

# Cultural Centre for Freudian Studies and Research

23 Primrose Gardens, London NW3. Tel: 586 0992

## NEWSLETTER NO. 1 - SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 1986

The Newsletter of the CCFSR will appear every 2 months. If you wish to receive the next five issues, subscription details are available on p. 3, as well as details relating to the Ivy House Programme. The aim of the Newsletter is to circulate information and work notes; we invite Subscribers to send both responses to work printed here and their own contributions. These should be sent typed to the Centre at its London address, and preferably should not exceed one-and-a-half A4 sides. If you wish to contribute to the November/December issue, texts should reach us by October 20th.

### BLOOMSBURY SEMINARS AND STUDY GROUPS

The Centre's Bloomsbury seminars are held at 6 Queen Square, London WC1 in the rooms of the Company of Astrologers on the premises of the Art Workers' Guild. Meetings start at 7.45 p.m. and admission is £2. (£1 for students of Middlesex Polytechnic): for information about Season Tickets, see below. During the first term there will be two seminars:

#### 1 Clinical Structure (Monday 13th October, 10th November, 24th November and 8th December)

The analytic experience concerns itself not only with the signifier. There is something more, included by Lacan in the structure of discourse, in the writing of (a), condenser element of jouissance. It is both to the signifying dyad  $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  and to this object that we situate the operations which cause the division of the subject; that is, the operations of alienation and separation.

Given these four terms that circulate in the discourses, what is in question is a structure, and it is with the help of logic and topology that we can investigate the modalities at play. Structure is not specific to the analytic experience in a formal sense; where it finds an exemplification in the analytic situation, it can likewise find an exemplification elsewhere. In this sense, the topological structures that Lacan elaborated are real; they return to the same place just like the stars. If there are well-known problems in model-specification relating to the range of interpretation of the quantifiers, this in no way alters the specification of a structure, since the primitive relations involved are to be interpreted extensionally. Structure is built up around a gap, and, for the neurotic, what is in question is a response to the desire of the Other. This seminar is concerned with the modalities of this response as they are articulated in hysteria, obsessional neurosis and phobia, and with the topology elaborated in the analytic experience.

D.L.

#### 2 The Relation of Psychoanalysis to Science, Logic and Mathematics (Monday, 20th October, 3rd November, 17th November and 1st December)

The Study Group will work on a variety of themes, starting with an investigation of the work of the Hungarian analyst, Imre Hermann, on the mathematician Janos Bolyai, and also his study of the psychophysics of Gustav Fechner. Suggestions for further work are the writings of Jean Cavailles and Albert Lautman on the development of modern mathematics and in particular their theses on the nature of dialectics and history; Ferenczi's distinction between scientific thinking and freefloating attention in his paper on elasticity and technique. Suggestions for further topics are invited, but work on either the Popper-Agassi-Lakatos tradition or the tradition of rationality of the Frankfurt School would be welcomed. The study group has previously looked at Hermann on Cantor, Hilbert, Brouwer and Russell, as well as Jacques-Alain Miller's article 'Axiome de la Structure'. None of this will be presupposed in the future meetings and no particular knowledge of science and mathematics will be presupposed within the Study Group.

B.B.

\*\*\*\*\*

## WORK NOTES FOR COMMENTS

### WHAT IS THE PSYCHOANALYST SUPPOSED TO KNOW?

Assuming that most of you are analysts, I take the opportunity to speak in order to be listened to in a way that my message is received and given back to me in a reversed form. For those who are not analysts, who might not understand my message or might want to make a judgement on me, with those I take a risk, because, after all, when we speak we always transmit something. -But even more so if there is somebody who is willing to receive our message and has ears to hear. We need another to give our message back to us, because we do not know it. We go to the analyst to know what we are saying which we cannot recognise but whose effects make themselves painfully felt. Or better, something suffers in us through the symptom, might it be only mere unhappiness. We assume the analyst to know what this symptom or unhappiness is about, we assume he knows the truth about us. But unfortunately for his illusions, the poor analysand soon realises that the analyst had never met him before and does not know his truth either, that, well, the whole trick in psychoanalysis is that you have to find it yourself. But what is this truth one finds just speaking about oneself, what is this pretension? It is true that a search for truth has always animated the human kind in all spheres: philosophy, science, religion, politics; even the dictators and the slaves claim a truth, but none can claim the absolute truth. Certainly, one can feel one is near to it, almost there ..... but none can claim to have or to be the whole truth.

So, what is so peculiar to the analytical couple in its search for it? Nothing else than finding out that truth is relative, partial and personal that truth flashes through its lies and that it never makes itself manifest in its wholeness. We could say that the logical paradox of the 'I am lying' could represent the analytical truth. But there is not such a thing as an absolute lie either, because it is in between the lies or the lines that truth peeps out like the sun sparkles through a thick foliage of a tree. But like the sun, you cannot look at it directly, because like Oedipus in the face of the truth of his parricide and his incest, you get blinded by it. But we can look at its sparkling through the gaps in the foliage, that is, through the holes of our discourse: a slip of the tongue, the absurdity of a dream, a haunting oblivion. Truth is in exile in relation to our knowing ego, however absurd this might seem, they are irreconcilable and we are split between them. The apparently paradoxical task psychoanalysis should accomplish is to find again something which we had originally refused to recognise, but which nevertheless strives for recognition. And what we have to recognised is this very split, this cut like a hole in the centre of our being. Truth presents itself to us at the border of our assumed being, that is, as non-being, in a conflict, a non-sense. In this negative and ungraspable form it presents itself at the limits of our existence, like death. This non-being is the truth of our being which we cannot accept. It comes out in the psychoanalytical discourse as a split off part of us, cut off, exiled, barred and making of us split beings. Lacan said the subject is always a barred subject, in the formula of a barred  $\$$ . Our language cannot say our being, if not as an interruption, a logical contradiction, a discord with our conscious and ethical thought. In our practice we come up against an ethical problem concerning our very being, that is, the ethical problem that being constitutes for humans. But even if in a negative form, through pain, denials and lies, it - the non-being - speaks through us. This is the language of the unconscious, of the holes of our discourse. Psychoanalysis can let holes speak, and the unconscious is their language. The psychoanalyst listens, then, to a discourse on the border of the analysand's very being. Here we are, placed on the slippery edges of an abyss, which we neither ignore nor, hopefully, fall into.

B.B.

Extract from 'What is the Psychoanalyst Supposed to Know?'  
In: 'Transmission and Psychoanalysis' (forthcoming 1987)

## JOUISSANCE IS NOT A SIGN OF LOVE

Lacan said that the *rapport sexuel n'existe pas*. Nothing prevents us from translating it as the sexual relation does not exist. It would be a translation that regards the teaching of Lacan as an automatic functioning.

It is a spectacular translation but also trivial since we cannot offer proof against the tide of everyone's impression that the sexual relation does exist - abundantly. In this impression is a hope that it does exist.

An axiom, of course, does not require proof. An axiom is a sign of God which honours Him and for which you shall be fruitful. If you axiomatised this translation, you would not be fruitful. It cannot therefore be a sign of God and, so, is not an axiom.

Those who appear to jouir the dramatic quality of this translation of the *rapport sexuel n'existe pas* might wish to call upon the Freudian thesis that sexual reproduction is not represented in unconscious knowledge. The thesis is not trivial, but it has only partially to do with the sexual relation, that is, it places a restriction on it.

The Church understands very well that the sexual relation exists, and it enacts a law in order to restrict it. This law is not a legal injunction. It knows that there is a gap in the law and has the humility to forgive failure. It understands the sexual relation, understands what brings peace and has the courage to say so.

Take the Lacanian remark that love is a substitute for the sexual relation. What would love be a substitute for if there were no sexual relation?

Love exists in a psychoanalysis as a transference effect, and you might very well wonder whether the real of the sexual relation does not make an appearance in a psychoanalysis when love flies out the window.

I am inclined to think that there is an axiom in all of this: in the sexual relation, sexual rapport does not exist. This translation is not so spectacular, but it is not trivial. I suggest that the hand of Freud is in this axiom. In a psychoanalysis where love flies out the window the real of sexual non-rapport appears.

In the meantime, sexual non-rapport is hidden in the sexual object. The subject's efforts, extravagant efforts, to convince himself that sexual rapport does exist, are constituted in the sexual object. The impasses of sexuality generate jouissance which involves the universal tendency to the debasement of the sexual object. Where the subject loves, he cannot jouir, and where he does jouir, he cannot love (see Standard Edition XI, p. 183). And so Lacan, following Freud, says that jouissance is not a sign of love.

R.K.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CCFSR AND MIDDLESEX POLYTECHNIC PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDY GROUP

### Subscription Rates and Season Tickets

Subscription to the Centre costs £17.50 per year, running from October to September. Cheques should be made payable to the Cultural Centre for Freudian Studies and Research, and sent to 23 Primrose Gardens, London NW3 4UJ. Subscribers will receive a Newsletter six times a year, giving current information and circulating work in progress. Subscribers can also receive 'Syngraphia' at the reduced rate of £6 per year (£4 for students and unwaged). Season Tickets to the Ivy House Seminars are priced as follows:

#### Non-Subscribers

Term 1	£8
Term 2	£8
Term 3	£4

#### CCFSR Subscribers

£7 (including free access for Term 3)
£7 (including free access for Term 3)
-

All 25 Seminars £16.50

£12.50

These tickets will be on sale at the Ivy House Seminars.

## BLOOMSBURY SEMINARS AND STUDY GROUPS

A ticket for entry to a series of four meetings costs £5 (£3 for students of Middlesex Polytechnic). An Annual Season Ticket for all 24 meetings costs £24 (£12 for students of Middlesex Polytechnic). They may be obtained by sending a cheque payable to the Cultural Centre for Freudian Studies and Research to the Centre at its London address. Please specify which meetings you wish to attend.

## CCFSR AUTUMN STUDY DAY

There will be a study day devoted to 'Clinical Perspectives of the Lacanian Teaching' on Saturday October 11th, from 10.00 a.m. - 12.00, then 2.00 p.m. - 6.00 p.m. in Central London. It is open to anyone interested, and there will be time in the afternoon session for participants to discuss questions relating to their clinical work. The number of places is limited, and registration will close on October 6th. Cheques for £25 should be made out to and sent to the Centre at its London address.