

Perspective of the talking-cure and reversal of perspective

Institutional presentation CCAF-Constituent Cartels of Freudian Analysis /
Marie Diebler, Martine Aïmedieu, Jean-Michel Darchy

Psychoanalysis is undermined by the neuroscience. but the practice of the cure and its transmission of the pass, which privileges indirect testimony, brings into play another relationship to knowledge. A nonknowledge as a reversal of perspective.

1- This term « Non-Knowledge » is borrowed from Georges Bataille and put to the test first in our field by Jacques Nassif, member of the CCAF and author of two recent books published by Editions des Crépuscules, *Pour Bataille, 2019* and *Le retour de Penthesilée, à la recherche du féminin perdu, The return of Penthesilea, in search of the lost feminine, 2022*. What matters is to situate Georges Bataille as an analysand having attempted with his work « *The inner Experience* » *L'expérience Intérieure, 1947* « to go as far as possible » of an analyzing statement. In this sense Bataille can be positioned as « passer of Lacan » in relation to Freud. This work of historicizing the lacanian gesture has the effect of legitimizing the relevance of the discourse of psychoanalysis, in order to demonstrate that it can no longer be the work of « the name alone of one » and the only psychoanalyst, whereas the latter is nothing without its analysands. This is nothing less than getting out of the dogmatic confinement to which a conception of psychoanalysis as « teaching » and of the cure and the pass as it would come to verify the relevance after the act. The analyst's silence, because of the fundamental rule, can be expressed as Non-Knowledge bearing on the accepted theory of psychoanalysis. It's the consequence of the fact that things, in the analytic device, have not (I quote in my article Non-Knowledge) « no name received and are relegated to an unverifiable exterior by the analyst ceasing to be as soon as he crosses his threshold. This reduces these things / cf. *Non-Savoir*) « to being only the words which come out of the analysand's mouth confining to « a non-knowledge » of things or to a knowledge of Words without things.

2- At the C.C.A.F we have devices: the cartels of practice and the Pass. As soon as they were founded in 1983, the Pass was taken over. Its functioning is modified on 4 crucial points.

-No institutional nomination even if there is a response.

-No title.

-No list.

-The jury is itself listened to by a « Reporter »

It's a chicanes loop to ensure successive disappropriations.

3- This development has proved to be necessary to define a new ethics of the Pass in order to re-found. This device carries an important ethical challenge. It maintains a necessary and sufficient isomorphic relationship between the talking-cure, the transmission and the object of psychoanalysis.

4- We have taken up some of these points in a cartel in 2017-2018 to rethink and re-problematise them.

What we got out of it : pass creates a new social link free of the conventions that could be imposed by the use of a priori criteria to verify a doxa. The focus tightens on the analysing act to name the analysis insofar as the psychoanalyst will not have obstructed it

The notion of author is released.

4-1 The Pass, creates a new social link between about ten people free of the conventions that could be imposed by the use of a priori criteria to verify a doxa. The focus tightens on the analysing act to name the analysis insofar as the psychoanalyst will not have obstructed it. The notion of author is released.

4-2 We've read various more or less disappointing tales of cure in the sense that we realized that they often provided a bypass function as to what the pass leads to. On the other hand, reading *Philippe Réfabert's book, Comme si de rien (Témoignage et psychanalyse, 2018,*

Editions Campagne première) relaunched our work although it never alludes to the Pass, to the consequences of the absence of witnesses. His position proposing to consider the talking cure from the angle of testimony came to him by revisiting the notion of « soul murder » that President Schreber in his memoirs h. I quote him P.167 « It appeared to me that this angle of view deserved to be extended to the whole range of psychopathology and that it was fruitful to see in the cure this experience where an analyst creates the conditions such that the witness in the analysand sees his capacity to bear witness for himself and for the other restored and restored.»

4.2.2 He proposes to place the notion of 'witness' at the heart of the device: the analyst . « The analyst 'makes himself' a witness -making himself a witness- at the point of return of the drive which corresponds to the constitutive temporality of the analyst's desire, the point of resolution of the transference which is temporality of the analyst's desire, the point of resolution of the transference that returns the demand to the drive. The analytic discourse itself is thus re-established as a witness at the point of objectivity of analytic theory, where the analyst in the clinical picture ends up which doesn't see us v. The hole of knowledge, the blind point. This is a reversal of perspective, the analyst « acting a witness » being able to allow (cf p 168) « ...to say with other words what had already been stated and at the same time would make it possible to dissipate certain problems. »

4.2.3 There is an obvious convergence between the theses of Philippe Refabert on trauma seen as the absence of a witness, leading to a sequestration of the victim in a discourse of complaint and what finds a way out, as a complement to the « absent archive » by the through the Passas externalized discourse. The analytic discourse itself being thus re-established as a witness.

In fine

The device of the pass paradoxically validates what Lacan pinned down in the 4 concepts of psychoanalysis: the desire of the analyst at the point of return (of the drive)-and synchronously of reversal making 'knowledge' in analysis 'an Other place of knowledge. : "an Other place of knowledge'. At the CCAFs, which do not 'school', it is no longer a question of the link to Lacan. From their foundation (1983) in deciding to pursue the experience of the pass they did so by taking a step to the side thus giving themselves the right to pass to a third time for psychoanalysis In this sense,

The CCAF could be considered in their intention as an effect of pass. The relaunch of psychoanalysis in its third stage is articulated around the question of non-knowledge vectored by the devices of cartelisation and the pass. They thus reaffirm the authority, alone, of experience, its sovereignty against any attempt of mastery that would reduce it to the exercise of power.