

The Pass and the End of Analysis

Jorge Assef

What is the relation between the title of the Lacan Circle of Australia's International Conference - "We're all mad here" - and the theme of this first intervention: "The Pass and the end of Analysis"? In 1978 Lacan wrote a short text, in which he says: "...everyone is mad, that is, delusional".¹ Thirty years later, Jacques-Alain Miller published his Seminar of the Lacanian Orientation. As you may know, Miller held a Seminar in Paris every year until 2011. In 2007, Miller gives the title "Everyone is mad" for one of the classes he gave during seminars given in Spanish. Tomorrow I will talk a lot about what this statement means. But today I want to take up again a specific paragraph of Miller's taken from that seminar. He states:

This sentence - "everyone is mad" - provokes without fail a shake-up of the certainties held by the one who presents himself as a therapist, as technicians of the therapy of psychosis - because this sentence - is placed in the slope: do not forget that it is about you.²

What does the title of the International Conference - "We're all mad here" - have to do with the theme of this first intervention "The Pass and the end of Analysis"? We psychoanalysts do not

think that we are above our patients, that we are from another planet, that we are a model of "good mental health", etc. We are all made of the same material as our patients. Thus, "Everyone is mad" means that psychoanalysts are also included. And that is why analytic training is not only a theoretical training, it is not enough just to receive patients, or to supervise the clinical cases we attend. The fundamental base of psychoanalytic training is personal analysis. But we have known that personal analysis is the fundamental base of our training since Freud. What is the novelty introduced by Lacan? This novelty is called Pass and it is a device invented by Lacan in 1967. The Pass consists of the procedure by means of which an analyst in training verifies that he has finished his analysis. If after going through this device the analyst is nominated "Analyst of the School" (AS) it is because he has verified the end of his analysis, and therefore he can make his own experience useful by transmitting to the School questions about the end of analysis.

That is why Miller in this same seminar, Everyone is mad, says: "psychoanalysts cannot be prepared by teaching, they can only be prepared by experience". To teach, there must be *matheme*, a lay formula, that responds to the: "(...) for all x (...)", However, in analytic experience the knowledge is yet to come and will always be valid only for one. The pass, precisely,

1 Lacan, J., *¿Lacan por Vincennes!* (1978), Revista Lacaniana de psicoanálisis #11, p.11. Grama, B. As. 2011.

2 Miller, J.-A., *Todo el mundo es Loco*, p.311.

tries to miraculously transform the knowledge of only one, which comes from his experience in analysis, into teaching material for everyone.³ But this also implies that the analyst has sufficient distance from his own madness, and that distance prevents him from bringing it into play in the treatments he conducts with his patients.

Therefore, we can say that everyone is mad, but that analysts work on their own madness in their own analysis in order to be able to leave their own madness outside the consulting room or at least be aware when something of their own madness interferes with their capacity to hear the analysand.

This is, the title of this conference that summons us all here in Melbourne - "We're all mad here" - is a possible way to think about the training of the Lacanian psychoanalyst and the central place that the question of the end of the analysis has for our training. It is for this reason that I chose these two topics for today's discussion: the end of analysis and the pass. These are two matters that concerns me in particular, especially since I received this invitation to come to Australia when I was already working as an AS. I finished my analysis, that lasted 22 years, in April 2021. I went through the pass device a few months later and I was nominated AS in August 2021. This means that I am in the middle of my AS function, which is extended for a period of 3 years. So, I am going to develop some points linked to the end of the analysis, although I will be brief. I am not aware of how much is known about the Pass in Australia, I don't know how familiar you are with the clinic of the end of analysis, that's why I thought it would be more interesting to keep my intervention brief and then open a conversation among all.

1. Two theorizations on the end of analysis

In order to locate what Lacan taught about the end of analysis, we have to recognize two different moments concerning the end of analysis.

First theorization on the end of analysis

This first theorization finds its most elaborated formulation in *Seminar XIV The Logic of Fundamental Fantasy* and *Seminar XIV The Psychoanalytic Act*. We can also find references to this topic around the time when he wrote: "*Proposition of 9th October 1967*", the text in which Lacan presents the device of the

pass to his School. This text not only revolutionizes theory but also psychoanalytic training, and even the politics of psychoanalytic institutions as they were known. This first theorization of the end of analysis is a journey that goes from the preliminary interviews to the beginning of the analysis. This is where the S1 that has marked the subject's life and that makes his fundamental identifications begin to unfold. The journey that the subject makes is to deconstruct these identifications, empty them of meaning and let them fall. On this path, the construction of the fundamental fantasy takes place; the object a is isolated, producing knowledge concerning the subject's specific modality of jouissance, and then finally, the fundamental fantasy is crossed. That is to say, at the end of this path, the fundamental identifications of the subject and the relation that the subject has to the object a have been deconstructed (we will see examples).

Second theorization on the end of analysis

The second theorization on the end of analysis is found in the period that we usually call: "the very last teaching" of Lacan, occurring at the end of his life. You can find the fundamental ideas on the end of analysis corresponding to that time in the writing: "Commentary to the English edition of Seminar XI". These concepts are written in a very condensed and concentrated fashion. This very short article contains a whole universe within. This is, it is so rich that it must be carefully unraveled to understand its full scope. Miller dedicated almost 4 entire seminars to it: *Donc, The place and the bond, Analytical subtleties, The very last Lacan*. The second theorization includes the first one: however, it goes beyond the crossing of the fundamental fantasy. The reason for this is that it considers the dimension of the *sinthome*, a concept that Lacan developed in 1975: 8 years after *The proposition*. This evening, I will mainly speak about the first theorization of the end of analysis, because as I said before, the second theorization has a complexity for which we would need much more time, so I will only make a small reference to it.

2. The idea of trajectory in the first theorization of the end of analysis

We said before that the first theorization on the end of analysis implies the idea of a trajectory, a journey beginning from what we usually call

³ Miller, J.-A., *Todo el mundo es Loco*, p.337.

"Preliminary interviews". During this time, there will be signs indicating that the subject is already inside the analytic device that moves to the traversal or crossing of the fundamental fantasy that marks the exit. The following Miller's reference can illustrate what we mean by the entry into analysis:

Preliminary interviews have multiple functions: diagnosis, location of the signifier of the transference and of the signifier of the call, and first displacement of the request from the demand to the desire and, if we can say, first division of the subject. That is to say, of what Freud calls free association, it means that the subject authorizes his word to go before him.⁴

I want to emphasize this phrase: "...that the subject authorizes his word to go before him". This is very important because it implies in the first place having a direct experience of what we call subjective division. That is, I say one thing, but when what it is said and it's out of my mouth what I can hear is something else: I am surprised; I am frightened; I laugh; I defend myself; I rush to clarify; I blush; I am inhibited; I get excited...

This experience of my subjective division provokes the installation of the subject supposed to know, which is not the analyst, but the unconscious itself. That is to say that if the subject who consults for the first time can develop a relationship with his unconscious - if he can allow himself to be disturbed by the unconscious, allows himself to listen to it, to believe it, to follow it, then we can say that this subject is already in analysis. From that moment on, the analytical work consists in locating and isolating the key words of the subject's discourse - what we call "master signifiers" or "S1". In this regard, Eric Laurent states that an analysis tries to isolate the S1 of a subject from the very beginning, those familiar signifiers that, in their contingency, contribute to the formation and stabilization of the modes of satisfaction that constitute the fundamental fantasy.⁵ I emphasize this reference from Laurent because whenever we speak of the fundamental fantasy we refer not only to the signifiers of the subject, but also to the modes of jouissance.

The fundamental fantasy is the basic "formula" underlying the relationship between the subject and the object. The fundamental fantasy is constituted in part, by the master signifiers, S1, that mark the life of a subject and that are inscribed with a predominant mode of drive jouissance. In the fundamental fantasy we find a fixation to certain mode of jouissance. This formula is put into play in every relationship that the subject establishes with other, with the world, and of course, it is also put into play in the relationship with the analyst. At the end of the analysis, after an S1 has been isolated and the identifications of the subject have been loosened, the analyst accesses the formula of his fundamental fantasy. This knowledge produces an understanding of the logic that had organized his life without him being able to realize it. Importantly, is it only possible to go beyond the fundamental fantasy, to free himself from this fixation a little bit more, after its formulation.

Testimony on the pass

Since I have been invited to share my work with you at a time when I am performing my function as AS of the World Association of Psychoanalysis, I will take my own case as an example - I will take parts of my second Testimony, held in October, one year ago in the American Federation of Psychoanalysis.

While I was still a university student I attended a seminar at the School of Lacanian Orientation in Argentina, that seminar was called "*Logics of Love Life*". At the end of that same year, and because of the breakup with my first partner, I decided to start an analysis. I called the analyst in charge of that seminar because I assumed that she knew about the entanglements of love, which was the area of life in which I suffered the most. My first period of analysis lasted eleven years consisting of two weekly sessions dedicated to the treatment of a hysteria solidly organized around an insatiable demand for love deployed in a circuit that went from idealization to voracity and in which I always ended up confirming a *cursed destiny*: "The other leaves me". I clearly recognized the enjoyment of that position thanks to a comical situation that happened to me during a vacation in Spain.

I met someone I had really liked one morning on the beach, I had agreed to have dinner with him that evening before he returned to a close town where he

4 Laurent, E., "El pase y los restos de la identificación". Letras N° 6, p.36. Madrid, 2013.

5 Laurent, E., "El pase y los restos de la identificación". Letras N° 6, p.36. Madrid, 2013.

was staying. I arrived at the restaurant 5 minutes late and as I didn't see him sitting at a table, I rushed off to the train station. Since the train to the town where he was staying had already left and I had no contact information for him, I was convinced that I had lost the "love of my life" because of my 5-minute lateness. That night I returned to the hotel totally devastated. The next day, I went to the same beach and he was there. He had stayed at a hotel in the area to look for me because the waiters at the restaurant had told him that at the moment he was in the bathroom, a young man with an Argentine accent entered the restaurant, quickly looked at the tables, asked where the train station was and ran out. This scene, which looks like the sequence of a comedy, shows how absurd love dramas are when the subject lives prisoner of his neurosis, locked in his own fundamental fantasy of "the other is abandoning me". It took me 12 years to cross, to move from that position: the decisive moment found me in Paris, a phone call at the wrong time triggered the anguish and I decided to consult my supervisor.

Those sessions cleared up a key issue; I was relating that my father died when I was 15 years old, that my mother informed me between sobs saying the phrase: "Dad left us", then I added: What I remember the most is the image of my mother sitting alone in the hospital corridor crying. After this, the analyst said: "Identified to maternal pain". That intervention was the one that definitively broke the fantasy of abandonment; however, there was still the side of the demand that had to do with the idealization of love and the demand.

At the end of a session, I felt an uncontrollable impulse to go and look at a work of art that I always found very attractive, *The Kiss* (Figure 1) by Constantin Brancusi. I sat in front of that work at the Pompidou Museum for several hours. Back in my analyst's office, when I recounted the fact, I could understand that it was an acting-out; it was about the insistence with which I wanted to believe that "sexual relationship" was possible. Although everything in the analysis led me to think that it was not possible to become one with the other, something in me resisted to consent to that and I instead, insisted on the idea of "the other half".

I discovered the most interesting aspect of the matter several years later, when I understood that

what I insisted on was not a romantic idea, but the devouring drive *jouissance* that was also visible in that work of art. It was in my second period of analysis, already back in Buenos Aires, when a nightmare staged the drive grammar that organized my case around the oral object and gave me access first to the signifier that named the formal envelope of the symptom: "Garrapata" / "Hanger-on" (like a parasitic bug, very similar to a leech, that attaches itself to



others to feed).⁶ That nightmare gave me access to the formula of the fundamental fantasy: "Hung on to the other".

The following nightmare shows the most lethal face of this hysteria: My partner was hugging me, hanging on to a side of my body with one hand and exerting a pressure that caused me an unbearable pain; suddenly, he brought his face close to my face and his blue eyes turned black. I woke up screaming: "He wants to eat my liver". "He wants to eat me". I finally understood that the fundamental fantasy was not "the other one leaves me" but "in order for him not to leave me I have to hang on to the other one with all my strength." From that moment on, I began to subjectivize that the love dramas I had suffered throughout my life were not a curse of destiny but the

6 The signifier "Garrapata" - literally "tick" in English - echoes at the same time "garra" (claw), "tener garra" (to have nerve), "agarrarse" or "aferrarse" (to hung on to), and "pata" (duck), as mentioned in the first testimony, towards "pathos" (N. de la T.).

effect of a jouissance: that is, my “love dramas” were a symptom supported by a fundamental fantasy of a devouring embrace that drowned desire and ruined every love relationship I tried to establish. Only then I was able to fully understand that afternoon at the Pompidou Centre staring at Brancusi’s “The Kiss”. Years later I was able to understand that behind that image that I found “so tender” was hidden the deadliest part of me. Finally, my greatest discovery was that the main obstacle to love was myself, the insistence with which, in the rage of my hysteria, I tried to find the “logic of love life” that would guarantee me to become one with my partner; and the way in which in each attempt something in me was satisfied, ruining the encounter. When I discovered the way in which my demand to be loved conditioned my analytic practice I began to take an interest in the pass. When I encountered the signifier “Hanger-on” I was better able to discern how this modality of jouissance interfered in my clinical practice, hindering the handling of transference. It took a little more time (a year) to conclude the analysis, until I presented myself to the pass device, but I will tell you that part of the story another day. In order to have a better understanding of what I just said I will read again Eric Laurent’s reference:

...in an analysis it will be necessary to isolate the familiar signifiers which, in their contingency, contribute to the formation and stabilization of the modes of satisfaction that constitute the fundamental fantasy...

This clarifies the example from my own case that I just mentioned. It happens that once an S1 is isolated, separated from S2, it can no longer return to the initial identificatory logic, the one that inertially leads the subject always to the same place. This effect on the signifying chain intervenes in the subject’s mode of jouissance, because by touching the identifications with a certain S1 we move the way of jouissance that was knotted there. However, it is not enough to move the subject’s modes of jouissance; it takes time for the subject to give up this jouissance, or to find another way of doing something with this way of jouissance. And, this step is carried out thanks to the analyst’s double function.

On the one hand, we know that the analyst is the addressee of the subject’s demand for knowledge, but on the other hand the analyst is located in the

transference as an object. And this means that in the transference, the subject’s fundamental phantasy is at stake and present in action. Here I could resort to another example, the transference of Graciela Brodsky. There is a testimony of Graciela called “*Partenaires*” that is published in *Revista Lacaniana* N° 13. It is interesting to observe how the end of analysis is a journey that goes from the first interviews to the end, and that it is precisely at the end when some things that were already there from the beginning are understood. This testimony also helps us to understand the place that the analyst plays in the transference at the end of the analysis. Graciela was the only child of a Jewish family. Her mother suffered from hypoacusis, a kind of deafness that made her unable to hear the child. These two conditions place two central issues of the case: the fundamental S1 of the case: “The only one” and the predominant pulsional object: the voice. I will now read you some fragments of the testimony:

Every time the signifier - the only one - was touched, the anguish would come... So when...I had the first interview...I repeated three times to the analyst “I am an only child” - just in case he was not listening well. The third time the analyst replied: “You already told me three times”.

Graciela explains that this intervention of the analyst allowed her to understand the value that this place had for her, but also, that it made it possible to knot the transference, since it demonstrated to the subject that the analyst was not deaf like the mother and allowed the subject to find a partner that suited her better: the one who listens. In her testimony, Graciela even says that the analyst “allowed me to believe, for years, I was “the only one” without disturbing that S1 to which I was attached”. In her case, a random event acted as the prelude to the crossing of the fundamental fantasy. This happened at the end of the analysis, when the S1 of her case had already been disturbed, and the subject was very advanced in her treatment. At the end of a psychoanalytic congress, Graciela saw her analyst dancing with other colleagues. She then says at that party:

...the agalma of being “the only one” was shaken when I found myself, one among others”...And she adds: “...If the party had the power to trigger anguish, it was because

there was something was released that had been sinthomatically knotted in the transference previously.

Consequently, the fiction of the fundamental fantasy exploded and the jouissance value of this S1 was lost. This last example shows how the transference knotting at the beginning of the analysis is unleashed at the end of the journey. Of course, these conditions that we have been raising take years of analysis. That is why Lacan says in his text "*Radiophony*": "It takes time to become the being". This time is a double time:

- 1) Time to work on the isolation and weakening of the S1, present in the identifications of the subject, and;
- 2) Time for the libidinal withdrawal, which includes the extraction of the object a, and the fall of the analyst.

This does not mean that one is done first and then the other - it is not a chronological question, rather, it is a logical process that involves all the dimensions of the subject. In my intervention tomorrow I will return to the subject of the times in the analysis.

3. Brief remarks on the second theorization of the end of the analysis.

From Lacan's last teaching onwards, the idea of trajectory, a journey that goes from the preliminary interviews to the crossing of the fundamental fantasy is not enough to explain the end of the analysis. It becomes evident to Lacan that not everything is resolved with the mere crossing of the fundamental fantasy because there are still symptomatic remains which will never be abolished, they will never reach a zero point. Therefore, the end of analysis is thought as a logical moment, as an act of the analysand who feels that there is nothing more to say, because otherwise, he would only be endlessly spinning around in circles. That is why there is a necessity of doing something new with those remains. In Lacan's words:

When an analysand considers that he is satisfied, well, one lets him go...Everyone knows that analysis has good effects that only last for a while, that does not prevent it from being

a resource and that it is better than doing nothing...the pass, when there is a pass, is a story that one tells (Lacan, *Scilicet* 6/7).

Indeed, in his last teaching Lacan does not believe that at the end of the analysis one finds a total, invariant, fixed truth, but rather a singular version of one's own truth, that of each one. The pass is a device by means of which the subject transmits this version of his truth to another. Lacan says in "*Preface to the English edition of the writings*" that "the mirage of truth, from which one can only expect a lie (what we politely call resistance), has no other end than the satisfaction that marks the end of the analysis." And when he refers to the pass again he adds:

That is why the pass is a way of testing the hystorisation of analysis, where I have to be very careful about not to impose this pass on everyone, because there is not everyone at this point ...I left it only to those who would take the risk of testifying the lying truth as good as possible.⁷

Another question that is important to emphasize in this second theorization of the end of analysis is the encounter with the limit of the transference unconscious as distinct from the real unconscious - but I will speak about this important distinction tomorrow.

Finally, at the end of analysis there is the issue of the sinthome. The sinthome is that subjective aspect, that is not crossed in an analysis: it does not change, but it is with which the subject has to do something with, to make use of it, to try to find a know-how. What is important to note is that beyond these new perspectives on the end of analysis, Lacan continued to maintain the necessity of the device of the pass for the training of the psychoanalyst, which brings me to point number 4.

4. Political consequences

I don't know if you are aware that almost at the end of his teaching in 1981, Lacan traveled to Latin America for the first time. It was a great event. Spanish speaking analysts from all over Latin America went to Caracas, Venezuela, to listen to Lacan in person for the first time. Lacan called them: "My readers". I think this name "readers" makes the distinction between

⁷ Lacan, J., *Otros Escritos*, p.599-601.

those who read the texts of psychoanalysis, i.e. who theoretically study Lacan's teaching, and those who are trained as analysts, i.e. who not only read the texts but are also analysands. The closing of this event known as "*Caracas Seminar*", included the dissertation of notable analysts of the world, and in this framework Jacques-Alain Miller gave a lecture entitled "Clause of closing of the psychoanalytic experience", where he recalled that while for Freud the analysis ended in a structural impasse, the irreducible limit of castration, Lacan showed that one could go further since the end of Lacanian analysis "supposes the transformation of the analysand into the analyst, the shift from one position to another".⁸ Miller pointed out the importance for analytic training of leading the analysis to its conclusive point, and he did so in a territory where many studied Lacan's texts but had not yet realized the psychoanalytic training that emerges from Lacan's teaching places the end of the analysis at the center of the training. And that is why the pass is fundamental.

Now, what must be emphasized is that the pass has had a subversive effect on the history of psychoanalysis. Let us recall that Lacan founded his School in 1964: from then on he felt free to articulate analytic training to the principles of a renewed practice of Freud's work. Thus, 3 years later, after the seminar "*The logic of fantasy*", Lacan published "*The proposition*" which places the crossing of the fundamental fantasy as the sign of the end of analysis. This is the moment where he introduces the device of the pass to his School.

This proposal changes the history of psychoanalysis, to the point that even within the Lacanian School itself, a little crisis starts, because the pass is opposed to the importance of what other psychoanalytical institutions generally called "careers". The pass proposal implies that it does not matter how many years someone spends reading psychoanalytic theory, or receiving patients, or working in an institution; rather, what matters is the formative effects produced by an analysis. Of course, having consistently studied psychoanalysis has a value in the training - it has a lot of value - but it is in the analytic experience itself where the core of the training is determined and carried to its conclusion. The International Association of Psychoanalysis, established during Freud's life, proposed another form of training program. It quantifies the years of analysis (adding up

so many hours); the hours of supervision; the theoretical training program...everything had to add up, and sooner or later when an analyst in training added up all those hours, then he/she was declared a psychoanalyst. Then, if that person makes merit, continues studying with responsibility and has patience, they may become a didactic analyst, approximately at the age of fifty-five. From then on, they will be assured of professional recognition and prestige.

As you can see, it is a programmed route, demarcated from the beginning, where chronological time is key, where the steps to be followed are precise, where age is decisive. The pass proposal sweeps away all this structure. The pass it is not oriented by the idea of the sum of hours and it does not matter how many hours someone went to the analyst; what matters is that someone can demonstrate that this analysis had effects - that it changed his position, that it freed him from his ghosts. What matters is to demonstrate that the analysis allowed him enough knowledge of his own subjectivity to prevent it from interfering in the clinical work with his own patients. In this way, we couldn't care less about this concept of career, it does not matter the number of years, it does not matter the institutional merits, what matters is that this analyst in training demonstrates his end of analysis.

Here lies the core of analytic training, in the analytic experience itself, and its conclusion. An immediate consequence of this approach is to understand the difference between "Lacan's readers", those who study or research on psychoanalysis in theory, and those who are trained as analysands. There are many people who quote Lacan theoretically, use him as a reference for their own theoretical postulations, but this is a use made of Lacan's work without taking into consideration that this work is tied to a training structure, which goes through the experience of an analysis, without analysis itself, reading Lacan is an intellectual task that remains "halfway". This is what Lacan wanted to make clear when he proposed the Pass for his School, and what Miller wanted to emphasize when he traveled to Caracas with Lacan.

Who is responsible for getting the analysis to the end?

Reaching the end of the analysis is not easy: it implies a long time, a path that is sometimes hard. Tomorrow I will develop this question in more detail.

⁸ Miller, J-A., *Seminarios de Caracas y Bogotá*, p.229.

I will talk about the three times of analysis: the beginning, the intermediate and the end. The intermediate time is the most complicated and difficult of the three, because it is the time in which the subject already knows almost everything about his case but remains tied to a mode of jouissance that is not easy to concede or change. There are usually moments of impasse, detentions, negative transference with the analyst, attempts to flee, to suspend, to leave the analysis, etc. Whether the analysis reaches the end depends a lot on how the subject manages to go through those moments of impasse in which the subject feels that it is impossible to move forward. By the way, in the writing "*Radiophony*" Lacan says "only by pushing the impossible to its last limits does impotence acquire the power to turn the patient into the agent."⁹ That is to say, to turn the analysand into the analyst. We could put it this way: when the impasses in the analysis are moments characterized by impotence, the way out is through "pushing the impossible to its last limits".

Now, the question would be: who is the one who pushes? Is it the analyst or the analysand? Miller states, "it is therefore a matter of interest not only to the analyst; it is of interest above all to the analysand". It is certainly so, but there is also the analyst's disposition." I will refer to a different testimony to use it as an example of this topic; it is not the testimony of an AS, but an interview that Judith Miller had with Rosine Lefort in 2007.

Rosine, whom we all know for her work with infantile psychosis and autism, says that she consulted Lacan for the first time in 1950, and tells of that experience of analysis:

In the family universe, I had a position of waste...a hyper-super-egoic, hyper-repressive family, which required me to be very intelligent. In my childhood, I was very neurotic: fugues, sleepwalking, phobias...The psychosomatic...was useful to me from the age of seventeen to twenty-seven. The moment the doctor told me that I was no longer ill, I lost all support and started an analysis.

Rosine recounts her first interview with Lacan:

The first thing I told him was that I was the irremediable waste...Lacan did not fight against

me, but against that place of waste...The analysis sessions were terrible; I could not miss the session but at the same time it was a horror to go to the session. I could not look at him, even though he asked me to, he would hold my hands and gently say "look at me", so I was wearing black glasses.

Rosine recounts the operations by which Lacan pushed the impossible in her case, especially when the moment of impasse arrived:

After the first three months, Lacan told me that everything had gone very well...there was - then - the great psychosomatic blow ...where I almost died...I think I had reached a state where it was necessary for all the horror of my childhood past to be there, present in act in the transference. Then, the phobias, the nightmares, the sleepwalking, etc. returned...I wrote to Lacan that I could not continue the analysis. Three hours later he sent me a letter asking me to come back. He continued to receive me for about a year without my paying him...Little by little the silence installed itself...Although he warned me one day that he would block the exit door...if I did not talk - which he did... Another day when I had escaped, he caught up with me when I was almost inside the subway. Lacan fought against my weakness and my horror, I never let up, but if he had not fought, I would not have come back.

Rosine estimates that that time of impasse lasted about 8 months:

Every day, twenty minutes...in silence; he kept his pressure and I touched what I never really articulated...the other side of all the words of my parents who had silenced me and of the nannies who insulted me...Later I understood that Lacan tried everything to free me from that.

In his attempts Lacan proposes to Rosine to take her with him to see hospitalized patients, this operation awakened her curiosity for psychosis. Rosine states:

9 Lacan, J., "Radiofonía", *Otros Escritos*, p.469.

I was terrified by that hole around which I could not put any word; that same hole, I found it in those patients, and I began to be interested in those children...it was he - Lacan - who had wanted and insisted that I talk to children...from that horrible place that I had known. Thus the place of rest, of waste, was the tool and the germ of my work as an analyst. To say that I got rid of it completely in life is another matter. But after all, I was there to return to the efficiency of what made me suffer, to do something else with it.¹⁰

These moments of impasse of an analysis constitute the privileged framework in which this "pushing the impossible" unfold. And in this framework, the key is the desire, the desire of the analysand of course, but it is also fundamental the way in which each analyst represents the desire of the analyst and lends himself to be the object of the transference - as Miller warns - without ideas of grandiosity.¹¹

Finally, Rossine teaches us that a psychoanalyst is born as the effect of a training that contains an impossible - a real - on condition that he has taken it, thanks to their own analysis, beyond impotence; making it an impossible that authorizes, that allows flexibility, that warns against the danger of prejudices and dogmatism, and that, precisely for this reason, favors the disposition to invent unique solutions. It is thanks to analysis itself that each practitioner of psychoanalysis finds in his training the style with which he will carry out his position as a psychoanalyst. There is a text by Miller called - "How does one become a psychoanalyst at the beginning of the 21st century" - where he discusses the question of analytic training today, I would like to share with you two points from this text to conclude.

First, Miller says that a person does not become an analyst by analyzing patients, much less by worrying about the therapeutic effects, on the contrary: there

is no other way than his own analysis, and the elaboration of the relationship to his own unconscious. So the quality of an analyst is only obtained by bringing the analytical experience to its conclusion as a psychoanalyst. And yet, once the analysis itself is finished, Miller says:

You will only last as analysts on condition that you remain...psychoanalyzing your own relation to the subject supposed to know, because your unconscious is not reduced to zero...The unconscious is always there, with the duty imposed on you to continue deciphering it, reading it. Secondly, he clarifies:

being an analyst is nothing but someone who would constantly work to become...“Being” invites to identification and...if one had to define a criterion of being an analyst...then I would say that it is intolerance to identification, whether in panic or in enthusiasm, in routine or in surprise. A psychoanalyst does not want others who are similar but only others who are different...We - the World Association of Psychoanalysis - want analysts who are analysands, perpetual analysands...who are all the more precious for being unusual and singular. Because the analytic path...is that of singularity, singularity taken to paradigm.¹²

I thought that these words were a good way to conclude today's intervention as they are linked to what I tried to pass on to you today. This is the importance of the end of analysis and the pass in Lacanian-oriented psychoanalysis. This would allow each of us to find our own way of being a psychoanalyst.

Translation: Agustina de Francisco

10 Publicado en Revista Lacaniana de Psicoanálisis #14, p.129-136. EOL, Junio 2013.

11 Miller, J.-A., Efectos terapéuticos rápidos, pg 105, Paidós, Bs. As. 2005.

12 El Caldero de la Escuela Nueva Serie N° 15 (2011).