

College of Initiatives and



Orientation of the School

INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL SCHOOL CARTELS

FLYING PAPERS



N ° 4

JUNE 2024

Aperiodic bulletin of intercontinental and bilingual school cartels

"Analysts are the scholars of a knowledge about which they cannot speak "



FLYING PAPERS

N ° 4

JUNE 2024

The CIOS, College of Initiative and Orientation of the School, is pleased to present the 3rd electronic edition of [FLYING PAPERS](#), intended for the circulation of the work of the "Intercontinental and Bilingual Cartels" initiated by CIOS, 2021-2022. The [FLYING PAPERS](#) aims to constitute a "space of resonance" within our School for the various individual products of these cartels; the half Days of the " CIOS, cartels" like the one on September 16, 2023 offer another opportunity to return to School what these intercontinental and bilingual cartels produce, so here are published in FLYING PAPERS No. 4 the texts of the interventions of this 3rd half-day which had brought together more than 180 people via ZOOM around the theme:
"The analysts are the scholars of a knowledge which they cannot discuss among themselves."
: Act and Knowledge of the psychoanalyst.

The series will continue with FLYING PAPERS No. 5: "The Intension of Psychoanalysis?" and FLYING PAPERS No. 6: "Becoming an Analyst and the Analytic Act," which will publish the interventions of the next afternoon of the CIOS cartels on September 14, 2024.

These cartels and the work transference they make possible have indeed facilitated new connections among SPFLF members, making it evident that the Forums of the five IF Zones – with their diversity, local particularities, and ever-evolving expansion – are nonetheless grounded in a singular principle: the extension of the intension of psychoanalysis, that which sustains the essence of "analytic discourse in action within analyses."

Taking the initiative, forming a cartel, and committing to transmit the outcomes of this work transference – this is how, for each participant, "making a school" is far from an empty phrase, for all are engaged to contribute to the development of knowledge regarding the logical and ethical principle of what constitutes a psychoanalyst capable of sustaining psychoanalysis. The "FLYING PAPERS" and the half days of the cartels of the school of CIOS serve to disseminate individual productions and their questioning throughout the school and IF community. all cartels belong to the school, we say, and are open to all. however, the intercontinental and bilingual cartels of the school of CIOS specifically invite school members to realise the commitment they undertook by becoming part of SPFLF and embracing the insistence of its object. let us recall here the terms of the *Principles For A School*: a school member's commitment entails "a specific engagement that involves not only engagement with psychoanalysis in intension, but also an "intension" without borders."

The CIOS continues this cartel initiative and supports it with the "Find your cartel!" section, the organization of half-days, and [FLYING PAPERS](#); it invites members of these cartels to present what

their experience of these cartels has enabled them to produce, and takes responsibility for translating them into the 5 languages of the IF- SPFLF.

For this [FLYING PAPERS](#) and the last half Day, we have chosen speakers from cartels that have not had the opportunity to be represented in these two events. We hope, however, that the other participants in all these cartels will be able to return the effects of their work back here and there.

We'd like to thank the authors for this 4th half-day, situating their work within the framework of the sentence proposed, and for sharing an experience of knowledge based on Lacan's instigation.

So, if psychoanalysts "are the scholars of a knowledge about which they cannot speak", this limit, paradoxically, does not prevent them from putting this impossibility into action in the cartel, without any guarantee of what may be elaborated as epistemically beneficial, and this in an experience of a bet always renewed...

Our School is international and speaks in many languages, and our exchanges would not be possible without the willingness and hard work of our teams of translators, whom we would like to thank in particular. Our various experiences with AI translators make us appreciate their availability even more: THANK YOU.

The College of Initiative and Orientation of the School, CIOS: *Carolina Zaffore, Dominique Fingermann, Ana Laura Prates, Rebeca García, Didier Castanet, Diego Mautino, Daphné Tamarin.*

THANKS to:

Anne Marie Combres (Fr), Sophie Rolland Manas (Fr), Luciana Guareschi (Br), Rebeca Garcia (Esp), Maria Claudia Formigoni (Br), Diego Mautino (It),, Pedro Pablo Arevalo (Esp), Sebastián Báquiro Guerrero Susan Schwartz (Austr), Daniela Avalos (Engl), Devra Simiu , Gabriela Costardi, Nathaly Ponce (Panama) , Elisa Querejeta Casares, Glaucia Nagem (Br), Diana Correa

CONTENTS

Presentation p. 2

Marina Severini (Italy)

The actheism of the analyst p. 4

Andréa Franco Milagres (Brazil):

Bending over backwards p.7

Sophie Rolland-Manas (France) :

A few bits of knowledge from the cartel, p.11

Julieta L. De Battista (Argentina):

Rogaton: Remnants of knowledge p.15

Mónica Palacio (Colombia):

On the knowledge of the analyst, p.17

Ramon Miralpeix Jubany (Spain):

Act and knowledge of the psychoanalyst, from the work of the cartel p.20

Marina Severini



Marina Severini lives and works in Macerata, a small town in central Italy. She is AME of EPFCL and has been a member of the School since its founding. She participated in the International Guarantee College, IGC 2016-18. She is a founding member of Flal, Lacanian Forum in Italy. She currently serves as a Delegate.

Cartel members: "The End of Analysis": Marina Severini Plus-Um - Clara Cecilia Mesa - Viviana Gomez - Silvia Quesada - Annalisa Buccioli

The actheism of the analyst,

The initial proposal that brought us together as an intercontinental cartel was to question ourselves about the end of analysis and the pass from analysand to analyst, which Lacan calls "The analytic act". Amongst other related subjects on this matter of the ending, which in the best of cases ends in a "pass", the constitution of the cartel itself is revealed to us, as an instance thought by Lacan as a dispositive.

Initially, this led us to consider the place of the "Plus-one". The designation of a "Plus-one" was left in suspense. We made the decision to allow ourselves to experiment with this modality of the cartel without a pre-established Plus-one. Although the decision was to not designate a Plus-one in advance, we cannot say that in our meetings, we worked without a Plus-one; in fact, we worked hard, and our meetings were always very interesting. This was supported by some questions we asked ourselves in the opening of our meetings: is it necessary to designate a Plus-one beforehand? Lacan refers to this subject, particularly to this function, in different moments of his teaching.

In the conclusions of the Study Days of November 8 and 9, 1975, Lacan makes a reference in these terms: *"In what I have written, nothing indicates that the Plus-one is incarnated. Perhaps it is a Plus-one that emerges, that works effectively in every group, because, ultimately, a group is something that is always made up of a certain number of individuals. There is a finite number, and the question of knowing if One is not always added to a finite number is a question that to me, seems worth asking"*.

In the Study Days of the cartels of the Freudian School (of 1975) he raises the question of how to conceive the Plus-one and hopes that the members of the cartels "don't forget to answer the Plus-one question". Lacan emphasizes that he wanted psychoanalysts to be able to notice this function that is always present in a group and is not always recognized. Paying attention to it is the way to give an analytical style to the work of a cartel! And once more: in a cartel, what unites is the fact that everyone is responsible for the group. "What makes the Borromean knot, is subject to the

condition that each 'one' be there effectively and not just imaginarily, which holds the whole group". And then, if each one is responsible not only for their own work but also for the work of the cartel, therefore, for everyone's work, then perhaps the fact that this function is not personalized and fixed in advance in the cartel could be an advantage. During the same Study Days, Lacan points out: *"I will no longer insist on the radical distinction between the Plus-one, on the one hand, when it comes to group work, which is a teaching job, and, on the other, the fact that we beg he who seemed to respond during the pass, to authorize himself with dignity in this position of analyst, to who we demand that he be that kind of analyst who we can consult"*. (sic)

Given that we are at the end of our cartel work, we can draw some considerations after the fact: a first hypothesis is that the function of the Plus-one has been circulating and, therefore, is embodied from time to time by some of us, because, it is a fact, we have been working hard and each time with renewed intensity; and a second hypothesis is that the Plus-one was present, in the form of the School, in the fact that the CIOS not only launched but also supported this initiative by providing moments of meeting and exchange: then we knew that this moment would come when we could talk about our work.

We must also comment on the fact that another question came up: how is all of this articulated with the subject of our work, the end of analysis, in its logical times, with the fall of the myth of the Other, and the possible passage to the analyst... What if atheism [ateísmo] becomes "actheism" [acteísmo]?

The term "actheism" is a neologism proposed by Colette Soler in which she condenses the act and the atheist. The act is atheistic, it is without God, which is one of the names of the subject-supposed-to-know. Hence, Lacan's proposal is the logic against the act of faith, understanding faith as the belief of every subject in the word and specifically in the subject supposed to know. Lacan situates the analytic act in the logical objection. This is how he announced it in lesson 10 of seminar XV, which was precisely dedicated to the Analytical act: "I have not addressed this in the express terms in which I am going to present it, in the terms of logic. For which reason in the terms of logic? Because logic is defined as what has the purpose of reabsorbing the problem of the subject supposed to know. Only in logic (...) may we ask the question of knowing in terms of quantification what 'there is a psychoanalyst' means".

Colette Soler argues that "Lacan has elevated the act to the dignity of the analytic cause, far from a failure of the analysand".¹ There is no Other of the act, it is a defect, a product of the structure itself, however, the act is also a solution: it resolves the impasse – impasse without exit - of the subject supposed to know. You could almost say that he deals with his indeterminacy.²

¹ Colette Soler, "L'acthéisme de l'analyste en Retour à la passe", p. 521.

² *Ibid.*, p. 525.

Then the problem will be to ask about this practice that, in the beginning, entering it, supposes an act of transferential faith in order to, at the end of it, at its 'exit', suppose a way out of said faith, in other words: to become an act of decided disbelief, which is supposed in the expression "to unsubscribe" from the unconscious.

Can the cartel be read as one of the places where the analyst "associates" with others due to the "non-portability of knowledge" and despite the fact that it is "non-exchangeable" knowledge?

But why is it not interchangeable and which knowledge? In our cartel, we have worked on the end of analysis as a logical conclusion, inscribed and programmed by the entry into analysis itself. It is indeed a conclusion of impossibility, a conclusion that Soler says,³ although logical, does not come by way of reasoning, but that "there is a jump here", a passage produced by an analysis carried beyond decipherment, because this impossible that concludes is not in the order of sense, of a knowledge that can be gleaned, it is another type of knowledge.

The analysand is then someone who no longer "believes" (in his symptom, in the subject-supposed-to-know, in the Other), an "atheist", but is it enough for actheism to occur? It is certainly necessary, but for the "atheist" analysed not to "remove the option" regarding psychoanalysis and for them to pass to the analytic act, to actheism that is, an extra step is required, not written, and not programmed in the entry to the analytical discourse.

Finally, it should be noted that our work led us to reflect that a possible way to address these impasses around the function of the Plus-one and the pass to the analyst would be to return to what Lacan proposed from RSI onwards, thus locating them in logic and Borromean topology.

Translated by Diana Correa

³ *Ibid.*



I came into contact with psychoanalysis at a very young age, first as a student of psychology and, soon after, as an analyst. Although I practiced psychoanalysis from a very young age, it took me a long time to become licensed as a psychoanalyst, and the paths that led me to this position were tortuous. I worked in various mental health services listening to severely psychotic patients and, at the same time, I taught for more than 20 years in psychology and medicine courses, transmitting psychoanalysis in a field that was not always favorable to this discourse. However, under the influence of analysis, I gradually disassociated myself from work in public health and, under the influence of the pass, I also disassociated myself from the university. Since then, I have dedicated myself entirely to clinical practice in Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil, the city where I was born and where I live. I am a member of the Belo Horizonte Forum and I am currently coordinating with a colleague a seminar on the pass, the end of analysis and the analyst's desire, and I am a member of the Forum's School Space and Poster Commission. I have held several leadership positions at EPFCL-Brazil and I am currently a member of CLEAG - Local Epistemic Commission of Reception and Guarantee, with special responsibility for the epistemic function and the living and pulsating work of the cartels in the Brazilian DEL.

Members of the cartel "No extension without intent": Andrea Milagres, Trinidad Sánchez-Biezma de Lander, Mas-Uno (Spain), Maria Jesus (Basque Country), Beatriz Maya (Pereira-Colombia) and Carmen Lafuente Balle (Barcelona),

Bending over backwards

For Carmen Lafuente Balle⁴

This is the product of a cartel made up of members of the Forums of Madrid, Barcelona, the Basque Country, Medellin (Colombia) and Belo Horizonte (Brazil). We have announced it to the CIOS under the name 'There's No Extension Without Intension'.

When starting a cartel, we never know if it will get knotted, if it will "turn on". To cartelize is to accept this risk: it may get stuck, go astray, dwindle. But cartelizing also involves a wager on the working transference. Risk taken, a very peculiar bond was produced: a bond that I will call love, not without the confused kiss of these two sister languages. In this cartel, psychoanalysis in intention linked us through the experience of each one in the dispositive: as passers, as passands, or as members of the Cartels of the Pass. There was a single, brief meeting of three of the five cartel members in Buenos Aires in July 2022, reaffirming our willingness to work. But, as we know, the real never misses and it was then that this loving cartel prematurely ended, precipitately imposing

⁴ This small group included Trinidad Sánchez-Biezma de Lander, plus-Um (Spain), Maria Jesus Diaz (Basque Country), Beatriz Maya (Pereira-Colombia), and Carmen Lafuente Balle (Barcelona), colleagues whom I thank for this short time, but fruitful in interlocution and delicacy.

its dissolution on us. Having said that, I pay homage to Carmen Lafuente Balle, whose presence left a trace of style and her absence made a hole in the cartel.

The psychoanalytic act is supposed from the moment the analysand becomes a psychoanalyst. This act takes place from a saying that turns a page and modifies the subject. But "it is not an act to walk if all one says is 'it walks, *ça marche*', or even 'let's walk, *marchons*', but only if it ensures that 'I am getting there, *j'y arrive*' is verified in it."⁵ The passand must convey how he arrived at the psychoanalyst's desire – with all the contingencies that the dispositive implies – and, knowing how it ends, say how this idea of being a psychoanalyst crossed his mind. This is what the Cartels of the Pass seek to catch: the mark of this desire. What is this mark that escapes the signifier and can only be passed in act? If the signifier represents the subject for another signifier, producing a chained series, the mark does not. The mark of the psychoanalyst's desire differs from the whole and distinguishes itself from the fabric that constitutes a body, like the scar that remains after an operation.

However, this mark does not guarantee the future of the analytic operation. After the pass, each one still has to "decide whether indeed the relay can be taken up from an act which is such that in the end it destitutes the very subject who establishes it."⁶ Because there is a subversion in the psychoanalytic act: there it is not the subject who commands; that's why we talk about an acephalous subject. This act is situated in what Lacan calls the "ideal topology of the object *a*", allowing us to deduce that "it operates by not thinking".⁷ If the psychoanalyst is not the subject of the act, what matter is he/she made of? He is manufactured with object *a*, is made from object *a*, says Lacan. And if "the act itself cannot function as a predicate"⁸ it is a question of what will come later: always incalculable. The act can only be judged "by the crumbs that have fallen from it onto the following year."⁹

It seems to me that these crumbs are the trace of what was the solution – always unique and inimitable – that the passand found. They point to what is new in their relationship with knowledge. It is also these crumbs that the School community awaits attentively to hear in the testimony of the nominated ASs. So, I was looking for an analogy that would serve to talk about what cannot be formulated. The proposed title for this panel fitted like a glove: "Analysts are the wise of a knowledge they cannot talk about".¹⁰

In effect, an "I don't think correctly, leaves the psychoanalyst suspended in the anxiety of knowing where to give it a place, to think psychoanalysis, despite this, without being fated to fail with it".¹¹ It is necessary to go back to what led to the conclusion of the analysis, producing the holing of the S of barred A, to which I already referred in my testimonies of the pass: the maternal Other could no longer walk. Like a window that opens suddenly, this flash made it possible to have an "insight":

⁵ Lacan, J. Summary of the 1967-1968 Seminar, The Psychoanalytic Act. *Autres Écrits*, Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Ed., 2003, p. 371.

⁶ Ibidem, p. 371.

⁷ Ibidem, p. 373.

⁸ Ibidem, p. 374.

⁹ Ibidem, p. 379.

¹⁰ Lacan, J. In the Brazilian edition the sentence was translated as: "psychoanalysts are the wise of a knowledge that they cannot cultivate". Check it out: On psychoanalysis in its relations with reality. At the French Institute in Milan, December 18, 1967. *Autres Écrits*, p. 358.

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 373.

it is necessary to continue. This event had a shocking effect, leaving me face-to-face with what constitutes "the scandal of the act, that is, the fault perceived in the subject-supposed-to-know".¹² Taking a step beyond the perceived failure – horror of knowing – it is necessary to conclude the experience. Take this step or remain in endless mourning. Crucial moment at the end of the analysis that can open the doors to the analytic act.

When concluding the cartel, I was faced with the question of what it is to testify from the possible places that can be occupied in the dispositive: passer, passand, Cartel of the Pass. Wherever one is there, my hypothesis is that the body participates. As passer: there is no way to be a "sensitive plate" and transmit to the Cartel of the Pass if one is not seriously concerned. If what was heard does not reverberate, the body does not vibrate. As a passand, heading to the Secretariat of the Pass: vertigo. However, testifying affects, not only the passand's body; it affects those we address, it affects the body of the School. The AS's testimony affects those who hear it because it bears the mark of that aberrant desire that, when transmitted, links intension to extension. At the end of the analysis, Lacan said, the transference is not liquidated; it will give way to the work of others, to work with others. In the testimony of the pass, we try to transform what psychoanalysis taught into a teaching, thus moving from intension to extension.

In one of the last meetings of the cartel, I was taken to Seminar III, in which Lacan proposes to penetrate a little into the notion of testimony. He says everything we value as communication is of the order of the testimony. Disinterested communication is just a failed testimony, that is, something on which everyone is in agreement. This occurs, for example, in the case of the scientific community, in which there is an ideal of the transmission of knowledge. But testimony is not just communication. In psychoanalysis, says Lacan, we deal with something radically different from disinterested communication: "It is not by chance that this is called *testis* in Latin, and that one always testifies over one's own balls. In everything that is of the order of testimony, there is always the effort of the subject, and the virtual struggle which is always latent in the organism".¹³

In fact, when an analysis is historicized in testimony to passers or even in front of a School community, courage is needed. To occupy the place of psychoanalyst, no less. In this last meeting, a colleague recalled that Colette Soler¹⁴ had once commented on what of the body comes into play in the testimony. She mentioned Lacan referred to the balls, but what is really in question is that it is always with the guts that we bear witness.

Would there be a relationship between what Lacan said in the seminar, *Anxiety*, that "we are not objects of desire except as a body"?¹⁵ This opens up a first avenue of research.

A sentence by Lacan in the summary of the Psychoanalytic Act also caught my attention:

"Once again, however, how can one not see that the *sample from the body* (emphasis mine) with which one must become a psychoanalyst has already been made, and that it is with this that it is necessary to tune the psychoanalytic act?"¹⁶

A question that is still open and that I would like to delve into in the next Intercontinental Cartel that has just started.

¹² Ibidem, p. 372.

¹³ Lacan, J. The Seminar book III, *The psychoses*. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Ed., p.51.

¹⁴ I don't know if this observation by Soler is published anywhere or if it would have been a verbal commentary.

¹⁵ Lacan, J. The Seminar book X, *Anxiety*. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Ed., p. 237. "It's this part of us that gets trapped in the machine and forever irretrievable. Object lost in the different levels of bodily experience in which its cut is produced, it is what constitutes the support, the authentic substratum of any and all function of the cause. (...) It is convenient to remember that it is body and we are objects, which means that we are not objects other than as body".

¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 375.

Finally, I use current language, because "the language, here as always, reveals the truth".¹⁷ Faced with a situation that requires an extraordinary effort to overcome an obstacle and do the impossible, we say that it was necessary to "make one's guts heart".¹⁸ When speaking of the passage from psychoanalysand to psychoanalyst, Lacan uses the terms rest, waste, manure,¹⁹ shit²⁰. Passing on to the psychoanalyst's desire implies making one's guts heart.²¹ Breaking the hierarchy of the body and achieving something that seemed impossible. From leftovers - noble or ignoble materials - make a cause, food. That's why I remembered Primo Levi's poem "The fly".²² Just like the fly, the psychoanalyst transforms waste into flight energy, which is so demanded by their craft.

I'm alone here: this
Is a sanitary hospital.
I'm the messenger.
No locked doors for me:
There's always a window,
A crack, a keyhole.
I find lots of food
Left by the overfed
And by those who no longer eat.
I also feed
On discarded medicine,
Because nothing harms me,
Everything nourishes me, strengthens, helps me;
Noble and ignoble matter,
Blood, pus, kitchen scraps:
I turn it all into energy for flight,
My work is that urgent.
I'm the last to kiss the lips
Of the dying and the soon to die.
I'm important.
My monotonous
Buzzing, irritating, meaningless,
Repeats the one message of the world
To those who cross this threshold.
I am mistress here:
The only one who's free, unhampered, healthy.

August 31, 1986

Translated by Gabriela Costardi

¹⁷ Op. cit., p. 375.

¹⁸ This is a literal translation of the Brazilian expression "*Fazer das tripas coração*" which means to "bust one's guts", to "bend over backwards", to "do one's utmost".

¹⁹ Lacan, J. Proposition of October 9, 1967, *Autres Écrits*, p. 259.

²⁰ Lacan, J. Address to the Freudian School of Paris, *Autres Écrits*, p. 281.

²¹ In Seminar X there is an interesting reference by Lacan on the organic metaphor. In the formulation "It's your heart that I want, nothing else" the heart must be taken literally. It is as a part of the body that it functions, as a viscera, let's say: "The ever-living metaphorical use of this part of the body, to express what goes beyond the appearance of desire, how can one explain it other than by saying that the cause is already lodged in the viscera and figurative in the absence? There is an obsession with the causal viscera".

²² Levi, Primo. "The fly." *The Complete Works of Primo Levi*. Edited by Ann Goldstein. Vol III. Liverlight Publishing Corporation. New York.

Sophie Rolland-Manas



Sophie Rolland-Manas is a psychoanalyst in Narbonne, AME of the EPFCL (Forum France), member of the CIG 2021-2022 and professor at the Collège de clinique psychanalytique du Sud-Ouest. Together with Dominique Marin (AME of the EPFCL), she directs a psychoanalysis seminar in Narbonne entitled "Humanity, a question for psychoanalysis".

Members of the cartel: What to do with the "pass"? Sophie Rolland-Manas, Rosa Escapa, Vicky Estevez (Plus One), Maria Antonieta Izaguirre, Maria de los Angeles Gomez, Maria de los Angeles Gomez.

A few bits of knowledge from the cartel,

Our cartel entitled : 'What do we do with the Pass' is about to terminate. So ahead of the last few working sessions remaining to us, I would like to warmly thank the four other cartelisans who form our little group: Rosa Escapa, Vicky Estevez (Plus-one), Maria Antonieta Izaguirre, María de los Ángeles Gómez. Together yet individually, we had the task of taking up and exploring some questions pertaining to the Pass and the School starting from some texts collected in the text *Retour à la passe* (*Return to the Pass*). An intercontinental and bilingual cartel at the very heart of its work for, while meetings took place in Spanish, the cartel relied on texts in French, thus navigating from one language to another.

It is based on these readings and discussions, in their link with the knowledge derived from each cartel member's analytic experience, that I assess what can be represented by this specific link that is established in the little group that is the cartel, itself founded on its incompleteness. Indeed, the cartel is de-completed, which is what the person of the Plus-one incarnates; and on the other hand, the answers found in the cartel's work will always leave a hole in knowledge. Which brings us back to the status of knowledge with its dimensions of incompleteness and inconsistency and to that of desire as test. An important stake for the cartel structured by these two lacks. These lacks make impossible the absorption by knowledge of this a. This is what causes desire and goes on to repeat itself again and again. This is also what is found in the elaboration, the production of work by each cartelisan.

So, even if “analysts are the wise men of a knowledge they cannot talk about”²³ they need not give up. In lieu of talking about it, they can try to explain it, speak about it and share a few bits.

I'll take the risk now of offering you my contribution which will not be a conclusion of these two years of cartel work, but rather an opening up of the questions we worked on, in articulation with the proposed theme about knowledge. My comments bear on a crucial time of the analysis, which conditions the analyst's act and orients the experience as a whole, an end time about which one could think that it marks a passage. Here it will depend on the time allotted to me for following several lines of response to the question: what about this knowledge that the experience leaves after the passage to the analyst?

I will start from this: a psychoanalysis involves supporting the very logic of an experience that allows for going beyond the alienating dimension of the transference. Lacan in his 'Proposition'²⁴ theorizes this moment of the experience, moment of passage which punctuates a before and after. This time of toppling of the transference corresponds to subjective destitution and to the fall of the subject supposed to know. Let us add that the moment of this destitution corresponds precisely to the time when the question of the truth which orients the whole process, falls. Let us also consider that, in this vacillation, emerges an unprecedented desire wherein a new knowledge is articulated. To put it differently and with Lacan, a knowledge the “invents itself” [*cru en son propre*].

If this moment of passage does not signal the end of the analysis, it conditions it and it has effects of change, of passage, as I said above. I will mention two, that from love of knowledge to desire to know; and that from transference to the analyst to transference to psychoanalysis. But this then casts doubt on the finiteness of the transference. Perhaps something of the transference does not go away, even when one has been able to discern its sources. Something of it persists, even in those who manage, in a moment of ending, to make the step, from subject to its cause. When, following a time of ending, the moment comes to continue, it is with the transference. In what way does it unfold? The question, I believe, concerns each of us from the moment we think about the transmission of psychoanalysis and the link to the School.

This brings us to the following statement of Lacan's: “The teaching of psychoanalysis cannot be transmitted from one subject to another except by way of a transference to the work”²⁵ and later he will say that psychoanalysis is “non-transmissible”²⁶ but that it is invented. Putting these statements together, it seems to me what one can understand about knowledge is that each one is required to put his “heart” to work.

This particular form of transference which would occur at the end of the experience would allow that it continue, but in a different way. This change, favorable to the constitution of a community of

²³ J. Lacan, 1967, « De la psychanalyse dans ses rapports avec la réalité », *Autres écrits*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, p. 359.

²⁴ J. Lacan, 'Proposition of October 9 1967 on the psychoanalyst of the School' in *Analysis* 6. 1995, pp. 1-13.

²⁵ J. Lacan, 9ème congrès de l'Ecole Freudienne de Paris sur « La transmission », in *Lettres de l'Ecole*, 1979, vol II, pp. 219-220.

²⁶ Ibid.

experience, has to do with the two registers evoked in the 'Proposition of 1967' : referential knowledge and textual knowledge. The two registers are distinct but both are convoked in the transference, although very differently. The notion of 'work transference' implies a shift allowing for referential knowledge, theoretical knowledge, to become invested with the former analysand's textual knowledge, the knowledge that was invented during the analysis and which continues to be invented afterwards. This particular form of knotting referential knowledge with textual knowledge is at the heart of the Lacanian conception of the analyst and of formation.

This way of conceiving transmission as effect of the reading of the theory's referential knowledge can, it seems, be situated at the point of articulation between intension and extension. We might say that the change that can occur as a result of analysis allows the knowledge issuing from the experience to not go unheeded [*ne reste pas lettre morte*], such that it can be transmitted by way of its mark on knowledge of the theory and of the clinic.

It seems to me that each of these two dispositives, the cartel and the pass, involve putting into play the notion of work transference : the pass insofar as it puts to the test the change in relation to knowledge that allowed the passage to the analyst. And the cartel insofar as it enacts the work transference. From this perspective the cartel is an especially suitable place to experience the knotting of textual knowledge and referential knowledge and the singularity of each one's invention.

To conclude, I would say that to go through the pass, to function as an analyst, does not exempt one from making oneself an analysand of the experience, so that a few bits of knowledge can be shared, and not only among psychoanalysts.

Translated by Devra Simiu

Julieta L. De Battista



Julieta L. De Battista practices psychoanalysis in Buenos Aires. She is AME of the EPFCL, was AE (2018-2021) and member of the CIG (2021-2022). She holds a PhD in Psychopathology from the University of Toulouse and teaches at the National University of La Plata, the University of Buenos Aires and the National University of Mar del Plata.

Members of the cartel " The psychoanalyst's knowledge": Kristèle Nonnet-Pavois, Anaïs Bastide, Carole Leymarie Julieta de Batista and Dominique Fingermann-Touchon (+1)

Rogaton: Remnants of knowledge

We embarked on the work of the cartel with Kristèle Nonnet-Pavois, Anaïs Bastide, Carole Leymarie and Dominique Fingermann-Touchon (+1) on Lacan's talks on 'The knowledge of the psychoanalyst (1971-1972): the analyst's complex relationship with what he knows.

In the background of our work was an unawareness of the fate of the *Verleugnung* of the analytic act²⁷ in the communities of analysts and its correlate of anxiety: "Unthinkable discourse that can only be sustained by being ejected from it".²⁸ Some of the analytical discourse requires that ejection to be sustained. How to converse then? Interrogating these talks about the knowledge of the analyst we plunged into the whirlpool of initial questions that revolved around learned ignorance, the border between knowledge and truth: truth that can only be half-said, the knowledge of impotence.

Thus, I decided on my question about whether we could find some clues, some traces, of what Lacan specified the following year, in 1973: to know how to be refuse²⁹ as a result of having sifted the very cause of the horror of knowing. We have that first formulation of '68 about the horror of analysts faced with the analytic act, and then this one of '73: to have sifted the very cause of the horror of knowledge. The horror of the act, the horror of knowledge. How could one talk about that horror? What do talks about the analyst's knowledge contribute to this? Lacan insists there on this

²⁷ Lacan, J. (1967-1968). *Le séminaire. Livre XV. L'acte psychanalytique*. Inédito.

²⁸ Lacan, J. "My writings are unfit for a thesis, especially an academic one: antithetical in nature, since what they formulate can only be taken or left. Each one appears to be no more than the memorial of a rejection of my discourse by the audience it was aimed at: strictly psychoanalysts. (...) It is an unthinkable discourse that can only be held if one is ejected from it." 'Préface a une thèse'. *Autres Écrits*, Paris: Seuil, p. 394. *Otros escritos*, Buenos Aires: Paidós, p. 414.

²⁹ Lacan, J. Note italienne. In *Autres écrits*, Paris: Seuil, 309.

paradox of the analytic act – how can an analysand want to become an analyst? The position of the analyst is only taken in the analytic work; in that passage from analysand to analyst there is an elective moment.³⁰ To what extent does an analysand let himself be carried away by his task? Especially when he realizes he's exhausted and he skirts the cause of the horror of knowing itself. Perhaps he can only get there with a certain amount of naivety³¹ or a sublimatory potential is at play: knowing how to make the detour around what the Subject Supposed to Know (SsK) is reduced to.³²

For there to be a "chance of analyst"³³ or an opportunity for the emergence one, Lacan emphasizes that it is the operation of the analytic experience that brings the *object a* to the place of the semblant. And what is this operation? Lacan does not innovate: to assert free association, to interpret, "The analyst is the man to whom one speaks and to whom one speaks freely. That is what he is there for."³⁴ Each analyst finds his way, or not, of giving to the fundamental rule the weight he considers it has in the experience.³⁵ And the "point of consequence" reached by the implementation of that rule will have its effects. The enunciation of this fundamental rule could undergo changes according to the point reached by the experience of the analysis itself. The transition from analysand to analyst would impact on the enunciation of the rule, on how someone is encouraged to enter the analysing task. A certain enthusiasm for this refuse that the implementation of the fundamental rule produces may give them an agalmatic value, to the extent that there is an analyst who summons that and supports that free speech. Lacan proposes in these talks at Sainte Anne a reference to the mould that appears on the walls: we can stay with those stains that lend themselves to the figures, to the drawings, or capture the effect of that work of subtle hollowing, a kind of erosion that furrows the walls.³⁶ The turns of free association do not lead to a more definite picture. The analyst to come not only knows then the fate of his analyst in the end, he also knows what the implementation of free association leads to.

With regard to my question about the traces of knowing how to be refuse there is a reference that seemed fundamental to me. There it is specified that the essential knot of the analyst's knowledge is that the truth can only be half-said; it is a knowledge that is always questioned, a knowledge that is extracted from the jouissance of the subject, a knowledge that results from the stumble, the failed action the dream: from the analysing work. I quote: "That knowledge is not supposed, it is

³⁰ Lacan, J. (1968). L'acte psychanalytique. *Autres écrits*, p. 37.

³¹ Lacan, J. "Thus the end of psychoanalysis harbours naivety, which raises the question whether it must be taken as a guarantee in the passage to the desire to be a psychoanalyst". 'Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the psychoanalyst of the School', *Analysis* 6, 1995, p. 10.

³² Lacan, J. "For the neurotic, knowledge is the jouissance of the SsK. This is precisely why the neurotic is incapable of sublimation. Sublimation, on the other hand, is proper to the person who knows how to get round what SsK is reduced to. All the creation of art is situated in this circling of what remains irreducible in knowledge as distinguished from jouissance". *Le séminaire. Livre XVI, (1968-1969). D'un Autre à l'autre*. Paris: Seuil, p. 353.

³³ Lacan, J. (1971). *Je parle aux murs*. Paris: Seuil, p. 67. « Pour qu'il y ait chance d'analyste ».

³⁴ Lacan, J. (2006 [1958]) *The Direction of the Treatment and the Principles of Its Power. Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. Trans. B. Fink. New York and London, W.W. Norton & Company, p. 514.

³⁵ In the writing on the direction of the treatment Lacan already pointed out that in the inflections, in how the analyst applies this rule we will find the way in which the doctrine that the analyst has of the analytical situation and the "point of consequence" to which he has arrived for him is conveyed. (Lacan, 1958: 489).

³⁶ Lacan, J. (1971-1972). *Le séminaire. Livre XIX... ou pire*. Paris: Seuil, p. 74.

knowledge, outdated knowledge, knowledge of *rogaton*, *surrogaton* of knowledge. That's it, the lcc. That knowledge (...), I defined it, a new feature in the emergence, of being able to be considered only as the jouissance of the subject".³⁷ The choice of the word *rogaton* and the emphasis in *surrogaton* attracted my attention. I probably wouldn't have stopped at it, if I had read the Spanish text, because in this language there would simply be no translation. *Rogaton* comes etymologically from *rogatum* - demand, *rogare* - interrogate, question - and has the following meanings: waste object, remainder of little value, little worthless writing, minor news of the day; but also "food composed of leftovers that had already been served", or "little work made from remnants". In Old French there was the expression "*porteur de rogatons*", referred in religion to the order of beggars, who carried relics or indulgences to obtain something in return that would allow them to survive. That *surrogaton* of knowledge produced by the analyzing work is no longer a supposed knowledge, it is outdated knowledge that opens the possibility of a new emergence for what it has produced in the subject's jouissance. We are then in that liminality between what an analysis produces and the production of an analyst. At this point of the conversations about the knowledge of the analyst, these talks in Sainte Anne begin to interweave with the elaborations of Seminar XIX, in which Lacan presents a distribution of the jouissances: phallic jouissance, and not-all phallic jouissance. Other questions arise for me, which I work on in some other cartels: if the analyst's knowledge is based on the analytic work on the subject's jouissance then – How does this distribution of the jouissances impact on the becoming analyst? What differences would there be between a woman's not-all and the not-all from which the analyst emerges? What is the operation by which an analysis transforms sexual jouissance to the point of leading someone to occupy this place of semblant of the object *a*, a-sexuated?

Translated by Elisa Querejeta Casares

³⁷ Lacan, J. *ibid.* "On the other hand, there is one thing that prevails in analysis, and that is that there is a knowledge that is drawn from the subject himself. In place of the pole of jouissance, analytic discourse places the barred subject. It is from the stumbling, the failed action, the dream, the work of the analysand that this knowledge arises. This knowledge, however, is not supposed, it is knowledge, lapsed knowledge, *rogaton* of knowledge, *surrogaton* of knowledge. This is Ucc. This knowledge - and this is what I assume - I define as a new feature in emergence, as being able to be posed only as the subject's jouissance". p. 79.



Mónica M. Palacio practices, teaches and studies psychoanalysis in the cities of Pereira and Medellín, Colombia. She belongs to the Forum of the Lacanian Field of Pereira, and since 2007 belongs to the EPFCL of which she is AME; she has found in the devices of School, the Cartel and control a rigorous way to sustain her training as an analyst, she has been interested in the politics of psychoanalysis, for this reason she has exercised different functions at local and international level, College of delegates, CRIF, CLEA. She has contributed to the translation of Colette Soler into Spanish in the Editions of the Spanish-speaking Forums of the Lacanian Field of the IF-EPFCL.

Members of the Cartel, Completion of the analysis, readings of the school, Luciana Guarreschi, Plus-One, Nadine Cordova, Patrick Barillot, Patricia Gavilanes, Monica Palacio.

On the knowledge of the analyst,

I'd like to start from the phrase from which the CIOS (College of Initiatives and Orientation of the School) invites us to this conference: "Analysts are the wise men of a knowledge they cannot talk about".³⁸ The knowledge [*saber*] we talk about in psychoanalysis is a paradoxical one, we have read it and said it in every way, but it must be told once more: it is not a knowledge [*conocimiento*] as an accumulation of diverse understandings, which may be important. It is not with this knowledge that the act is performed.

Sometimes the recognition of one's own ignorance can lead to the search for a supposed theoretical knowledge [*conocimiento*]³⁹, hoping that it might reveal a little more about the work of the treatment. his hope reveals itself vain because unconscious knowledge [*saber*] cannot be taught. This is what the sentence above indicates us. The knowledge in question presents itself as paradoxical because it is related to the Unconscious, moreover, it is an excluded knowledge whereas the Unconscious is a non-known knowledge, a knowledge accessible due to an analysis carried to its ultimate consequences and which thus has revealed a singular truth: the truth of the subject.

³⁸ Jacques Lacan, Del psicoanálisis en sus relaciones con la realidad. En el Instituto Francés de Milán, el 18 de diciembre de 1967, En Otros Escritos p. 371.

³⁹ Translator's note: There are two nouns for 'knowledge' in Spanish: *saber* and *conocimiento*. 'Saber' is knowledge that one has, and 'conocimiento' is knowledge as understanding. It is knowledge as 'saber' that is used in rest of this text.

This notion of paradoxical knowledge is placed by Lacan along with decipherment: analyzing work based on the cleavage, the fault, the question, and the inquiry, which leads, as I said, to decipherment and therefore to the unveiling of this knowledge during an analysis, with the analyst as the contingent product of this operation.

The cartel of which I was part, on the readings of the School, tried to trace the theoretical production of the analysts of our School on the end of the analysis, the cartelisands questioned that particularity of the analytic act, which makes it possible to lead without impeding the way to the end. My question had to do with the final trajectory and with what allows the AMS analyst to name one of his analysands as a passer. What must the analyst know to make this wager? The discussions and the readings of School, allow me to reach a non-decisive conclusion, the wager of the AMS is not founded on the experience of others. I see in this answer what Colette Soler says: "[...] for the analyst there is no example that is valid for his act, he must reinvent it every time." ⁴⁰

The demand for knowledge presented to the cartel, being this device in which the analyst who interrogates himself about his act could recognize himself in the word that circulates or in the questions that are articulated around the same theme, has a limit, since the demand is met with a knowledge that will not tell the truth of the act it sustains, nor what it is in that act.

Despite the work in the cartel in which some questions and their answers could be common, the AMS analyst finds himself there with no guarantee. Having the certainty of winning the wager for the passer could give meaning to the fact of being designated AMS, but what happens instead is that a void in knowledge is produced, the fault is installed, allowing all of this to continue a work where the AMS is not alone, because in order to the transference to the work of the School has been necessary.

It is not in the reading of the different issues of *Wunsch*, where the knowledge can be found, although it has allowed me to understand that it is about making School from the unsustainable, to think the experience from the impossible to say. To make School is to put in the center this point where there is nothing to say about knowledge, for the desire to know can make a link and make possible what I have called work transference with the different cartelisands that make up a cartel and, by extension, the link of work in the School is possible.

When I was invited to participate in this conference, I had a doubt about the translation into Spanish of the phrase that summons us, "Analysts are the wise men of a knowledge they cannot talk about" when in French it says "*Les analystes sont les savants d'un savoir dont ils ne peuvent s'entretenir*". "*S'entretenir*" resonates in my Colombian Spanish as to be entertained. The analyst cannot entertain himself with that knowledge put in the texts to make the wager of the pass, of the passer;

⁴⁰ Colette Soler, *El saber del analista y su saber hacer*, en "*El saber del analista y su saber hacer. Jornada europea de escuela* 2017

that is what is done in the sciences: demonstrations and improvements, which imply being up to date. In psychoanalysis it is necessary to wager for the singular, which is not transmitted either in clinical studies, in the case presentations, not even in the testimonies of the pass; each subject and his relation with the word and with the saying is so specific that something does not achieve the effect of transmission, instead it achieves the effect of knowledge for the listener, but of knowledge with only that subject, because with another the wager starts again. The knowledge deposited by the analytical experience will allow at most not being deceived, in front of the semblants, in front of the discourse, etc.

Of course, we analysts talk about the experience, this meeting being one proof of that, however I also notice that this conversation does not imply common and convergent points. In this I differ from one of my colleagues in the cartel who published in *Hojas sueltas* issue number 2, that he perceives a certain homogeneity in our School. On the contrary, I perceive in the work of the cartel a divergent path, there are so many readings and interpretations of some of Lacan's sayings about the pass, on the time of the ending, on what the passer is, on the function of the pass as such, which evidently is not a conversation, it is not a sharing, the analysts are then wise men of a knowledge about which they cannot converse, they are wise men of a knowledge that houses the enigma that allows others to advance, there where they do not entertain themselves, for each one must find a way to do with that empty place.

Translated by Sebastián Báquiro Guerrero



Ramon Miralpeix Jubany is a psychoanalyst in Barcelona, AME of the EPFCL, founding member of the FPB-EPFCL. Teacher of ACCEP (Clinical Formations of the Lacanian Field). At the international level, she has been part of the CRIF as representative of Spain and of the CIG, and at a more local level, he has been part of the DEL-F8 device. Member of the editorial board of Pliegues (publications of the FFCLE (Federation of Forums of the Lacanian Field in Spain).

Members of the cartel: "When only words remain", Pedro Pablo Arévalo (+ one) , Andrea Brunetto , Silvana Pessoa , Blanca Sánchez, Ramon Miralpeix

Act and knowledge of the psychoanalyst, from the work of the cartel

For this paper I am going to start fundamentally from the work of the cartel⁴¹ carried out so far, and what I have been able to extract from it for this title that affects the link between analysts, for us, in a School, the EPFCL.

But first I am going to take support from a couple of Lacan's texts. The first one, from which the title of this conference arises, 'On psychoanalysis in its relations with reality'.⁴² From there I take as a starting point "... the affinity of the signifier with that place of emptiness."⁴³ This empty place is the "the reality of the unconscious." This reality is constructed in the analysis to the extent that the analyst offers himself "as a support of that unbeing" to cause the division of the subject. And he adds that this situation is "untenable" for the analyst, and hence his association with those who share with him the inability to exchange this knowledge.⁴⁴

We have on the one hand that empty place akin to the signifier, which has a paradoxical relationship with that place, because it has the capacity to plug it in its "vocation" of filling it with meaning, but at the same time it has, in its arbitrary and at the same time necessary materiality, the capacity of emptying it. This "materiality" is played in an order different from that of the signifying chain that would produce the illusion of a transmissible knowledge, and it is played in the equivoques, as well

⁴¹ The members of the cartel are: Pedro Pablo Arevalo (+ one) [Europe, Spanish], Andrea Brunetto [America, Portuguese], Silvana Pessoa [America, Portuguese], Blanca Sanchez [Europe, Spanish], Ramon Miralpeix [Europe, Spanish]. We worked on Albert Nguyen's book, *Cuando sólo quedan las palabras*. Los Monográficos de Pliegues Federación de Foros del Campo Lacaniano, F-8 No 11

⁴² J. Lacan, Del psicoanálisis en sus relaciones con la realidad en el instituto Francés de Milán, el 18 de diciembre de 1967. Otros escritos, Paidós

⁴³ Ibid. p. 376

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 379

as in all the metaphorical and metonymic possibilities, and in the framework of silence necessary to give accessibility to that *"moterial"*, and especially in the act. As for the equivoques, they always refer to elements of *lalangue*, and, with his *"knack"*, the analyst may be lucky enough for the analyzand, parlêtre, to glimpse something on the other side of the shore illuminated by the brilliance of this stumbling upon an element of *lalangue*. The knack passes through the opportune act.

And in the analysand it allows us to pass from *"I don't want to know anything about it!... and yet I speak incessantly about it - or rather, because of it"* to *"there is a knowledge that is impossible to attain and of which nothing can be said, and of which, nevertheless, something is transmitted"*. This is what we can understand at the beginning of Seminar 20, *Encore*, when Lacan speaks there of this *"I don't want to know anything about it"*. We all start from the same thing, Lacan too, the difference is that he starts from another position, he places himself as the analyzer of his own *"I don't want to know anything about it"* ... this is what he does throughout his seminar. And there again there is a knowledge that is transmitted *"by remnants"*. This, I believe, marks a difference between those who *"lived"* Lacan's seminars in his bodily presence, and those of us who have no choice but to suppose and catch a saying that would be his, in what has been written of what he said. The time, the way, the circumstance in which it was said is practically all left out, so that the transmission can only reach us by another way, direct and intermediary. Direct, because it is that of the analysis – and there, we all start from the same place – intermediary, because of how we access the knowledge produced by Lacan from his analyzing position, through others who transmit, because they have their own voice, remnants of a knowledge that exists in the word.

Second point of support:

"The sexual relation is an intersynthomatic relation. This is precisely why the signifier, which is also of the order of the sinthome, (...) operates. This is precisely why we have the suspicion of the way in which it can operate: it is through the intermediary of the sinthome.

*How then can the virus of this sinthome communicate itself in the form of the signifier?"*⁴⁵

To this question Lacan answers by saying that this is what he has tried to explain throughout his seminars.

But the question that suggests itself to me is the following: would an intersynthomatic relation between analysts make a transmission possible? Perhaps the experience of the pass allows us to answer this question in the affirmative. I leave it at that, in case in the debate we can recover some of that. [A]

⁴⁵ 9e Congrès de l'École Freudienne de Paris sur « La transmission » . Parues dans les Lettres de l'École, 1979:

"Le rapport sexuel est un rapport intersynthomatique. C'est bien pour ça que le signifiant, qui est aussi de l'ordre du sinthome, c'est bien pour ça que le signifiant opère. C'est bien pour ça que nous avons le soupçon de la façon dont il peut opérer : c'est par l'intermédiaire du sinthome.

Comment donc communiquer le virus de ce sinthome sous la forme du signifiant ?"

Here I can only say something on the basis of the "ideal", that is, of the conditions for this to take place. The first condition is to operate with something that would have been placed as a suppletion in the place of the cause, that which, through experience in personal analysis and in the clinic, facilitates a common language that in each one relates to that from which his or her subjectivity arose. This should make possible an intersubjective relationship between analysts. Although we can also introduce here the major difficulty: the incompatibility between certain jouissances or certain forms of enjoying (*jouir*) (what we see emerging in some group experiences).

I end with two quotations from Nguyen because I cannot say it better than him:

"How to ensure the transmission of this knowledge from the moment when analysis is at the same time transmissible and non-transmissible? He borrowed several ways to do so: first with the signifier and its logic, turning to the matheme and then to the knot, to topology and finally to the poem."

"Where is this possibility of transmission of a new knowledge, unprecedented for the subject, measured if not in the pass, in the collective work (cartels, congresses, etc.)?"⁴⁶

"The question of this transmission seems to me so crucial that 'skilnyapas' (whatthereisn't) and 'skilya' (what there is) are followed by 'what to transmit'. This question of transmission dwells between the consequences of skilnyapas (whatthereisn't): that is to say this guarantee that is missing, this last word that is missing and this sexual relation that cannot be written, and the consequences of skilya: that is to say that there is the One, and if I can say: There is the One and yaksa (it is what there is), which gives the double perspective of contemplating the question of the act in the practice of analysis today and also the question of the ends of analysis in the light of Lacan's contribution that goes from the pass to the poem and the access to the real. We can focus on the real but it is necessary to know that this access is marked by the stamp of the impossible."⁴⁷

[A] We all know that it is precisely transmission that is the most important difficulty of the procedure of the Pass. The same name indicates to us that something passes or does not pass. From where to where does it pass? From whom to whom? What is it that is expected to pass? Is it not something of the order of what cannot be said in words, even though it requires this means for it to pass? I am speaking both of what can be transmitted, both of the encounter with the singular nucleus of jouissance on which the sinthome is founded, and of the point of emergence of the analyst's desire (one does not quite know how this transmission takes place since there is no universal: the various passers in their ways of transmitting to the Cartel of the Pass what is heard and what is heard by the passand always speaks as one, unique, singular).

Translated by Nathaly Ponce

⁴⁶ Albert Nguyen, *op cit*, p. 185.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 258-59.