, followed by the uniqueness of this function. There is no way of developing a praxis of theory during the function of passer, which happens in a brief time that imposes the urgency of knowing how to navigate this function, which may cause desire, excite, but can also cause anxiety, frighten. This experience returns in some way to the analysis of each passer as an addition or disturbance in knowledge, and it may also produce a change in their engagement with the School. It is not rare that listening to the testimony of a passand, and transmitting with their voice what each one heard to the Cartel of the Pass, leads the passer to the Pass.

For the passand, it is the exercise at first of re-reading what he can read of his unconscious in his analysis, the hystorisation of this, the cutting out of what has been demonstrated as essential, its logic, its equation. In aiming to transmit the knowledge acquired up to the limit of the impossible, a new knowledge is outlined from the position of “becoming a psychoanalyst through his own experience”, unique, which borders, gives a sharper outline to the finitude of his path, its structure, real, symbolic and imaginary entangled with the symptom, the knot proper to each One, that can be shown in the Pass.

This knowledge expands, unfolds, recreates, "trans-creates" (as Walter Benjamin proposed in his work of translation), but it is also theorises with what has been decanted, the slurry of passands named Analysts of the School – an elaboration of knowledge that can become more objective and systematic in the transmission of the singular of one’s analysis for the entire community of the School.

As for the Cartel of the Pass, we expect from each of its members a sensitivity to, firstly, capture the unheard, the untransmissible, and, second, after “deducing from the testifier the place of the forgotten saying, and as this manifests itself beyond the hysteria of an analysis”, (Fingermann, 2016, p. 107), to be able to deliberate on whether there is an Analyst of the School or not. It is from this nucleated work of the Cartel of the Pass that each person's questions can arise for the elaboration and the product, which is how I was able to understand this.

The question I ask myself is, therefore, how not to recognise the intensity of this movement of “thinking with one’s feet” (Lacan, 2003[1973], p. 311), “practical thought oriented towards action and not towards lucubrations”, as Colette Soler proposes (2018 [2007-2008], p. 27). This practice must therefore produce a currency, a freshness, and then a return to the School as a real whirlwind that affects each of the disassorted individuals who make up the School, as well as the participants of our Clinical Colleges, clinical formations that can now nourish a curiosity, being intrigued and concerned by what we transmit from the dispositive of the Pass.

Concerning the effects produced by the nominations in the School, I conclude, as Lacan (2003[1962]) indicated, that the nomination is the “reading of a unary trait that designates absolute difference”. These are also diverse effects and obviously not always the most expected. Effects that can attest to the real involved in the formation of the analyst, produce satisfaction in many, demonstrating again what the wager in psychoanalysis can indeed produce: trans-formations, an analyst, cause of the desire to pass on the experience of the pass. However, we are not exempt

from imaginary effects, from hurried deductions or even from a certain idealisation of the pass, because of another idealisation that corresponds to the end of the analysis.

Criticism, questions, evaluations are always welcome in psychoanalysis, in the School and its dispositives and agencies. From what I have been able to evaluate and perceive myself, the SPFLF is very attentive and seeks to encourage debate with the aim of making the necessary changes for a responsible, ethical functioning congruent with the principles that guide us so that we do not lose our compass. Holes, cracks, discontinuities and reworkings are an essential part of the movement of doing, of working, of walking and balancing on a tightrope.

To engage in the School, to participate in its agencies, seems to me to be the best way of being able to weave a critique from the doing, from the work, and can prove to be one of the interesting effects of the Pass which is to know the School from the inside.

However, I consider that the fundamental effect for the School and the training of its analysts, that we can draw from the Pass for each of the analysands, the practising analyst or AMS, would be to question ourselves about finished or unfinished analyses and about the know-how of the clinic of each one. Perhaps the best effect of the pass is to make a hole in knowledge and, consequently, to awaken the desire for know-how, to orientate, vectorise analyses towards the real because “it is necessary to take the real into account [...] that which is detached from our experience of knowledge” (Lacan, 2003[1973], p. 312). The effect of the Pass, in order to highlight the analytic discourse, can “found a social bond purged of any necessity for the group” (Lacan, 2003 [1972], p.475), which may have essentially contributed to the distinction of any group with its effects of “imaginary obscenity and effect of discourse”, (Lacan, 2003 [1972], p. 475) from the School.

References

- Fingermann, D. *A (de)formação do psicanalista: as condições do ato psicanalítico*. São Paulo: Escuta, 2016.
- Lacan, J. *O Seminário, Livro 9: a identificação [1961-1962]*. Recife: Centro de Estudos Freudianos do Recife, 2003.
- Lacan, J. Proposição de 9 de outubro de 1967 sobre o psicanalista da escola. In: *Outros escritos*. Tradução de Vera Ribeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003. P. 248-264.
- Lacan, J. O aturdido [1972]. In: *Outros escritos*. Tradução de Vera Ribeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003. P. 448-497.
- Lacan, J. Nota italiana [1973]. In: *Outros escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003. P. 311-315.
- Soler, C. *Comentario de la Nota Italiana de Jacques Lacan: Curso 2007-2008*. Medellín: AFCLM, 2018.

Eliane Pamart (France)

Cartel: Theme – Transmission (June 18, 2021)

Plus-one: Dominique Touchon Fingermann, (Brazil and France), Beatriz Oliveira (Brazil), Beatriz Maya (Colombia), Eliane Pamart (France), Tatiana Assadi (Brazil)

The clear-obscure effect of the Pass

How to approach the possible effects of the Pass on the School, knowing that the Pass and the School are united since their appearance in Lacan's 'Proposition' of 1967?

In this first text, he elaborates the fundamental principles by presenting the dispositive of the Pass from the outset. He considers the putting into place of this procedure to be necessary in order to counter the problems of hierarchy which had, up to that point, hampered psychoanalytical societies like Freud's IPA, but also the SPP [*Société psychanalytique de Paris*] of which he was a member.

Freud, in his text 'The question of lay analysis' of 1926, had put forward the hypothesis of a School to guarantee the training of analysts.¹

In the 'Preface to the English edition of Seminar XI of 1976',² that is, nine years later, the last text on the Pass, Lacan confirms the function of this dispositive in refining its aims.

His first text designates this gathering of analysts with the name of 'School', and posits that "the psychoanalyst derives his authorisation only from himself,"³ and in return, the School guarantees that an analyst has come out [*releve*] of its training. Lacan's School is articulated around these two principles, making the Pass the dispositive through which to verify the realisation [*effectuation*] and becoming the agalmatic centre of formation in the Lacanian orientation.

In positing that the analyst is only authorised by himself, he ousts any recourse to an Other guaranteeing this passage to the analyst, leaving him the responsibility for a vertiginous act in the greatest solitude.

The Pass grasps the effects of the analytic act that allows the emergence of the desire of the analyst, dissipating the "thick shadow" [*ombre épaisse*].⁴

Lacan writes again in his 'Proposition': "this thick shadow that covers this juncture I am concerned with here, the one at which the psychoanalysand passes to psychoanalyst, that is what our School can work at dissipating".⁵

¹ Freud, S. (1926e) The Question of Lay Analysis. SE XX, p. 179.

² Lacan, J. (1981 [1976]) The Preface to the English-Language Edition. In *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis*. London, W.W. Norton & Company.

³ Lacan, J. [1995 (1967)] Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School, trans. Russell Grigg, *Analysis* 6, p. 1.

⁴ Ibid., Translator's note: in the English version, Grigg translates "*ombre épaisse*" as "dark cloud", p. 8.

⁵ Ibid., p. 8, (trans modified, see footnote above.)

He called for the compilation of experience and expected a doctrine on the testimony of passands to be based on it: “a cumulation of experience, its compilation and elaboration, an ordering of its varieties, a notation of its degrees”.⁶

In 1975, in the ‘Geneva Conference on the Symptom’, he comes back to the reasons for putting his dispositive in place.

“In the spirit of my Proposition,” he writes, “this exercise is carried out so as to cast some light upon what happens at this point,”⁷ this moment of passage from analysand to analyst, for those who wish to be analysts, and who wish to testify to the Cartel of the Pass. He questions the composition of this jury as well as its potential listening, while justifying the function of passer – whom he will designate as the Pass itself – through this function of knotting between passand and Cartel of the Pass, and its proximity to the analysing position of the passand. If one has found his exit, the other seeks it once more.

He appeals to Freud’s process of group identification in order to inform analysts of their choice.

In terms of the testimonies gathered in this framework, Lacan reminds us, citing Freud, not to put a case in a pigeon-hole. “He would like us to listen, if I may say, entirely independently of knowledge [*connaissance*] we have acquired, to be aware of what we are dealing with, namely the particularity of a case”.⁸ A little further on he says, “it is clear that we are unable to obliterate our experience”, and he adds “if that were better understood, there would be perhaps a path towards another mode of intervention”.

The function of the passer is thus instituted to counter these phenomena of identification, and of the classification of cases, in making himself the passand’s spokesperson to the Cartel of the Pass. But how to testify to a real that does not cease not being written? How to read it in what is heard of the remainder of a saying, faced with a Cartel sitting squarely in its non-knowledge [*insu*], about a pre-established knowledge?

Lacan chose to set in place a supplementary obstacle where the passand and the cartel never meet during the procedure. “I wanted a person who was at the same level as the one crossing this threshold to be a witness”.⁹ For Lacan, no doubt, the Pass is established to shine a light on this passage to the analyst for the School.

However, in spite of this dispositive, he states that “it became another mode of selection”, faced with passands who testified “in all honesty”.¹⁰ If this experience is required for the transmission of psychoanalysis, the choice of nominations depends on contingencies and the resonance of the Cartel. The School does not escape from the effects of the group and their doxa and we cannot exclude this phenomenon of identification in what is heard in a Pass coming to punctuate the decision. Why is there so little nomination in our School?

How to cast light on what hasn’t passed? What remains misunderstood [*mal-entendu*] even not understood/heard?¹¹ What has not resonated against the edges of the hole that constitutes the Pass in the School? How to testify to this enigma?

⁶ Ibid., p. 10.

⁷ Lacan, J. (1975) Geneva Lecture on the Symptom, *Analysis* 1, 1989, p. 11.

⁸ Ibid., p. 11. Translator’s note: The two following citations in this paragraph are also from this page.

⁹ Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 11.

¹¹ Translator’s note: In French, the verb ‘*entendre*’ can mean both ‘to hear’ and ‘to understand’. This doubling of the meaning in the French language suggests, in a way resonant with Lacan’s teaching, that we hear is what we understand.

Lacan spoke honestly about testimony. Colette Soler recently spoke of an ‘authentic’ testimony producing an AS [Analyst of the School]. But what becomes of the non-nominated?

Like Freud, Lacan wished, “to hystorise”¹² psychoanalysis in demonstrating the effects of the analytic act to which the Pass would testify within the School, sustaining the position of analysand in its members. These effects would be a permanent questioning about analytic practice, such as in the proverb: “*Vingt fois sur le métier remettez votre ouvrage*” [‘Do your work twenty times over’ (in order to perfect it)]. The clear-obscure effect of the Pass could make the School, the question is required to support the status of the new profession in the world.

3rd table:

The effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in extension

Beatriz Maya (Colombia) and Trinidad Sanchez-Biezma de Lander

Coordinator: Sandra Berta (Brazil)

Beatriz Maya (Colombia)

Cartel: Theme – Transmission (June 18, 2021)

Plus-one: Dominique Touchon Fingermann (France et Brazil) Beatriz Oliveira (Brazil), Beatriz Maya (Colombia), Eliane Pamart (France), Tatiana Assadi (Brazil)

The Crumbs [*Migaras*] of the Act

The present text is the product of two cartels of the CIOS [CAOE]. The work presented at a previous conference, whose theme was ‘Style’, left me with a concern that I intend to unfold here. On the other hand, the other cartel, whose theme is ‘Intension’, is the backdrop to the whole development.

In order to sustain the School, intension is not enough, it requires extension; the Pass constitutes a good hinge to articulate them. It is a question of giving an account of the leap that was made in order to occupy the place of the analyst made of the *a*; from a before to an after that has consequences,¹ which implies passing from intension to transmission and, from there, to extension.

Thus, intension and extension make a duo coupled by the emptiness that evidences the pass and that we write as *a*. The style of the speaker is notable when it is backed by the experience in the dispositive. When I say ‘style’, I refer to two issues that Lacan adds to Buffon when he says: “The

¹² The Preface, op. cit. p. viii.

¹ Lacan, J. *Seminar XV* The Psychoanalytic Act. Session of 21 February 1968

style is the man himself² a formula extended by Lacan as follows: “the man one addresses”³ including the Other in the message, and then adding: “it is the object that answers the question about the style’ being at stake ‘the fall of the object’”.⁴ It is not enough to sustain this hypothesis from evidence, we should think about what is structural.

L'Étourdit starts from crumbs⁵ for an extension where the said and the saying come into play. It is also a question of crumbs in what the passers pick up for the transmission to the cartel, the same crumbs that will continue to operate for the extension. For this to happen, how can we not cover what would be a leap⁶ – Lacan calls it the passage to the analyst – both in the analysand-analyst relationship and in the cartel of the pass? It is necessary that the *hystorisation* is not only the way to listen to “what there is”, it is a question of including the saying in the “there is not” of the saying⁷. It is from the experience of *de-sense* [*au-sentido* (*Sp*), *dé-sens* (*Fr*)] that the impulse for transmission arises.

“Let the analyst be at least two. The analyst who has effects is the analyst who, from those effects, theorises them,”⁸ says Lacan. The analyst who gives an account of his passage in the dispositive of the Pass is one of the two, the effect of the intension that is offered to the Pass and, the other one is the one who proposes to make an extension of the act, the one who tries to respond from that act. This is how I understand Lacan's saying “if there is someone who spends his time passing the pass, it is me”.⁹ The same thing that he expects from those who have gone through the experience.

The Pass has been able to leave in passers, passands and members of the Cartel an incomplete knowledge because there is no ultimate signifier; the impossible to say always pushes towards production, it is the motor for extension. The questions lead to a search for an answer in the formalisation of what makes the work of extension and continuing formation; an effort to transmit the untransmissible of psychoanalysis. Something on the side of the act is re-actualised every time speech is used [*se toma*] to keep psychoanalysis in existence.

How can an experience that ‘cannot be forgotten’¹⁰, as Lacan indicates, as far as the passant is concerned, not be falling under the remit of the extension, from ‘a certain sector of shadows’¹¹ that also concerns the other participants of the experience? Lacan himself expected it from the jury of the pass when he said: ‘I limit myself to waiting for what will actually result from it, including a very different way of collecting the testimony’¹². He is waiting for the effects that the pass may leave, including the deterioration, devastation or ravage (*dégât* – in French in the text) with which the pass itself makes its transmission¹³. The stamp, the mark left by the pass is glimpsed in the intervention of those who try to say something afterwards.

So the extension is not without the support of the act which, in various ways, has made possible to arrive at the pass. It is not necessary to go back to retelling the story in order to grasp that the

² Lacan, J. *Écrits, The First Complete Edition in English*, Overture to this Collection, Trans. B. Fink, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, London, 2006, p. 9

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Lacan, J. *Autres écrits*, *L'Étourdit*, Paris, Seuil, 2000, p. 449

⁶ Lacan, J. Seminar XV, The Psychoanalytic Act, lesson of 21 February 1968.

⁷ Lacan, J. *Autres écrits*, *L'Étourdit*, 2000, Paris, Seuil, p. 459.

⁸ Lacan, J. *Seminar XXII*, RSI, Session 10 December 1974, Unpublished.

⁹ Lacan, J. *Sobre la experiencia del pase*, Ornicar, España, 1981, p. 39.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 36.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., p. 38.

¹³ Ibid., p. 39.

words bring the echo of an experience. Each one inevitably returns to a familiar terrain where the real of the symptom emerges, no longer as impotence this time, but as relying on the impossibility that is verified in that which will always be questioning, and this constitutes the dynamism of the work.

A written text, which renews the sayings of Lacan and Freud, is the result of some disquiet that traces the same thing that one wants to circumscribe through different paths. Style, then, is at stake in the extension; as I said earlier, if it is the object that responds through style, that is the cause of desire, and sustains the subject between truth and knowledge¹⁴, it can only be from there that a transmission is made that relies on the reception by the Other, on what resonates in the addressee, beyond signification.

Lacan affirms that what he wrote, although it is not very well understood, ‘*retains*’¹⁵. I wonder about what is retained; it is not only an intellectual curiosity, there is something of the intimate that collides with that writing, leaving the singularity of the subject that situates us on the outside and takes us out of the idea that there is a paradigm. It is always a question of starting again from crumbs that allows the pass to be the basis for an extension of psychoanalysis. The crossing of transferences, not by chance, in one of the cartels from which I speak here, dynamised the possibility of articulating the two sides of the experience: intension and extension. A certain intimate community allows the work to move forward, and the question to be kept coming and going in a teaching like Lacan's. Disagreement is not a stumbling block, the different positions are outlined so to be discussed, even if it is not a matter of convincing the other, precisely, the disparity allows for a re-reading of what is thought to be already known. In the *Proposition* Lacan traces “the topology of the projective plane”, in order to knot extension and intension with a gap [*biancia*]¹⁶ that not only alludes to what an analysis discovers in each one but also to what the analysts lack in order to continue thinking about psychoanalysis.

¹⁴ Lacan, J. Overture to this Collection, *Ecrits*, The First Complete Edition in English, Trans. B. Fink, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, London, 2006, p. 22.

¹⁵ Lacan, J. *Mon Enseignement*, Paris, Seuil, 2005, p. 80.

¹⁶ Lacan, J. Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School. Trans. Russell Grigg. *Analysis* 6, p. 11: “consistent with the topology of the projective plane, it is on the very horizon of psychoanalysis in extension that the internal circle we outline as the gap of psychoanalysis in intension closes”.

Trinidad Sanchez-Biezma de Lander (Spain)

Cartel: Theme – There is no extension without intension (June 21, 2021)

Plus-one: Trinidad Sánchez-Biezma de Lander (Spain), María Jesús Díaz (Spain), Carmen Lafuente (Spain), Beatriz Maya (Colombia), Andrea Franco Milagres (Brazil)

The Cartel: A Possibility for a Discreet Link

Today I focus upon the work on the cartel, a possible transmission that occurs within that one small group, and the link that is made after the surprise as an effect of what is transmitted. It is not knowledge, but rather it is an account of what causes it; it is therefore a knowledge that is not taught, but is transmitted. Lacan affirms that his choice for psychoanalysis transmits this even against the analysts, just as Freud did, who, from his solitude accounted for his choice, in the midst of the community he had created.

From this proposition, the cartel could be thought of as a place where in its product, are gathered the crumbs of the psychoanalytic texts that it addresses and the elaboration that collects the sayings of others as well. *The saying is not the voice, the saying is an act.* (Lacan RSI)

After a decision from the current CIG to form intercontinental cartels, I thought of forming one with certain names and former work links. Only one name, which also coincided with the two necessary conditions to compose the cartel: another language, another continent, was a person *I did not know at all*, I had only read a small work published by her some time ago.

This *not knowing her at all* was a requirement that was imposed on me, without realizing it too much and without knowing to what extent that condition could cause affects that I recognize as new and that I can talk about today. When I became aware of this new link, I personally named it the best thing that happened to me in Buenos Aires, so much so, that it made me work on what kind of link that was and why or how it had been created.

The question could have drifted like so many others, subsumed amongst the things of life, but a contingency placed it back in the foreground; a request to present a small contribution to today's Conference, put it to work. And since Opportunity, Fortune's poor servant, is painted bald, that contingency made me go back to what I never stopped asking myself. How is this new link, product of the cartel, caused? which is far from being a: "*all for one [like in] Fuente Ovejuna*"

It is nevertheless indispensable that the analyst should be at least two, the analyst to produce effects, and the analyst who theorises these effects. Lacan. RSI.

We know from Freud and **Group Psychology**... that in order to constitute a group, identified subjects are needed, and for Lacan, as found in **L'Étourdit**, despite knowing that it is impossible for analysts to form a group, for those scattered and ill-assorted to group, nevertheless it is he who invites us to form cartels, small groups where a work of the School is elaborated.

It is in the **RSI Seminar**, class of 4/15/75, where he states that the cartel has to be identified to a particular point of the group that although he does not specify on this occasion, he presents it just as he is working on the hole of the Borromean knot, a knot that allows the real, the symbolic and

the imaginary to be held together. To my understanding, what he proposes is to identify the cartel with the object (a) as an empty hole. *It is certain that human beings identify to a group. When they do not identify to a group, they're finished and ought to be locked up. But I am not saying by this to what point of the group they must be identified.* Colette Soler works on this sentence in *What Produces a Link* and focuses on: *they ought to be*, like a duty, and later goes on to say that the *difficult universal*, following Jean Claude Milner, does not lie on the sameness of the elements of the same class but on the differences.

The hole allows the function performed by Socrates, where from the lack of knowledge that marks his division as a subject, he can redirect the questions to others until he obtains the desired result in terms of knowledge. In any case, be it from a position of (a), the void at the center of the knot, or from the place of the divided subject of the lack, when the cartelisands identify themselves with this non-knowledge, the essential lack of the structure, the small group opposes the service of a leader, allowing individualities to survive within it.

This identification with the lacking object can be read as the possibility of Identifying one by one, or one with each one, while working from the non-knowledge of each one to produce a plus of knowledge. This identification is what Lacan called *identification by participation*, participation in the desire that animates the other, and in the case of the work transference, participation of the lack that animates that desire in the other.

So: neither mimicry, nor ritual. From the beginning, the cartel becomes the royal road that allows the experience, the multiplication of a new form of social link between analysts, around the elaboration of knowledges, which, even though different, support the possible transmission of an exteriority of a knowledge that is produced inside of it. It is a device, I would say, simple but demanding, committed. Setting up a cartel is no small feat because the unknown, the hole in knowledge must be the starting point of a path that can be uncomfortable, intense, even excessive.

The choice of the +One is simply more than one, a reminder of the structure. One more signifier that marks the lack of the signifier in less. The object (a) can very well inscribe that point of the group, embodied by the plus One, with which each one identifies as the cause of the functioning of that peculiar, erring link, which loves solitude.

Lacan never proposed a School formed of subjects identified with something concrete, he always proposed a School made up of workers determined to produce an elaboration on two important questions: what is psychoanalysis? and to deal with this he proposed the cartel. And what is a psychoanalyst? and for this he invented the pass.

Bibliography:

Lacan, J. RSI. Lesson of 3/18/1975. 1974-75 Seminar.

Lacan, J. RSI. Lesson of 12/10/1974, 1974-75 Seminar. This is RSI's Spanish translation on Patrick Valas' website. Soler, C. ¿Qué es lo que hace lazo? Curso 2011-2012. Pliegues. Ediciones de los Foros Hispanoparlantes del campo lacaniano [Soler, C. What Produces a Link? 2011-2012 Course. Pliegues Spanish-Speaking Forums of the Lacanian Field Editions]

Notes

Quevedo, in Fortune in Her Wits, or, the Hour of All Men, does not propose a moral, but we can draw up a moral of the story from his work: one must not defame Fortune, one must not curse what is real. This is what psychoanalysis aims for. Fortune, good or bad, is an event, Opportunity is something else. It depends on something external and on the possibility of the subject grasping

it in due time, always remembering that one must seize it by the hair. Since she is bald from behind, the only occasion to seize it is when it is showing its face, such as the subject's decision.

Lope in Fuenteovejuna. The play is based on an episode that occurred in Fuente Ovejuna, an Andalusian town. The town's Commander does not respect the laws and abuses his power; he harasses the mayor's daughter and tries to take her to his palace by force. The townspeople, fed up with the thefts, outrages and cruelties of the Commander, decide to unite and take justice into their own hands. One night they arrive at the palace, invade his home and kill him in the name of Fuenteovejuna. At the trial, when the judge asks them who killed the Commander, the whole town answers: "Fuenteovejuna, sir".

4th round table: The desire of the analyst, its place

This title refers to the 'Address to the Freudian School of Paris', of December 1969, where one can read:

"Thus, the desire of the psychoanalyst is this place which one is outside of without thinking, but one finds oneself again in being out of it for good, that is, having taken this exit only as an entrance, and not just any entrance, since it is the path of the analysand. Let's not pass over that to describe this place in a series of infinitives said to be the inarticulable of desire, desire nevertheless articulated from the sense-outcome of these infinitives, namely the impossible with which I satisfy myself at this detour."

Co-ordinator: Marie José Latour (France)

Patricia Muñoz (LAN), Anaïs Bastide (Belgium), Sandra Berta (Brazil), Nadine Cordova (France), María Jesús Diaz (Spain), Camila Vidal (Spain)

Anaïs Bastide "The Desire of the Analyst, its Place"

Our cartel is working on *The Knowledge of the Psychoanalyst*, which dates from 1971-1972. Up until then, Lacan had already spoken a lot about the being or the desire of the analyst. These terms are not found in the Saint-Anne talks. What does he add with this expression? Lacan had posited shortly before that the unconscious is a knowledge without a subject that encodes *jouissance*.¹ Even so, this title is not without reminding us of the link between psychoanalysis and rationality. Indeed, in the aftermath of his *Address to the Freudian School of Paris*, Lacan strongly criticizes some people's infatuation with non-knowledge [*non-savoir*]. He reaffirms that the question for the psychoanalyst

¹ This is the thesis of Radiophonie. Lacan, J. (1970). Radiophonie, *Autres Ecrits*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, p. 403-447.

is indeed that of ‘what he has to know’,² and he lists five occurrences of it.³ All of them concern knowledge of the structure. If it is assured, this knowledge is also limited by the structure of language. Thus, in contrast to the knowledge of science, its perspective is neither of power nor of progress, but rather of humility. Yet this knowledge deposited in analytic theory, though necessary in order to be able to operate as an analyst, is not sufficient since the question remains of how, for each particular analyst, this knowledge comes to him in his own treatment? It is from this angle that I approach the proposed theme. If we admit that analysis must operate a modification on the subject’s relation to knowledge, a preliminary question is: what is knowledge? Lacan makes an equivocal use of this term.

He insists that analytic discourse stands on ‘this sensitive border between truth and knowledge’.⁴ He thus reformulates the glimpsed fault [*faille aperçue*] of the subject supposed to know, that is, the bar placed on the locus of the Other and, the change it implies both in the relation to truth and to the real knowledge of the unconscious, this ‘unknown knowledge’ [*savoir insu*], enjoyed [*jouit*], which works on its own, which does not determine the subject, but the object *a*. This object *a*, whose pure logical consistency Lacan posited, is both what coordinates the experience of knowing and, the remainder produced from it because it is refractory to knowledge.⁵ From the ‘vain knowledge of a being that slips away’⁶ of 1967, to the ‘acquired knowledge, but to/for whom [*à qui*]?’⁷ of 1969, to the knowledge of the impossible of 1972, the emphasis shifts.

Indeed, if the analyst’s desire implies a being that is modified by his own analysis, this desire is non-predicable, so how can we circumscribe something of it? Provided the analysand pushes the experience far enough, endures and faces it, something may emerge in the analysis that was not there before. Following the different uses of ‘real’ and ‘semblant’ that Lacan makes of the term ‘knowledge’, holding the two ends of the thread of these new words ‘*lalangue*’ and ‘*mathème*’ that he brings into these discussions, could it be that what emerges is possibly a knot of knowledge, the fruit of the saying [*dire*] of the analysis? A knot of a pimple [*bouton*] of knowledge,⁸ of the expressed knowledge of the structure⁹, and of the holed knowledge¹⁰ with its enigmatic affect as index. A knowledge effect, effect of the analytic dispositive, and made of an experience of the unconscious.¹¹ This knowledge [*çavoir*]¹² of the analyst is no longer the one we possibly used to run

² Lacan, J. Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School, trans. Russell Grigg, *Analysis* 6, 1995, p. 7, (trans. mod.).

³ Castration, necessary for repetition, destiny of phallic jouissance, irreducible symptom, the impossible sexual relation. Lacan, J. (1971-72). ... *ou pire. Le savoir du psychanalyste* (version Staferla online), Leçon du 04/11/1971.

⁴ Proposition, op. cit., p.10, (trans. modified).

⁵ This is the thesis of “L’acte psychanalytique. *Compte-rendu du Séminaire 1967-1968*”, taken up again by Lacan in *The Knowledge of the Psychoanalyst*.

⁶ Lacan, J. (1967). Proposition, op. cit., p. 10 (trans. mod.).

⁷ Lacan, J. (1969). L’Acte psychanalytique. *Compte-rendu du séminaire 1967-1968. Autres Ecrits*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, pp.. 375-383, op. cit., p.375. Translator’s note: ‘*acquis*’ (acquired) and ‘*à qui*’ (to/for whom) are homophonous in French.

⁸ Unconscious knowledge that is not only of the enjoyed signifier [*signifiant jouit*] but of the incarnated signifier, passed to the real of jouissance.

⁹ Since the pimple [*bouton*] of unconscious knowledge (which, as such, does not have a truth) is expressed (in a dermatological sense) by the subject, its truth content is evacuated, and only remains the signifying articulation that shelters it i.e., the knowledge of truth. Thus, it is about the question of the articulated knowledge of the real of the structure extracted from the elucubrated knowledge proper to each one.

¹⁰ Irreducible unconscious knowledge, knowledge of *lalangue*; what is surprising, says Lacan, is that this unknown [*insu*] knowledge (...) is articulated, is structured like a language. Lacan, J. (1971-1972), ... *Ou pire, Le Savoir du psychanalyste, version Staferla, leçon du 04/11/1971*, op. cit. p.15.

¹¹ It seems to me that it is one thing to enter the pass via subjective destitution with its affects [*éprouvés*] – a destitution programmed by the analytic dispositive to which, therefore, each analysis leads and, another thing to grasp in it a formula of a knowledge proper to one.

¹² Translator’s note: *çavoir* is homophonous with *savoir* (knowledge) and is composed of *ça* (Id/it) and *voir* (to see), i.e., ‘to see it’.

after or idealise. Corollary to separation. Could we say this knowledge is the one that falls on us [*nous tombe dessus*]? In any case, its point of emergence determines and overcomes you and, insofar as it is a knotting, it engages you. As for what follows [*ce qui suit*], this remains to be seen [*c'est à (sans accent) voir*]¹³ as in the expression 'to be continued' [*à suivre*], since this knowledge is not to be calculated [*il s'calcule pas*].

¹³ Translator's note: *c'est à voir* means 'it remains to be seen' but here the author uses *a* without an accent, referring to a knowledge based on object *a*, a knowledge that cannot be calculated or programmed as such.

Sandra Berta,¹ In Search of Something New

What this table proposes is in accordance with our work in the Cartel where we attempt to make some inroad into the ‘Address to the Freudian School of Paris’. A text that is institutional and critical of psychoanalysis and the teachers that would reject the ‘Proposition’, a text which opens the referents of the structure at the end of analysis.

The desire of the psychoanalyst and the psychoanalytic act are what interests the Cartel that we have put together on the basis of what our School has been teaching us about the Pass over the last 20 years.² In the testimonies we have read so far, the time of the end of analysis is the pivot of what is elaborated by the AS: the time of the fall of the subject supposed to know (1967) and what is left for the mourning of the end.

On the same day that Lacan would read the ‘Address to the EFP’, he would say in his seminar: “it is enough to delineate the path of the exit, to enter there as well, without thinking about it, it is that in the end, the best way to get back in, in a certain way, is to exit again.”³ It is a topology that can serve to formalize the paradoxes of the end, where there is a resolution of the continuity of the fantasy through the discontinuity of the act where the subject is not. In his ‘Address’, in the sentence that summons us, this is signaled by the infinitive of the verb that speaks of the unarticulated of desire (as always defined by Lacan) but of a desire that is finally articulated by the equivocal homophony of the *sans-issu*.⁴ Does that articulated desire refer perhaps to the desire of the analyst?

In the ‘Address’ he also writes: “That is why it is from elsewhere, from the psychoanalytic act only, that one must locate what I articulate on the ‘desire of the psychoanalyst’.”⁵ The psychoanalytic act does not represent the subject, it is contingency that is a rupture with what it was supposed to correspond and respond to in the psychoanalyzing process: the desire of the Other. That route that could be infinite is suspended because something new is produced. Something that affects, transforms and deforms the initial symptom that, in the process of an analysis, had already been metamorphosed or reduced to a minimal expression in terms of its *jouissance*. But in addition, Lacan wanted this act and its effects to have consequences for the social link, that is, in his School.

The question is whether this being outside without thinking about it is transmitted by the modifications and metamorphoses of the symptom or whether what is transmitted is something new, uncommon in the process, in the detours of the end of analysis and in the *sans/sans issue*. Something new sometimes can be read in what is transmitted. Or at least it is something we look for in the Cartel in the written testimonies. Something that is read as new. The minimal contribution could be an index of the non-predictability of the desire of the analyst. It is there where the paradox of the end and the paradox of saying the impossible is lodged. Those small contributions ‘smuggle’ [*contrabandean*] the difference between the doing of a practice and the

¹ Cartel ‘*Wunsch*-What do the last 20 years of the Pass in the EPFCL teach us?’ Alejandro Rostagnotto (LAS) Plus-one; Patricia Zarowsky (France), initiator; Sol Aparicio (France); Camila Vidal (Spain); Sandra Berta (Brazil). Languages: Spanish and French. Language spoken in the cartel: Spanish. Cartel declared to the CIOS on May 18, 2021.

² The School in light of the testimonies of the Analysts of the School. Alejandro Rostagnotto’s presentation of our first period of work in the first Half-Study Day of the Cartels of the School, February 5, 2022.

³ Lacan, J. Seminar XV: ‘The psychoanalytic act,’ Lesson of December 6, 1967.

⁴ Without-exit (*sans-issu*)/meaning-exit (*sens-issu*). These phrases are homophones in French.

⁵ Lacan, J. (1967) Discurso em la Escuela Freudiana de Paris. *Otros Escritos*. Paidós, p. 289. Editor’s note: an English translation of this text, the ‘Address to the Freudian School of Melbourne’ has been made by members of the Forum of Melbourne.

sustaining of an act which, although it depends on certainty, is in danger of escaping, of slipping away leaving behind the “potential” [*en potencia*] that defines it.

Nadine Cordova: The place of the buckle

Our cartel was formed around the title “Termination of the analysis, readings of the School.” We decided to address this theme on the basis of a few texts drawn from *Wunsch* and from Lacan. But we were quickly oriented towards the gap that exists between the passage to the analyst and the end of an analysis.

It seemed relevant to us to think of *termination*¹ in the plural in order to highlight not only the variety of these passages and these endings – testified to by experience – but also our different points of view on the subject. Now, while rereading the ‘Proposition of [9 October] 1967, I realized that Lacan made the termination of psychoanalysis correspond to the passage to the analyst² and wrote *termination* in the singular. It seemed interesting to me to rely on this correspondence to say a few words about the desire of the psychoanalyst, its place.

Until now, I associated the term place with the big Other, the locus of a treasure. Let us remember that Lacan writes of the process of subjectivation starting from a chosen mathematical operation which marks separation, and which falls precisely by what causes me, and that causes outside the subject [*bors sujet*]; it’s an object that falls from this operation, we know this. The division thus buckled, has for effect that the desire of man is the desire of the Other, a place henceforth holed.

Lacan locates the desire of the psychoanalyst precisely at the place of the fall, of the waste, there where it [*ca*] testifies to the hole in the treasure, there where it [*ca*] is buckled, where it [*ca*] causes desire. The psychoanalyst therefore lends himself, for some others who seek their truth, to occupying this place, by buckling it, by buckling the *blab blab* in order to signify that it is on the side of the object that it [*ca*] takes place, their desire.

Through this positioning, the artificial device makes the analysand subject, who tirelessly demands the response of the Other, experience through twists and turns the effects of the

operation, I would say its mechanism. And there may be a chance of a meeting at the destination: the encounter with a fractional trait, *I* the effect of the signifier vacillates in meaning... it [*ca*] has a place, *I* buckle it; passage to...

It is in this temporal place where the affair of an analysis plays out. In act, the desire of the analyst is situated in this place where the analysing speech undergoes a cut. The analytical operation is buckled. In this *site of the buckle* there is simply a desire; the subject will choose whether or not to sit down, there where, for some, he will also fall from this place.

Despite the variations of the treatments, we can therefore join Lacan, the termination of the analysis is located at the time when it [*ca*] passes this place since it is a passage without return in the singular.

¹ Term borrowed by Lacan from Balint.

² Lacan, J. ‘Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School’, trans. Russell Grigg, *Analysis* 6, 1995, p. 7.

Only, there is yet a remainder, a place to leave for good, a door to cross through. The end this time concerns the separation of another body more or less at a distance from this passage-termination of the analysis.

To think about psychoanalysis is to try to open it up to these questions in another place.

Maria Jesus Diaz An Approach to the Desire of the Analyst

For me psychoanalysis is an experience, it is an experience of the unconscious that carries with it an ethical position, and throughout this experience, it became clear to me that neither Freudian analytical neutrality nor the identificatory path was enough to become an analyst, since the clinic did not work for me.

The lack of results and/or failures soon led me to ask myself: What would the necessary singular position be for the one who establishes himself as an analyst that would allow psychoanalysis to exist? How does someone become an analyst? In other words, what makes the one who establishes himself operate in the right way and with this act allow the emergence of the unconscious? What would the mechanism be that makes this possible?

This question led me to the Lacanian notion of the desire of the analyst, an enigmatic and complex concept that would be what would function as an operator. But what is this special desire? How is it produced?

In the first chapter of *Seminar XI* Lacan asks: What must the desire of the analyst be in order for it to operate? And throughout this Seminar he situates the fundamental elements for thinking the position of the analyst and says “he should know, in the process through which he guides his patient, what it is around which the movement turns”.¹ In the last chapter he maintains that “the analyst’s desire is not a pure desire. It is a desire to obtain absolute difference”.²

This would be the first approach to the concept, later developed in his teaching and formalised in the ‘Proposition of 9 October 1967’ and in the ‘Address to the Freudian School of Paris’.

In the ‘Proposition’ he says one becomes a psychoanalyst, properly speaking, with something extracted from one’s own analysis.

In the ‘Address to the Freudian School of Paris’ in 1967, he states “That is why it is from elsewhere, from the psychoanalytic act only, that one must locate what I articulate on the ‘desire of the psychoanalyst’, which has nothing to do with the desire to be a psychoanalyst” and that “the act happens by a saying but on condition that the subject is changed, that there is another one after the act”. Furthermore, in this discourse he continues, “Thus the desire of the psychoanalyst is this place which one is outside of without thinking, but one finds oneself again in being out of it for good, that is, having taken this exit only as an entrance, and not just any entrance, since it is the path of the analyst”.

¹ Lacan, J. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis*, trans. A Sheridan, ed. J-A Miller. London, W.W. Norton & Company, 1981, p. 230.

² *Ibid.*, p. 276.

After this brief journey through these texts, I believe I understand that only as a product of his own experience of analysis, he can become an analyst, provided that the analyst, as a result of that experience, has made transformations and modifications that allow him, when acting as an analyst, to maintain his desire as an empty place and thus lend himself to a desiring function, so that the unconscious desire of the subject who comes to his consultation can be located and emerge. For this, the analyst in his experience of analysis must have extracted a knowledge, and also a desire to know, but not just any desire to know, but a desire to know about the cause, about what pierces and establishes the emptiness but at the same time inscribes pure difference: language.

Patricia Muñoz: Aporias of the analyst's desire

When we ask the question about the desire of the analyst, we can say that it is an operator that allows a function, which has to do with the possibility of the psychoanalytic act. Moreover, there is a real at play here that provokes its own ignorance, even its systematic negation, as Lacan reminds us.¹

Since this desire of the psychoanalyst can arise as an encounter, Lacan, in the 'Proposition of 9 October on the Psychoanalyst of the School', brings us as an example Cantor and his encounters with transfinite numbers. He says: "It is worth thinking about the experience of a Cantor [...] in which the desire of the psychoanalyst is situated."² Later, in '*La Equivocación del sujeto supuesto saber*' [The error of the subject supposed to know], he refers again to Cantor, but this time in the sense of that real unconscious without a subject. He says: "The knowledge that is liberated in the error of the subject – how could a subject have known it before?"³ In that place a knowledge emerges that can be found thanks to the desire of the analyst.

In turn, Lacan also tells us in 'The Direction of the Treatment and the Principles of its Power' that it is, without doubt, in the relationship with being that the analyst must find his operative level. His task is the psychoanalytic act, but this act is founded on a paradoxical structure, for "in it the object is active and the subject subverted",⁴ which is why he refers to an aporia of the psychoanalytic act.

As we know, desire is inarticulable, articulated, however, by the dead-end of those infinitives, the impossible. Infinitives that, as we know, have to do neither with time nor with any subject. Lacan says, then:

Thus, the desire of the psychoanalyst is this place which one is outside of without thinking, but one finds oneself again in being out of it for good, that is, having taken this exit only as an entrance, and not just any entrance, since it is the path of the analysand. Let's not pass over that to describe this place in a series of infinitives said to be the inarticulable of desire, desire nevertheless

¹ Lacan J. La proposición del 9 de octubre de 1967. En Otros escritos. Pág. 262 y 263. [English translation: Lacan, J. 1967. Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School in *Analysis*, No 6, 1995. Trans R Grigg. Melbourne, The Australian Centre for Psychoanalysis, pp. 1-13.

² Ibid., p. 268.

³ Lacan J. La equivocación del sujeto supuesto saber, en Otros escritos, p. 356.

⁴ Ibid., p. 352.

articulated from the sense-outcome [Translator's Note: Lacan's French term "sens-issue" (here translated as 'sense-outcome') is an equivocal – one hears also "sans-issue" which could also signify 'without issue']. Of these infinitives, namely the impossible with which I satisfy myself at this detour.⁵

A topological place in the space-time of the cure, which is also illustrated by the metaphor of the swinging door and the object *a* as a hinge. Nothing ensures that one can maintain the place of the analyst, one passes by passing the pass, Lacan tells us, passing from analysand to analyst and back to analysand. In the same way, he warns psychoanalysts that if they think about the experience they leave that place, since that pass is like the sea: it always begins again⁶.

It is because of the above that, if the analyst only authorises himself, although often without knowing what he is doing, without knowing what he is getting himself into.⁷ Why would anyone want to occupy the place of the analyst? I don't think much thought is given to the consequences of occupying it. I wonder, moreover, if it is a conscious decision or something that is imposed on him because, despite his unnameable and inarticulate condition, it is, nevertheless, what can make it possible for there to be analysis for others.

Camila Vidal: The analyst's desire

Lacan reminds us of the impossible of the analytic operation. The demand for healing has only one serious way out, which is its return to the entrance door. Hence the clinical importance of the entry into analysis and the symptom sifted in it.

Symptom and sinthome knotted in the analytic path, which is not only about the recognition of the impossible of the resolution of the symptom but of the time necessary to get used to it, finding right there the impossible solution: knowing how to manage. This is the psychoanalyzing way.

The desire of an analyst requires one more step, it is the "without thinking" of "being outside without thinking about it", therefore the caveat that an analysis is necessary but not enough to produce an analyst.

In the second part Lacan explains to us what is the condition of the possibility of this "without thinking".

It brings us back to the drive, to that path of infinitives, unique verb tense without a subject, headless drive, the only site where the subject has no place, and the only location where, therefore, one can eventually be outside without thinking.

Inarticulate desire, but, nevertheless, articulated (with no sense, with no way out) to the drive where what is played is not a fault but the impossible of that position itself.

⁵ Lacan J. Discurso a la Escuela Freudiana de París, en Otros escritos. Pág. 284. [English translation from the 'Address to the Freudian School of Paris' from a translation by a group in the Forum of Melbourne.]

⁶ Lacan J. El acto psicoanalítico, en Otros escritos, p. 396.

⁷ Conferencia en Ginebra sobre el síntoma. Nos dice: comencé ... muy tontamente... p. 120.

An articulated desire but from the place of the Other, he warns us a little further on, of that Other that does not exist, indicating well the impossible that the very alienation in which the subject is constituted, establishes, preventing any type of resolution, as he explains in “The logic of the fantasy”, where he tells us that alienation does not write down the fact that we are subject to the signifiers of “the Other”. This doesn’t mean that we submit ourselves to “the Other” and that consequently separation would be the liberation from this dependence. This would be to err, Lacan asserts. The real difficulty is that this Other is marked by a bar, it lacks a signifier, no separation will be able to ease that first failure, to erase that mark and any articulation from the place of that barred Other will always show its deep inconsistency due to the impossibility it entails.

This place reserved for the analyst, this being outside without thinking about it, is not an easy place to live in because it implies a double impossibility, that of desire and that of the drive. It is no longer a matter of a subject confronted with his own impossible (the way of the analysand), but of the impossibility itself functioning in the void that the absence of subject, that the absence of thought shapes: a void made object.

Is the structure that allows the positioning of the analyst outside of the position of subject, outside of thinking?

It is at this juncture that the analytical act may eventually emerge.

It’s not about remaining in the fog, I wrote in relation to the testimony of my pass, but simply of being there, separated from it, that is the analytical position. In Freudian terms, it is nothing more than floating attention. Fog of listening to words separated from that listening.

The symptom is substitutable but not reducible in a treatment and in this direction the psychoanalyst inhabits an impossible position, one can only inhabit “being an analyst” outside of attempting its existence in subjectivity. Hence the importance of the dispositive of the Pass for a School in a wager to bring about a transmission outside of the subjectivities that may arise.

Conclusion And an invitation to continue

Maria de los Angeles Gómez (Puerto Rico)

After listening to the rich and fruitful reflections of this 2nd Study Day of the Intercontinental and Bilingual Cartels of the CIOS, the honour falls on us to bring some final touches by way of conclusion.

The challenge was: to think psychoanalysis in and from the cartels of the School by gathering the work done in the cartels almost two years after the CIOS's proposal was launched

This Study Day testified to the vitality of this proposal, which allowed us to establish working and collaborative links with more than 20 declared and currently active cartels. We heard the elaborations of members of cartels from the Americas (Latin America-North, Latin America-South and Argentina) and from Europe (Spain and France).

The audience was also excellent! It was 180 people at its peak and almost 150 at the end.

The reflection on the effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in intension, on the School and on psychoanalysis in extension, guided the work of the first three sequences.

In her opening remarks, Colette Soler formulated three questions: how to represent these effects not only in the expectations of the analysand but also in relation to the act and the desire that this act implies? How does the dispositive of the Pass make it possible to maintain the distinction between the School, the Forums and the groups of everyday? How does psychoanalysis situate itself in the discourse of the time with its own real, which is not the real of each individual but the real of science?

Then came the time for a round table that worked on the theme of the desire of the analyst, its place, based on a fragment from the 'Address to the EFP' delivered by Lacan in 1969.

The rigour of each presentation and the questions it raised augur well for the possibility of continuing the work within existing cartels and perhaps, in others that may be constituted in the near future. This is the wager. The '*Feuilles volantes*' will collect their work.

'To conclude' refers etymologically to the act of stopping and declaring something finished. We are therefore stopping today, but we will no doubt continue, in our cartels, 'to think about psychoanalysis and the Pass in its effects in intension, in extension and on the School'.

A big thank you to Lucile Cognard for the organisation, to the team of translators, and, of course, to each of the Cartels who presented their reflections and their work, as well as to each of you for having supported this commitment to work in our School.

CATALOGUE OF THE INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL CARTELS OF THE SCHOOL OF THE CIOS

1) Cartel – Theme: *Wunsch*: What have the 20 years of the Pass of the SPFLF taught us? (May 8, 2021)

Patricia Zarowsky - p.zarowsky@wanadoo.fr

Sol Aparicio - sol.aparicio@orange.fr

Camila Vida - camilavidal@hotmail.com

Sandra Berta – bertas@uol.com.br

Plus-one: Alejandro Rostagnotto - rostagnotto@gmail.com

2) Cartel – Theme: The end and the ends of analysis (May 9, 2021)

Roser Casalprim - rcasalpr@copc.cat

Marta Casero - gautami@telecable.es

Adriana Grosman - drigros@me.com

Kelly Vargas - kelly.vargasgarcia@gmail.com

Plus-one: Ana Alonso - alonso.an@gmail.com

3) Cartel – Theme: When only words remain (May 23, 2021)

Blanca Sánchez Gimeno - blancasanchez@telecable.es

Ramon Miralpeix - miralpeix@copc.cat

Andrea Brunetto - brunetto@terra.com.br

Silvana Pessoa - silvanapessoa@uol.com.br

Plus-one: Pedro Pablo Arévalo - pp_arevalo@yahoo.com

4) Cartel – Theme: Return to the function of speech (May 23, 2021)

Pedro Pablo Arévalo - pp_arevalo@yahoo.com

Anna Gasull - agasull@copc.cat

Katia Botelho - katiabotelho79@gmail.com

Jorge Escobar - jorgee@une.net.co

Plus-one: Matilde Pelegrí - matilde.pelegri@gmail.com

5) Cartel – Theme: The (de)formation of the analyst (May 23, 2021)

Pedro Pablo Arévalo - pp_arevalo@yahoo.com

Adriana Grosman - drigros@uol.com.br

Andréa Franco Milagres - andreafranco@milagres@gmail.com

Patricia Muñoz - patriciamunozdef@gmail.com

Plus-one: Ida Freitas - idafreitas55@gmail.com

6) Cartel – Theme: The end of analysis, from the readings of the School (June 4, 2021)

Nadine Cordova - cordovavi.nadine@gmail.com

Patrick Barillot - pbarillotepfcl@gmail.com

Patricia Gavilanes - patricia.gavilanes@wanadoo.fr

Mônica Palacio - momapaco@hotmail.com

Plus-one: Luciana Guarreschi - guarreschi.lu@gmail.com

7) Cartel – Theme: The desire of the analyst (June 5, 2021)

Beatriz Helena Martins de Almeida - almeidabia@gmail.com

Claudia Domínguez - claudiadominguez@libero.it

Matilde Pelegrí - matilde.pelegri@gmail.com

Viviana Gómez - licvgomez@gmail.com

Plus-one: Victoria Torres - victoriaistorres@gmail.com

8) Cartel – Theme: End of analysis, the aims of analysis (June 9, 2021)

Jorge Chapuis - chapuis@telefonica.net

Fernanda Zacharewicz - fzacharewicz@yahoo.com

Carmen Nieto - carmen.nieto.centeno@gmail.com

Robson Mello - psicmello@uol.com.br

Plus-one: Pastora Rivera - pastora.rivera@gmail.com

9) Cartel – Theme: Effects of the Pass on psychoanalysis in intension (June 14, 2021)

Chantal Degril - chantal@lindisriver.co.nz

Matias Laje - matiaslaje@gmail.com

Leonardo Pimentel - leonardoptl@gmail.com

Agnès Metton - agnes.metton@wanadoo.fr

Marc Strauss - strauss.m@wanadoo.fr

Plus-one: Bernard Toboul - brtb@hotmail.fr

10) Cartel – Theme: The knowledge of the psychoanalyst (June 18, 2021)

Carole Leymarie - leymariecarole@yahoo.fr

Kristele Nonnet-Pavois - k.nonnet@hotmail.fr

Julietta De Battista - julietadebattista@gmail.com

Anais Bastide - nais.bastide@laposte.net

Barbara Shuman - babashuman1123@gmail.com

Plus-one: Dominique Touchon Fingermann - dfingermann@gmail.com

11) Cartel – Theme: Transmission (June 18, 2021)

Beatriz Oliveira - biaoliv@uol.com.br Beatriz Maya - belemare@gmail.com

Eliane Pamart - eliane.pamart@orange.fr

Tatiana Assadi - tatiassadi@uol.com.br

Plus-one : Dominique Touchon Fingermann - dfingermann@gmail.com

12) Cartel – Theme: There is no extension without intension (June 21, 2021)

María Jesús Díaz - mjdiazg6@gmail.com

Carmen Lafuente - clafuenteballe@gmail.com

Beatriz Maya - belemare@une.net.co

Andrea Franco Milagres - andreafranco@milagres@gmail.com

Plus-one: Trinidad Sánchez-Biezma de Lander - mtlander@hotmail.com

13) Cartel – Theme: The ends of analysis (June 21, 2021)

María Laura Cury - mlcsilvestre@uol.com.br

María Luisa Rodríguez - mlrmarialuisarodriguez@gmail.com

Rebeca García Sanz - rebegarciasanz@gmail.com

Tereko Zaballa Ramos - terekozaballa@gmail.com

Juan del Pozo Garicano - jidelpozo@telefonica.net

Plus-one: Mikel Plazaola - mplazaolacloud@me.com

14) Cartel – Theme: The function of the saying (June 21, 2021)

Christophe Charles - christophe.charles4@wanadoo.fr

Andrea Fernandez - ahfernandes03@gmail.com

Bruno Geneste - bruno.geneste@gmail.com

Glaucia Nagem de Souza - glaucia.nagem@uol.com.br

Rithée Cevasco - ritcev@yahoo.fr

Plus-one: Dominique Touchon Fingermann - dfingermann@gmail.com

15) Cartel – Theme: The new tyranny of knowledge (June 21, 2021) - Members of ILIPP

Sara Rodowicz Slusarczyk - sara.rodowicz.slusarczyk@gmail.com

Cora Aguerre - coraguerre@gmail.com

Vera Pollo - verapollo8@gmail.com

Philippe Madet - philippe.madet@gmail.com

Plus-one: David Bernard - dabernard2@yahoo.fr

16) Cartel – Theme: What to do with the Pass? (June 18, 2021)

María de los Ángeles Gómez - mgomez.caribe@gmail.com

Rosa Escapa - rosaescapa@gmail.com

Sophie Rolland-Manas - sophie.rolland@dbmail.com

Maria Antonieta Izaguirre - maria_izaguirre@yahoo.com

Plus-one : Vicky Estevez - vickyestevez@free.fr

17) Cartel – Theme: The end of analysis (August 12, 2021)

Marina Severini - marinaseverini3@gmail.com

Clara Cecilia Mesa - claraceciliamesa@gmail.com

Viviana Gomez - licvgomez@gmail.com

Silvia Quesada - sgquesada@hotmail.com

Annalisa Bucciol - annalisa.bucciol180@gmail.com

18) Cartel -Theme: Putting the notion of *lalangue* into perspective with the other levels of unconscious language. Interrogation of its conceptualisation and its effects in treatments. (Septembre 4, 2021)

Léla Chikhani - lela.chikhani.mail@gmail.com

Gabriel Lombardi, gabrielombardi@gmail.com

Ana Laura Prates, apratespacheco@gmail.com

Bernard Toboul, brtb@hotmail.fr

Plus-one: Zehra Eryörük - zehra.eryoruk1@gmail.com

19) Cartel Theme: The cartel as a place and an experience of an international work transference (October 14, 2021)

Esther Morere Diderot – e_diderot@hotmail.com

Ali Tissnaoui – ali.tissnaoui@gmail.com

Sheila Skitnevsky Finger – skitfinger@gmail.com

Miriam Pinho – miriampinho@yahoo.com

Plus-one: Coralie Vankerkhoven - coralie_vkk@yahoo.com

20) Cartel Theme: The a-effet (November 7, 2021)

Adriana Bruschi - adribruschi@gmail.com

Alejandra Noguera - alejandranoguera41@hotmail.com

Célia Fiamighi - celia.fiamighi@uol.com.br

Ivan Viganò - ivan.vigano@gmail.com

Plus-one: Cecilia Randich - cecilia.randich@gmail.com

21) Cartel–Theme: The analyst as product of the analysis and his link to the School (around the commentary on the ‘Italian note’ by Colette Soler) (January 27, 2022).

Lia Silveira - silveiralia@gmail.com

Claire Parada - claireparada@gmail.com

Chico Paiva - chicopf@yahoo.com.br

Kristèle Nonnet-Pavois - k.nonnet@hotmail.fr

Plus-one: Diego Mautino - studio@diegomautino.191.it

22) Cartel Theme : The body at the end (February 3, 2022)

Dyhalma Ávila López - dnavila@psicoa.com

Liora Stavchansky - liorastavchansky@gmail.com

Gabriela Costardi - gabicostardi@hotmail.com

Plus-one: Gabriela Zorzutti - gabrielazorzutti@gmail.com

23)Cartel –Theme: The end of analysis (March 16, 2022)

Pedro Alvarez - pedroalvareznit@gmail.com

Marcia de Assis - marcia.assis@gmail.com

Isidre Bosch - iboschva@copc.cat

Roseli Rodella de Oliveira - rrodella@gmail.com

Plus-one: Margarita Santiso - mailto:msantiso@copc.catmsantiso@copc.cat

24)Cartel–Theme: Body (March 20, 2022)

Esther Jiménez - esther.jgarriga@gmail.com

Alejandro Rostagnotto - alejandro.javier.rostagnotto@unc.edu.ar; rostagnotto@gmail.com

Franc Estevez Roca - francestevezz@hotmail.com

Maria Cláudia Formigoni - mclaudiaformigoni@gmail.com

Plus-one: Ida Baptista de Freitas - idafreitas55@gmail.com

25)Cartel Theme: Languages and psychoanalysis (July 17, 2022)

Maricela Sulbaran - maricelasulbaran@yahoo.fr

Francisco José Santos Garrido - fransantosg@yahoo.es

María Angeles Gómez - mgomez.caribe@gmail.com

Beatriz Elena Zuluaga Jaramillo - beatrizelenazuluagaj@gmail.com

Plus-one: Lidia Hualde - hualde-tapia.lidia@orange.fr

THIRD LETTER OF PRESENTATION OF THE INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL CARTELS

For reference

From the CIOS 2020-2022
To Members of the School

Dear Colleagues,

This is our third message concerning the project for an international network of cartels. It follows from the various questions that have been addressed to us by the three current dispositives of the guarantee and that have led us to recall the proposed arrangements by specifying them again.

These cartels will be intercontinental and bilingual. This is their definition. They will therefore bring together members of the School from two different continents who speak at least two different languages. Their aim is to promote, as we have said, new and multiple links for the work of psychoanalysis in intention not only at the level of international and national bodies where it already exists, but at the very base of the School by engaging all Members of the School who have not yet participated at the level of the bodies of management. They will find in this network a space where their work can find a new resonance, possibly via a newsletter, Study Days, intercartels, and other forms to be invented etc.

As a result, we also hope to gain more clarity in the distinction between the work of the Forum and the work of the School – a distinction which is constitutive at our origin and which also corresponds to two different modes of admission, each with its own criteria which have not ceased being debated since the beginnings of the School. They deserve to remain in the spotlight with the passage of time.

In addition, as we have said, for the work to be possible, in each cartel only one language will be spoken and that supposes, specifically, that the members of the cartel have in common one of the five languages of our community, those in which we send you this message. These cartels will therefore be bilingual in their composition, their members speaking at least two different languages as has already been said, but one of these two languages will not necessarily be the one spoken in the cartel: depending on the case, the work can be done in any one of our five languages, English, Spanish, French, Italian or Portuguese.

Last point: for the launch of these cartels, we had indicated that we would invite members of local or international bodies of management, assuming that they would be directly concerned with the initiative. Note that this was not, however, to invite them to form a cartel between themselves, but on the contrary to invite them to invite Members of the School they do not as yet know. We also know from experience that the differences between the members of a cartel, that is, differences in age, training and culture, are a plus that stimulates work.

Finally, many questions will undoubtedly still arise. We have therefore planned that each member of the CIOS will soon bring together, through Zoom, the members of the School in

their area to collect the questions that are still unresolved and develop them, in order that this network be set up quickly.

With our cordial greetings,

The CIOS 2020/2022

Julieta De Battista, for Latin America South

Sandra Berta (secretary) for Brazil

Mikel Plazaola for Spain

Colette Soler (secretary) for France

María de los A. Gómez (ALN) for Latin America North (Puerto Rico)

Maria Teresa Maiocchi, for Italy-FPL1