

This paper must be referred to as: 'The crucial problems: the end of the treatment, transmission and institutionalisation, in *The Letter. Lacanian Perspectives on Psychoanalysis*, spring 1997, pp. 117-122.'

The crucial problems: the end of the treatment, transmission and institutionalisation

Paul Verhaeghe

There are with many different approaches to this complex subject of this congress. I have been asked to formulate the closing remarks, and of course this always entails the danger of what Freud called the "secondary elaboration", i.e., the smoothing out all of difficulties. In order to avoid that danger, I want to keep the problem open on the point which I consider to be the most difficult one, namely the end of the treatment and the transmission of psychoanalysis. Moreover, I intend to demonstrate that the maintenance of this opening is indeed crucial.

In this respect, seminar 12 occupies a special place. From a conceptual point of view, it succeeds to the eleventh, that is, to the introduction of the Real as a category; this introduction adds a new dimension to Lacan's theory, thus necessitating a "nachträgliche" re-elaboration of this theory. For Lacan, the crucial problems concern the identification, the transference and the demand, and the relations between those three, which he will approach from a topological point of view. It is this introduction of the Real that will rework the division between *Being and Knowing*.

Nevertheless, if we overstress the conceptual content of the seminar, we may lose sight of the institutional framework in which it took place. Let us not forget that the previous year saw Lacan thrown out of the IPA, and that he founded his own school in 1964 (EFP).(1) From the twelfth seminar onwards, a number of lessons will be given for a restricted audience, i.e., for the privileged ones. In itself, this is already an illustration of the central problem, namely the end of the treatment and the transmission.

Those two are without doubt the most crucial problems of psychoanalysis, and of course we have to connect them in a direct way to the two themes of the twelfth seminar, i.e., identification and transference; the link between these two couples runs through the demand for recognition. Indeed, every demand is a demand for recognition by the other who is thereby promoted to the position of the big Other. This is necessarily connected to the "Neurosenwahl", the choice of the subject for a certain position towards the desire of this Other, or, to put it in Freudian terms, the connection to the Oedipal situation.

Those crucial problems are already crucial with Freud, despite the fact that he will treat them separately. The end of the treatment receives an unfinished answer in "Analysis terminable and interminable", stating that every cure stumbles on and stalls at a certain anxiety; for Freud, this has to do with the, for him incomprehensible, repudiation of femininity ("Ablehnung der Weiblichkeit"). The second problem, that of the transmission of what Freud denominates as "die Sache", is the main theme of his correspondence, and thus of his personal life.

With Lacan, the end of the treatment will meet the same troublesome femininity, but he will give it another name, that is, the Real and the jouissance. From the twelfth seminar onwards, the question concerning the end of the treatment will join the one on the transmission of psychoanalysis, and together they will find a concrete form in the ever problematic formation of a group or school. Eventually, both will culminate in the idea of the "passe". As a kind of bonus, the relationship between psychotherapy and psychoanalysis as such will be questioned.

In these matters of institutionalisation, we find an illustration of a well known clinical saying: that the son inherits the sins of the father, in this case son Lacan and father Freud.(2) This illustration lies with the ever impossible group and school formation with analysts, which is abundantly illustrated by the history, both freudian and post-freudian, lacanian and post-lacanian or whatever. Time and again we find the same symptom, thus showing its coercive character and implying that it is of a structural nature. The psychoanalytic theory itself permits us to describe this symptom: as a matter of fact, the end of the treatment entails always a reappraisal of the end of the Oedipus, through which the subject had to acquire a position of his own towards the Real. It is already stated by Freud that this oedipal complex ought to be destroyed during the development of the subject, but that this destruction is never completed; on the contrary, it becomes repressed, which entails inevitably the return of the repressed.(3)

If the destruction of the complex has taken place, *exogamy* becomes possible: the subject has mastered his anxiety sufficiently for the Real (Lacan)/the Woman (Freud), to be able to enter the world in his own way. As a consequence, the original group *explodes*. If this destruction does not take place, then one remains within the sphere of *incest*, looking in the original group for safety against the anxiety-inspiring Outside. As a consequence, the group *implodes*.

The history of analysis can be written down in terms of alternation between this explosion and implosion, between exogamy and incest. It starts off with papa Freud who "analyses" his own daughter Anna, thus protecting her from the advances of crown-prince Jones, but at the same time obliging her to stay forever in the inner circle of the original group. This is the structurally determined repetition, that entails time and again a return of the repressed:

each analytical group constitutes itself around one central figure, an original son who became himself a father because he killed a foregoing father. The analysts who are trained by him, are his creation, and they will continue to display that statute forever, with as an effect that each originality, each procreation, becomes prohibited; in the name of an original thinker, original thinking itself becomes forbidden, theory degrades into dogma, clinical practice into paradigmatics. The typical sign of this incestuous situation is the *prohibition* of stepping outside the boundaries of the group. In its wake, a number of predictable phenomena will arise, and it is no coincidence that they made their appearance today in the lectures, e.g. the function of secrecy, the importance of naming and not-naming, the analyst in the position of the sophist, all those divine details of course ending with the ever crucial problem of the portrait of the analyst...

This can be perfectly demonstrated both in the freudian and the postfreudian history. Nevertheless, knowledge of this problem does not suffice to avoid it or solve it. Indeed, Lacan's critical reflections(4) on his predecessors can be applied with the same success to the lacanian and postlacanian history. The ultimate death-blow takes place when the condition for admission to an analytic group does not depend any more on the fact of having been in analysis, but on the fact of *with whom* one has been in analysis, *casu quo* in supervision. In this respect, Karl Kraus's biting remark becomes true

The repetition-compulsion in this symptom demonstrates its inevitability, and thus its structural character. From my point of view, I try to understand it by making a differentiation between two different termination points, a therapeutical one and a psychoanalytical one. From a lacanian point of view, a therapeutical end always entails a reinstallation of the S1, i.e., the guaranteeing and safety providing transference figure, with whom the subject identifies. It is a reinstallation, because it retakes the original identification with the father. A structural and thus inevitable consequence of this identification is the fact *that it entails the formation of a group around this S1*. This can be understood both from Freud's "Group psychology and analysis of the ego" and from Lacan's discourse of the master. A second structurally determined consequence is the fact that this group formation will always find its limit in *religion*, i.e., in the belief in the ever arbitrary S1, and that is of course the fideist position in the analytic practice. This can be read as such in the early Freud, where he states that the actual success of a psychotherapy depends on the belief of the patient in the therapist. Half a century later, Lacan will corroborate this idea by stating that a believer cannot be analyzed if he does not exchange his belief for the analytic one. This process always implies that there is love to the matter, albeit a narcissistic and thus deceiving one.

Once this therapeutical end is reached, the possibility of another goal arises, this time an analytical one. Based on the reinstallation of the S1, the subject in analysis can reach the point of what Lacan denominates as the "destitution

subjective", with as its counterpart "le désêtre" of the analyst. It is no coincidence that precisely in the twelfth seminar Frege is turned into an object of study. Indeed, the hope was that Frege's theory would permit the elaboration of a symbolic structure independent of the subject, who would be connected to this structure by a later "suture". Inversely, this subject could then be disconnected from the Symbolic, and it is there that the idea of subjective destitution takes off. In my understanding, this is the lacanian formgiving of what Freud elaborated with his ideas on the necessary destruction of the Oedipal complex. Again, for Lacan this process comes down to an identification, albeit it a very special one, as it implies the identification of the subject with its own cause, beyond any guarantee of his existence in another's desire, and this brings us to the dimension of the crucial object. The structurally determined effect of this end is as predictable as in the previous case: instead of group formation, the subject ends up *with the maximum possible difference with others*. The limit of this process is *poetry*, being the most subjective way of giving form to the lack, which means that it is always a creatio ex nihilo. At this moment, another form of love becomes possible, the one mentioned by Lacan in the very last sentence of seminar eleven, together with this idea of absolute difference.

Thus considered, the end of a psychotherapy stands in a definite relationship to the psychoanalytic end; let's put it this way: the analytic goal can only be reached after the therapeutic end. The necessity of this relationship may not hide from us the fact that it is also a contradictory one: an analytic group, in the proper sense of the word, is not possible, it is even a *contradictio in terminis*. If one wants to form group, then one is in need of a S1-which-assembles, without which no group is possible. The courageous efforts to prove the contrary, had to fail, and then I think of *Scilicet* and *L'ordinaire du psychanalyse*, two periodicals that aimed at embodying this subjective destitution by publishing only anonymous papers.(5) Thus, in matters of psychoanalytic institutionalisation, the paradox is that one has to form a group based on an experience that leads or ought to lead the subject to the pinnacle of absolute difference with others. In clinical practice, the narcissism of the small differences seems to be more preponderant...

Due to the structurally determined character of the matter, a remedy seems out of the question. Usually, the typically hysterical attacks on the S1-character in charge will only corroborate his position; eventually, he will be replaced, but the structure as such will remain unchanged. Beyond this hysterical "solution", it is much more interesting to note the fact that this structure, i.e., the relationship between S1 and object a, that this structure forms part of the Unconscious itself. The Unconscious is always a border process, an opening that closes itself almost immediately; in short, an ever failing process, due to its very nature. Hence the fact that it gets lost time and again, both with the subject and in history, thus making it necessary to reinvent it time and again.(6) The successful formation of a group is a sign of the closure, the failing of this formation pinpoints at the opening.

In short, we have to worry particularly at the point where the failure tends to fail.

Notes

1. J.Lacan, Acte de fondation de l'EFP, 1977.

2. J.Lacan, Seminar 11, p.///.

3.S.Freud, The Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex (1924d), SE 19, pp. 157ff.

4. J.Lacan, Situation de la psychanalyse en 1956, in: Ecrits. Especially the pages (pp. 473-484) on what he calls "La Suffisance, les Petits Souliers, les Bien-Nécessaires and les Béatitudes" are very revealing.

5. The first issue of *Scilicet* was published in 1968, the last one in 1976. The papers were not signed, with one exception: those by Lacan... *L'ordinaire du psychanalyste* (first issue 1973, 12 issues, last one in 1978) intended to publish even Lacans papers anonymously, but that was refused. Especially *l'ordinaire* took pains to give concrete form to the subjective destitution and the anonymous rapports from the "passe" by way of anonymously published papers. Just like the passe, they failed on that very point (cfr. Roudinesco, II, pp. 468-475). The same can be said about the cartel formation; both, passe and cartel, were a lacanian attempt to form a counterpart to "les effets de colle", the ever closing group formation. Both succeeded in demonstrating its impossibility.

6. Cfr. J.Lacan, Seminar XI, chapter II.