

PREAMBLE

This founding: we can first of all raise the question of its relationship to the teaching which does not leave the decision on its act without guarantee.

It will be posed that, however qualified may be those in a position to debate this teaching in it, the School neither depends on it, nor even dispenses it since it is pursued outside.

If for this teaching in effect, the existence of an audience that has not yet taken its measure was revealed at the same turning point that inspired the School, it is all the more important to mark what separates them.

Ecole Freudienne de Paris - this title held in reserve in the founding act, clearly announces the intentions from which we proceed, to anyone who sticks to its terms.

Let us skip the place, from which we take up again, not without the entitlement to do so, with its original coat of arms, the challenge it stamps out, already saluted by Freud: the School affirms itself to be first of all Freudian, for the reason that, – if there is a truth which no doubt is supported by a presence that patiently reiterates it, but which from this effect has come to consciousness as the French orientation – the fact is that the Freudian message in its radicalism goes way beyond the use that is made of it by the practitioners of English-speaking obedience.

Even if we lend a hand in France as elsewhere to a practice mitigated by the spread of a psychotherapy associated to the needs of social hygiene, it is a fact that no practitioner fails to show his discomfort or his aversion, even his derision or horror, in proportion to the opportunities that he is offered to immerse himself in the locus opened up in which the practice here exposed takes on an imperialist form: Conformity of aims, barbarity of doctrine, complete regression to pure and simple psychologism - the whole badly compensated for by the promotion of a clergy, easy to caricature, but which in its compunction is indeed the remainder which testifies to the formation by which psychoanalysis is not dissolved in what it propagates.

This discord, let it be imaged by the clarity that emerges from questioning whether it is not true that at our epoch psychoanalysis is everywhere, the psychoanalysts elsewhere.

For it is not for nothing that people are astonished that the very name of Freud, by the hope of truth that it conveys, should be made into a figure to be confronted to the name of Marx, undispelled suspicion, even though it is patent that the gulf between them is unbridgeable, that on the way half-opened by Freud there could be glimpsed the reason why Marxism fails to account for a power that is always more inordinate and more insane as regards politics, even if a relaunching-effect does not result from its contradiction.

That psychoanalysts are not in a condition to judge the evils in which they are steeped, but that they feel that they are failing here, - this is enough to explain that they respond by an encysting of thought. A surrender that opens up the way to a false complacency, carrying for the beneficiary the same effects as a true one; in this case, the stamp with which they besmirch the terms of the enterprise for which they are responsible, which does not at all of itself fall under the jurisdiction of the reigning economy, but is convenient for the conditioning of those it employs, even in the top echelons: the psychological orientation and its diverse duties.

Thus psychoanalysis is too expectant and psychoanalysts too unstable for the uncertainty to be undone from elsewhere than from the very point from which they have taken their distance: namely the formation of the psychoanalyst.

Not at all that the School does not dispose of what assures it that it is not breaking any continuity: namely psychoanalysts irreproachable from whatever point of view one takes, since it would have been enough for them as it was for the remainder of the subjects formed by Lacan, to disown his teaching to be recognised by a certain 'International', and that it is well known that they owe the renunciation of this recognition to their choice and their discernment alone

It is the School that puts in question again the principles of a patent qualification, and with the consent of those who manifestly have received it.

Which is why it proves again to be Freudian - the term School now comes to be examined by us,

It is to be taken in the sense that, in ancient times, it meant certain places of refuge, indeed operational bases against what could already be called the discontents of civilization.

By restricting ourselves to the discontents of psychoanalysis, the School intends to give its field over not simply to the work of criticism: to the opening up of the foundation of the experience, to the putting in question of the style of life onto which it opens out.

Those who are engaged here feel solid enough in themselves to declare the manifest state of things: that psychoanalysis at present has nothing surer to set it off to advantage than the production of psychoanalysts – even though this balance-sheet must appear as leaving a lot to be desired.

Not at all that people abandon themselves in it to some kind of self-accusation. They are conscious here that the results of psychoanalysis, even in their state of dubious truth, present a more worthwhile figure than the fluctuations of style and the blind premises relied on by so many therapeutics in the domain where medicine has still not found its bearings as regards its criteria (are those of social recuperation isomorphic to those of cure?), and even seems to be going backwards as regards nosography: I mean psychiatry which has become a question for everyone.

It is even rather curious to see how psychoanalysis plays here the role of lightning conductor. How without it would people make themselves be taken seriously in the very places where it is a merit to oppose it. Hence a status quo in which the psychoanalyst takes comfort in the opinion that it is known to have of its insufficiency.

Psychoanalysis had nevertheless from the start distinguished itself by giving access to the notion of healing in its domain, namely: to restore to symptoms their sense, to make a place for the desire that they mask, to rectify in an exemplary way the apprehension of a privileged relation – again it would have been necessary for it to be able to illustrate it from distinctions of structure that the forms of illness require, to recognise them in the relationships of being which demand and which identify themselves to this demand and this identification.

Again it would be necessary that the desire and the transference that animates them should have raised up those who have the experience of them to the point of rendering intolerable to them the concepts that perpetuate a construction of man and of God in which understanding and will are distinguished, by means of a so-called passivity of the first mode to the arbitrary activity that it attributes to the second.

The revision of thought that is called for by the connections to desire that Freud imposes on it seems to be beyond the means of psychoanalyst. No doubt they eclipse themselves by the carefulness that inclines them to pity at the weakness of those that it succours.

There is nevertheless a point where the problem of desire cannot be evaded, when it involves the psychoanalyst himself.

And nothing is more exemplary of pure gossip than what circulates in this connection: that this is what conditions the sureness of his intervention.

To pursue into alibis the miscognition which shelters here with its false papers, demands the most valid encounter of a personal experience with those who will call on it to acknowledge itself, holding it to be a common good.

Scientific authorities themselves are hostage here to a pact of insolvency which means that it is no longer from outside that one can expect a requirement for supervision which is supposed to be on the agenda everywhere else.

It is the business only of those who, psychoanalysts or not, are interested in psychoanalysis in act.

It is to these that the School is open so that they can put their interest to the test - it not being forbidden to them to elaborate its logic.

J. LACAN