



11

The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

Introduction

Thirty-five years after his death, the work of Jacques Lacan remains clinically disputed yet theoretically vindicated. The practice of Lacanian analysis is still disputed within IPA institutes who are struggling to reconcile the growing popularity of Lacan and Lacanian analysis with the initial decision that excluded him from the organization. Moreover, Lacanian clinical practice may be disputed within IPA psychoanalysis, but this fact is small in comparison to how psychoanalysis at large is clinically disputed within evidence-based practices.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, at some point,

The word psychoanalysis or Freud or Freudian psychoanalysis became a taboo word within the clinic of evidence-based practices. There are many reasons for this being the case despite the fact that nowadays brief psychodynamic psychotherapy has joined the ranks of evidence-based-practices in mental or so-called “behavioral” health.

This chapter has been co-authored by Dany Nobus.



19 Although there is empirical evidence that psychoanalysis is effective as a
20 treatment (as argued in the previous chapter), Lacanian psychoanalysis
21 is less disputed within the general culture because it is a new form of
22 psychoanalysis, and science must remain open to new treatments that
23 have not been quantitatively tested.

24 Lacanian psychoanalysis follows from a different form of rationality
25 and epistemology as already argued. The experience and clinical effect of
26 psychoanalysis is a singularity that can only be verified on a case by case
27 basis and then with difficulty due to the social, ethical, and legal prob-
28 lems involved in disclosing information associated to case histories. The
29 material disclosed in analytical sessions is not limited to social narratives
30 and histories of abuse that could be disclosed to the public and are even
31 disclosed to the public in TV talk shows.

32 The decline of psychoanalysis is also due to internal reasons, one of
33 which affects Lacanian psychoanalysis and the other does not. The first
34 follows from a dogmatic theoretical position by which we mean not the
35 enumeration of first principles, which is inevitable in science, nor the
36 provision of proofs, but the refusal to consider other schools of thought
37 within or outside psychoanalysis.

38 The second internal reason for the decline of psychoanalysis affects
39 psychoanalysis but not Lacanian psychoanalysis. Mainstream psycho-
40 analysis remains dogmatic with respect to the frame for treatment which
41 was the main reason for expelling Lacan from the IPA. In this Lacanian
42 psychoanalysis is revolutionary and may coincide with the external cri-
43 tiques of psychoanalysis. The scansion and citation of speech in analysis,
44 and the scansion of the length of the session represent a renewed prac-
45 tice of interpretation that goes a long way in addressing the questioned
46 effectiveness of psychoanalytic interpretations and insight as predict-
47 able conscious explanations of the unconscious that are not clinically
48 efficient.

49 Although Lacan wanted his form of psychoanalysis to take root
50 in North American soil, not only the difficulty of his texts, but also a
51 dogmatic and colonialist attitude on the part of French and European
52 psychoanalysts was not helpful in this regard. What helped establish
53 the first Lacanian School of psychoanalysis in the US (LSP) twenty-six
54 years ago, was the attempt not only to teach Lacanian psychoanalysis



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

227

55 as a clinical practice, but also to apply Lacanian theory and practice to
56 clinical work in institutions, to use and teach Lacanian theory in local
57 universities, to dialogue with other forms of psychoanalysis, and to
58 accept the local licensing laws for the various professions under which
59 psychoanalysis can take place. At the same time, we are aware that the
60 regulation of the profession can also have an adverse effect on its prac-
61 tice, since the restrictions of the Law do not encourage or support the
62 rule of free association about topics, themes, and fantasies regulated
63 and repressed by the Law. The state regulation of the profession has the
64 effect of generating or enforcing a climate of conformity that may be
65 inimical to the spirit of psychoanalysis.

66 Nowadays LSP is a functioning Lacanian school in the United States
67 based in California and supporting the practice of Lacanian analysis
68 across the country. Bruce Fink's translations of Lacan's work and Fink's
69 own introductory texts have helped disseminate Lacanian analysis in
70 the United States. Most Lacanian analysts in the US and UK are also
71 licensed and professionally trained clinicians. In the UK, CFAR (Centre
72 for Freudian Analysis and Research) forms clinicians who are then
73 authorized to practice once they finish the requirements for training
74 within the institution. This is a better system than the licensing laws of
75 the US, that require a host of professional bureaucrats, and an indus-
76 try of experts that live off the regulation of the practicing professional
77 clinician. Given the trajectory of psychoanalysis as a child of Europe,
78 psychoanalysts in Europe were in a better position to mount legal
79 challenges to the attempts by the State to regulate the profession.

80 In this chapter, we would like to look at the Lacanian school as an
81 organization, beginning with a review of Lacan's trajectory in attempt-
82 ing to develop a new psychoanalytic organization.

83 Lacan's theories have gone from strength to strength in academic
84 departments of literature, cultural studies, modern languages, linguistics
85 and rhetoric, media and communication studies, women's and gen-
86 der studies, philosophy and film theory. The versatile applicability
87 of his concepts as solid tools for critical analysis is also demonstrated
88 in the widest range of disciplines outside the traditional human
89 and social sciences, and seems to gain more and more momen-
90 tum daily, with architects, legal scholars, criminologists, educational



91 scientists, theologians and classicists now also engaging with his work
92 (see e.g. Beattie, 2013; Caudill, 1997; Cho, 2009; Hendrix, 2006;
93 Jagodzinski, 2005; Miller, 2007; Milovanovic, 2003).

94 Since the late 1990s, Lacan's notions have also started to gain
95 momentum in organization research, critical management theory, busi-
96 ness studies and public administration scholarship, on both sides of the
97 Atlantic. Many of the new Lacanians in these fields have demonstrated
98 how key Lacanian concepts such as the mirror stage, the divided sub-
99 ject, the *objet a*, desire, *jouissance*, fantasy, and discourse can be used
100 productively in order to understand, inter alia, how organizations func-
101 tion and become dysfunctional (e.g. Arnaud, 2002), how individuals
102 operating within organizations maintain their professional identities
103 and develop certain types of working relationships with their colleagues
104 (e.g. Arnaud & Vanheule, 2007; Driver, 2009b, 2009c; Harding, 2007;
105 Kosmala & Herrbach, 2006), how authentic leadership is established
106 (e.g. Costas & Taheri, 2012), how work-related problems such as envy,
107 stress and burnout may be addressed (e.g. Bicknell & Liefoghe, 2010;
108 Driver, 2014; Vanheule, Lievrouw, & Verhaeghe, 2003; Vanheule
109 & Verhaeghe, 2004; Vidaillet, 2007), how strategic and operational
110 change management may be facilitated (e.g. Driver, 2009a; Kenny,
111 2009), how practices of human resource management affect individuals
112 at work (e.g. Johnsen & Gudmand-Høyer, 2010), how executive coach-
113 ing and consulting can be tailored to subjective as well as collective
114 needs (e.g. Arnaud, 2003), how entrepreneurship discourse is predicated
115 upon the assumption of certain "work identities" (e.g. Jones & Spicer,
116 2005), how staff representatives react to the threat of factory closure
117 (Vidaillet & Gamot, 2015), and how organizational processes are con-
118 ditioned by broader socio-political and economic configurations (e.g.
119 Bloom & Cederström, 2009; Fotaki, 2009; Glynos, 2011; Stavrakakis,
120 2008). If Lacan has not fully arrived yet in organization and critical
121 management studies, then he is making serious headway as a theoretical
122 force to be reckoned with.

123 If we restrict "organizational culture", then, to the classic structure of
124 the corporate enterprise operating under economic conditions of high
125 capitalism, Lacan indeed emerges as the anti-organizational psychoan-
126 alytic theorist par excellence. As an anti-humanist and a fierce critic of



127 the adaptation paradigm in ego-psychology and related psychoanalytic
128 models, Lacan was profoundly weary of any developmental, corrective
129 and accumulative perspective on mental health, and of any clinical and
130 theoretical outlook that regards the restoration of a patient's psychic
131 economy and its return to a well-integrated state of stable equilib-
132 rium as a realistic aspiration (see e.g. Lacan, 1988 [1953–1954], p. 25;
133 Lacan, 2006 [1953], p. 204; Van Haute, 2002). By extension, Lacan
134 was extremely sceptical of any social system that inscribes progress
135 and growth as the most advanced accomplishments into its discourse,
136 because he did not believe that the outcomes (goods and services) of a
137 production cycle can be fully achieved through regulatory frameworks
138 (Lacan, 2006 [1968–1969], pp. 15–19).

139 Obviously, these points would apply to both theory and practice.
140 The ideology of health and well-being is a humanistic approach that
141 is deeply entrenched in the delivery of public mental health services
142 within the United States. Fromm's humanistic psychoanalysis and the
143 humanistic theories of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers have been
144 influential in this regard. Lacan would be critical of these develop-
145 ments as having lost the creative edge of the Freudian analysis of the
146 Unconscious.

147 Ego psychology within psychoanalysis advocates the ego's adaptive,
148 integrative, and synthetic functions that promote a notion of psychical
149 equilibrium within the context of social reality and the reality principle.
150 This approach blends well with psychiatry as a social institution that
151 promotes biological health and normal or normative social behaviour.

152 What is lost in these approaches is a critical perspective on normal
153 behaviour, and an idealistic/humanistic philosophy serves as a defence
154 against the importance of psychopathology and the symptom for per-
155 sonal development. Lacanian psychoanalysis is centred on the Real of
156 the Unconscious rather than on a humanistic ideal or a historically
157 determined social reality.

158 However, Lacanians have not abandoned Freud's insistence on the
159 transformations of the symptom and psychoanalysis as a treatment for
160 psychical suffering (applied psychoanalysis). The observations of psy-
161 choanalysis, although empirical and clinical, are singular and apply to
162 each subject in which psychoanalysis is reinvented as a practice and a



163 theory. Clinical outcomes can be measured according to symptom
164 index scales in the areas of work and relationships. However, Lacan
165 did abandon measuring psychoanalytic outcomes based on the ability
166 to maintain relationships as is commonly the case within mainstream
167 psychoanalysis and psychiatry (DSM's social and occupational objec-
168 tives). If anything, social outcomes of treatment nowadays have to take
169 into account the realities of relationships in contemporary society where
170 many marriages end in failure and where Freud's developmental ideal of
171 joining love and the sexual drive no longer holds.

172 What replaces the notion of a normative relationship is the realiza-
173 tion that the human problem of an ideal rapport between the sexes does
174 not exist. People may choose to make do or not with whatever relation-
175 ships in which the *sinthome* may be implicated. In addition, the other
176 side of the failure of the rapport between man and woman (male or
177 female), is the proposition that "*Il y a d'Un*" (the One 'ex-sists'). A sin-
178 gular subject may find equilibrium not in a relationship but in being
179 "All-alone". This is not a narcissistic isolated individual but rather a sin-
180 gular subject linked to others through symbolic links and the Real that
181 forges them. If Lacan has a developmental ideal it is through the subject
182 of the Real of his later work that makes accord or creates new links and
183 a new Borromean structure.

184 In line with this, Lacan did consider how the "anti-organizational"
185 forms of lack, loss, and waste could be built into the walls of an alter-
186 native organization, how organizational life could be re-built, as it were,
187 upon the foundations of incompleteness, as a non-totalizing entity in
188 which hierarchical authority is balanced against a communal, libertarian
189 and solidarity culture of exchange.

190 **Esprit de Corps**

191 In the late Summer of 1945, Lacan spent five weeks in England, during
192 which period he visited Hatfield House in Hertfordshire, which at the
193 time was a specialized centre for the rehabilitation of former prison-
194 ers-of-war and veterans. Still a psychiatrist, yet also already a psycho-
195 analyst, what Lacan saw at Hatfield made a huge impression on him,



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

231

196 so much so that upon his return to Paris he showered heaps of praise
197 on this quintessentially English version of “democratic psychiatry”...
198 Psychiatry served to forge the instrument thanks to which Britain won
199 the war; conversely, the war has transformed psychiatry in Britain” **AQ1**
200 (Lacan, 2000 [1947], pp. 26–27).

201 Even more instructive than his visit to Hatfield was Lacan’s long
202 conversation with Wilfred R. Bion and John Rickman—“two men”,
203 he said, “of whom it can be said that the flame of creation burns in
204 them” (ibid.: 15). During the Winter of 1942–’43, Bion had been put
205 in charge of the rehabilitation of demoralized soldiers in the so-called
206 “Training Wing” of the Northfield Military Hospital, near Birmingham
207 (Harrison, 2000, p. 186).

208 Rather than reinforcing the Wing’s iron army discipline, and actively
209 preparing the soldiers for their swift return to military service, which
210 had often seemed to result in an exacerbation of their neurotic symp-
211 toms, Bion helped the men re-focus their energies on the accomplish-
212 ment of specific group tasks and the management of inter-personal
213 relationships. Rather than treating the soldiers’ neurotic conditions as
214 individual illnesses, Bion decided to turn neurosis itself into the col-
215 lective enemy, thus re-creating a positive *esprit de corps* characterised
216 by shared loyalty, solidarity, fellowship, and an implicit sense of duty
217 amongst the patients who became willing to accept responsibilities.

218 Lacan thought this so-called “first Northfield experiment” to be
219 absolutely brilliant. Speaking to *L’évolution psychiatrique*, he stated:
220 “[T]he lively details of this experience [...] seem to me to be pregnant
221 with a birth of sorts that is a new outlook opening upon the world”
222 (Lacan, 2000 [1947], p. 19). But he did not stop there. Apart from
223 complimenting the way in which English psychiatrists had succeeded
224 in tackling the problem of war neurosis in new and imaginative ways,
225 Lacan also applauded Bion’s so-called “leaderless group project”, which
226 had been conducted some years before the first Northfield experiment,
227 under the auspices of the War Office Selection Boards. As Bion put
228 it, during the experiment “it was the duty of the observing officers to
229 watch how any given man was reconciling his personal ambitions, hopes
230 and fears with the requirements exacted by the group for its success”
231 (Bion, 1946, p. 78).



232 Neither the observing officers, nor the advising psychiatrists, nor Bion
233 himself for that matter, were acting upon a position of authoritarian
234 leadership, but rather “suspended” their leadership in favour of releas-
235 ing the group’s own internal dynamics, thus also questioning its prop-
236 ensity to expect shotgun solutions to be delivered by identified leaders.
237 Reflecting upon the experiments and justifying the idea of “suspended
238 leadership”, Bion later commented: “The group always make it clear that
239 they expect me to act with authority as the leader of the group, and this
240 responsibility I accept, though not in the way the group expect” (Bion,
241 1961 [1948–1951], p. 82). In his subsequent work with groups, Bion
242 would consistently refuse to adopt a directive stance, instead allowing
243 the group to evolve spontaneously and to follow its own internal laws,
244 and only intervening when he believed he knew what was about to hap-
245 pen, which often left people in the group feeling puzzled and bemused.

246 Lacan strongly commended how English psychiatrists had made a
247 major contribution to the war effort, but he was even more appreciative
248 of the “democratic” principles supporting Bion’s innovative recruitment
249 device.

250 Firstly, rather than someone in an established position of authority
251 recruiting and selecting the new officers, candidates are being given the
252 opportunity to demonstrate *in vivo* what they are worth, and there-
253 fore to somehow self-select, in a situation of strict “fair play”. Secondly,
254 although the officers and psychiatrists assess individual contributions
255 to the group task, they themselves only testify about what they have
256 observed to a selection panel, so that theirs is only one voice among
257 many, and the final decision is to a large extent based on what is con-
258 veyed in a “witness statement”.

259 Thirdly, the objectivity and validity of the entire process are not driven
260 by the controlled administration of psychometric tests or the use of con-
261 ventional quantitative measures of physical and mental capacity, but rather
262 by the careful elicitation and rigorous evaluation of strictly subjective
263 phenomena (Lacan, 2000 [1947], pp. 22–24). It is these very principles
264 that Lacan would endeavour to situate at the heart of the psychoanalytic
265 training programme in the *École freudienne de Paris* (EFP), the organiza-
266 tion which he himself founded in June 1964, some eight months after his
267 exclusion from the International Psycho-Analytic Association (IPA).

268 **Work Transference**

269 Neither in his written texts, nor in any of his seminars did Lacan explic-
270 itly refer to Bion's work again, yet his most important contribution to
271 organizational theory, namely his own foundation of the EFP and the
272 fundamental pillars upon which it was built, was clearly inspired by
273 Bion's experiments with leaderless groups and at Northfield. It should
274 be mentioned, in this context, that up until the point when the EFP
275 was established, Lacan had had a fair share of trouble with psychoan-
276 alytic institutions, not in the least with the IPA, from which he was
277 definitively barred as a training analyst in November 1963 (Miller,
278 1977; Turquet, 2014).

AQ2

279 The key events are worth recapitulating, here, if only because they
280 once again illustrate that, contrary to what some scholars have claimed,
281 Lacan had a lifelong interest in organizations, clearly positioned himself
282 vis-à-vis a certain type of organizational culture, and typically argued
283 in favour of an organizational structure that is commensurate with the
284 nature of the task to be accomplished.

285 In 1934, whilst still in analytic training, Lacan joined the *Société*
286 *Psychanalytique de Paris* (SPP), then the only psychoanalytic organiza-
287 tion in France, and rapidly made his way through its ranks, becoming
288 a full member in 1938 (Roudinesco, 1997 [1993], pp. 80, 86). When,
289 after the second World War, the SPP resumed its activities, Lacan
290 became a member of the SPP's "Teaching Committee" and in this
291 capacity, he produced a paper outlining the procedures for the selection
292 of new trainees, as well as the indicative contents of a psychoanalytic
293 training programme, and the mechanisms for recognizing new psycho-
294 analysts (Lacan, 1976 [1949]). The document was mainstream apart
295 from the fact that Lacan did not de facto wish to exclude non-medically
296 trained candidates from the psychoanalytic profession, and that he also
297 proposed a certain de-centralization of power, allowing more members
298 to participate in decision-making processes pertaining to candidate-se-
299 lection and the delivery of teaching.

300 Then, during the Winter of 1952-'53, an acrimonious conflict erupted
301 between Lacan and Sacha Nacht, the president of the SPP, around the
302 organizational structure of a proposed psychoanalytic Training Institute,



303 whereby Lacan's main reservations concerned the seemingly unassail-
304 able power of the Institute's directorate and the autocratic "examination"
305 of the candidates' training by a sovereign group of self-appointed "offi-
306 cials". In the end, Lacan lost out and was forced to resign from the SPP,
307 by which he also forfeited his membership of the IPA (Miller, 1976, p.
308 90). The minutes of the IPA business meeting of July 1953 indicate that
309 Lacan's vehement attack on the Institute's hierarchical functioning may
310 not have been the only problem, and that Lacan was also perceived as
311 someone who would take unacceptable liberties with firmly established
312 clinical rules. As Marie Bonaparte, by far the most prominent member of
313 the SPP, put it to the IPA committee: "[O]ne of these members [Lacan]
314 [...] promised to change his technique [of variable-length clinical ses-
315 sions], but did not keep his promise" (Eissler, 1954, p. 272).

316 After the first split in the French psychoanalytic community, Lacan
317 spent ten years delivering his weekly seminar at Sainte-Anne Hospital,
318 as part of the analytic training programme of the newly created *Société*
319 *Française de Psychanalyse* (SFP), whilst practicing as a psychoanalyst,
320 entertaining people at his Summer house in Guitrancourt, and generally
321 having fun. At the SFP, he did not occupy any important administrative
322 or managerial positions, yet generally supported the new organization's
323 request to be considered for re-admission to the IPA (Etchegoyen &
324 Miller, 1996, p. 48).

325 However, throughout this period, Lacan also fired on all cylinders
326 when considering the psychoanalytic establishment's practices and pro-
327 cedures, whereby he did not let an opportunity go by to ridicule the
328 institutional hierarchy and its rigid, dogmatic attitudes towards analytic
329 practice and training standards. Already in the 1953 "Rome Discourse",
330 he suggested that the SPP's Training Institute was erected based on a
331 "disappointing formalism that discourages initiative by penalizing
332 risk and turns the reign of the opinion of the learned into a principle
333 of docile prudence in which the authenticity of research is blunted
334 even before it finally dries up" (Lacan, 2006 [1953], p. 199). With
335 undisguised sarcasm, he went on to compare the Institute's conception
336 of analytic training to 'that of a driving school which, not content to
337 claim the privilege of issuing drivers' licenses, also imagines that it is in
338 a position to supervise car construction' (ibid.: 200).



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

235

339 Lacan's finest moment came in 1956, in a paper published on the
340 centenary of Freud's birth. Dissecting the so-called "situation" of psy-
341 choanalysis and the contemporary condition of psychoanalytic training
342 programmes, he painted a hilarious satirical picture of the spurious dis-
343 tribution of power in the psychoanalytic establishment, in the great tra-
344 dition of Swift and Rabelais. In "The Situation of Psychoanalysis and
345 the Training of Psychoanalysts in 1956" (Lacan, 2006 [1956]), which
346 remains one of Lacan's least studied papers, but also one of his most
347 vehement repudiations of the hierarchical structure of (psychoana-
348 lytic) organizations, he designated those people who are in analysis as
349 Little Shoes.

350 Little Shoes comply with institutional and clinical rules, do not dare
351 to speak up for themselves outside the sessions, and generally follow the
352 path imposed by the *soi-disant* or 'Sufficiencies', those who have success-
353 fully finished their analytic training and have been given full access to
354 the psychoanalytic profession—psychoanalysts, as the Institution would
355 call them. Lacan asserted that the Sufficiencies do not say much either,
356 because self-sufficient as they are they do not feel the need to start a
357 conversation or engage in discussion.

358 But then there are also the 'Beatitudes', in whom we can easily recog-
359 nize the so-called "training analysts", and who have been appointed by
360 the Sufficiencies, and put in charge (as superior members of the organ-
361 ization) of the Truly Necessary, i.e. those Little Shoes who do not come
362 to see a psychoanalyst because they want to be relieved of some pressing
363 personal problem but because they want to train as psychoanalysts.

364 In carefully laying out the stakes of his elaborate exposition, Lacan
365 conceded that no psychoanalytic society can exist without Sufficiencies
366 (practicing psychoanalysts), with the caveat that as a professional rank
367 this position can only ever be reached asymptotically and therefore
368 never be fully attained, so that Sufficiency is but the momentary occu-
369 pation of a certain clinical position and not the definitive realisation of
370 a certain professional stature. Put differently, for Lacan, analytic training
371 is never fully finished, and no one should ever have the right or the duty
372 to say that he or she *is* or has effectively become a psychoanalyst.

373 Critical as the presence of Sufficiencies may be for the survival of
374 psychoanalytic organizations, Lacan was particularly disapproving, here,



375 of the sovereign power they seem to have, not only in selecting the Truly
376 Necessary (analytic trainees) and distinguishing them from the Little
377 Shoes, but also in appointing the Beatitudes (training analysts) from
378 their own kind, and deciding which of the Truly Necessary can become
379 Sufficient on the basis of what the Beatitudes have managed to achieve
380 with them. In short, Lacan disputed the doctrinal authority with which
381 the psychoanalysts in the organization would concentrate all power
382 within their own ranks, and exposed the psychoanalytic establishment
383 as a ritualized, ceremonious and formulaic institution, not dissimilar to
384 the self-perpetuating leadership of the Catholic priesthood or religious
385 organizations.

386 Less than two months after Lacan was expelled from IPA and SPP
387 he started again with a new seminar, in a new location and with a new
388 audience. The topic was “the foundations of psychoanalysis”, later to
389 be modified into “the four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis”.
390 At the beginning of the first lecture he could not resist reopening a
391 barely healed wound, and so he started with the question “*En quoi y*
392 *suis-je autorisé?*”—“What gives me the authority to do this?” or, as the
393 English translator of the seminar renders the phrase: “Am I qualified to
394 do so?” (Lacan, 1994 [1964], p. 1). Clearly, the problematic “authoriza-
395 tion” in question did not simply concern Lacan’s position as a lecturer
396 but referred more specifically to his teaching about the foundations of
397 psychoanalysis.

398 The question should thus be understood as: “What authorizes a psy-
399 choanalyst who has just been officially removed from his training posi-
400 tion in a psychoanalytic organization to lecture on the basic principles
401 of his discipline?” If the question was not entirely rhetorical, Lacan
402 nonetheless decided that the “problem [be] deferred” (ibid.: 1). But not
403 for too long. At the Summer solstice of 1964, Lacan created his own
404 School, the *École Française de Psychanalyse* (EFP), subsequently to be
405 renamed as the *École freudienne de Paris*. In the opening paragraphs of
406 its “Founding Act” he emphasized that the organization (*l’organisme*)
407 had been established to accomplish a programme of work (*un travail*),
408 with three distinct aims: (1) restoring the cutting-edge truth of Freud’s
409 discovery; (2) returning the practice of psychoanalysis to its proper
410 duty (*devoir*); and (3) denouncing the deviations and compromises



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

237

411 that blunt and degrade psychoanalysis (Lacan, 1990 [1964], p. 97).
412 Although he did not refer to Bion's distinction from the early 1950s
413 between a productive work group and three inert basic-assumption
414 groups (Bion, 1961 [1952]), Lacan thus set out with the explicit goal
415 of forming a "work group", whose working objective or primary task
416 (*objectif de travail*) consisted in a "movement of reconquest" (*mouvement de reconquête*) (Lacan, 1990 [1964], p. 97).

418 To ensure that the group would remain focused on the designated
419 task and would not (as Bion would have had it) resort back to one or
420 more "basic assumptions" (fight or flight; pairing or tactical political
421 alliances against this or that; or idealization of a leader), Lacan pro-
422 posed that the work be carried out by small groups of minimum three
423 and maximum five people, *and* an additional person—the so-called
424 "plus one"—who oversees selecting the concrete work topic, facilitating
425 the discussion and determining the outcome of each individual group
426 member's work (ibid.: 97). After some time, the small groups would
427 be expected to permute, insofar as the individual members would be
428 encouraged to leave to join another group. Lacan decided to call the
429 small group a "cartel"—a name he glossed etymologically as being
430 derived from the Latin *cardo*, meaning "hinge" (Lacan, 1990 [1964], p.
431 101; 1976 [1975], p. 221). It is important to note, here, that the cartel
432 constitutes a temporary collective effort around the accomplishment of
433 a set of specific individual tasks, from which the entire organization may
434 benefit.

435 Being a member of a cartel (the essential work group) was also a
436 necessary and sufficient condition for being a member of the School
437 (Lacan, 1990 [1964], p. 100). In addition, Lacan stipulated that who-
438 ever is put in charge of "directing", be it the work of the cartels or (at
439 a higher level) the work of the entire School, would not be occupying
440 a chiefdom (*chefferie*), because of which he or she would then be given
441 access to a higher rank. *Mutatis mutandis*, nobody in the School, regard-
442 less of rank and status, would be perceived as having been demoted if
443 she or he engages in "base-level work" (ibid.: 97–98). Every individual
444 enterprise (*entreprise personnelle*), regardless as to which position the
445 individual occupies within the School, would moreover be subjected to
446 institutional criticism and control, so that no hierarchical stratification



447 makes someone inferior or superior, and a “circular organization”
448 (*organisation circulaire*) is created (ibid.: 98).

449 The idea of the cartel was exceedingly simple and is redolent of the
450 leaderless groups Bion set up when having to select new Army officers
451 at the start of the second World War, with the proviso that in Lacan’s
452 School the cartels were not designed to select or recruit individuals,
453 nor to facilitate any kind of therapeutic results, but to contribute to the
454 accomplishment of the School’s primary task. As such, the Lacanian
455 cartel drew both on the leaderless group and Bion’s “work group”,
456 whereby institutional leaders are placed in positions of “suspended”
457 authority.

458 Although the concept and structure of the cartel was discussed exten-
459 sively in the EFP, it did not prove nearly as controversial as Lacan’s pro-
460 posals for safeguarding the quality of the work and guaranteeing its
461 transmission. If the cartel is the format and the mechanism by which
462 the work is executed, then a certain regulatory framework is required
463 to ensure that the work is captured, evaluated and communicated,
464 internally as well as externally. What is required here, Lacan stated, is a
465 “work transference” (*un transfert de travail*), which requires putting in
466 place a system that enables the work to be transferred from one person
467 to another, from one group to another, from the groups to the School,
468 and from the School to its external environment (ibid.: 103). The
469 notion of *transfert de travail* may very well be a hapax in Lacan’s work,
470 but should clearly be understood in connection with what, in his 1958
471 text on the direction of the treatment, he had already defined as *travail*
472 *du transfert* (the work of transference) and *travail de transfert* (transfer-
473 ence work), both terms adduced as translations of Freud’s concept of
474 *Durcharbeitung* (working through), which is meant to capture the most
475 advanced part of the clinical psychoanalytic process (Freud, 1914,
476 p. 155; Lacan, 2006 [1958], pp. 498, 526).

477 The two notions of the work of transference and transference work
478 are two different notions that can be mistaken for one another. The
479 same applies to the notion of transference love and love’s transference
480 in Freud. Transference is present in all relationships but has a techni-
481 cal meaning in the therapeutic relationship between analyst and analy-
482 sand. The same is true of work transference and transference work. The



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

239

483 first refers to the transference of work and of goods from one person to
484 another in the work of the organization.

485 Transference proper is the transference of the Unconscious of the
486 analysand (mainly sexual and aggressive fantasies, traumas, etc.) unto
487 the analyst who does something different with it than what happens in
488 human relationships. Transference in analysis is something problem-
489 atic (that could even derail the treatment) that does not necessarily help
490 the treatment. If anything, and as Winnicott pointed out, the analyst
491 must survive the transference. This is clearly not the case with work
492 transference within an organization although there can be a residue or
493 transference work at work within work transference that threatens a psy-
494 choanalytic organization from within. Many personal transferences get
495 acted out in the work of the organization as a communal structure and
496 alleged democratic institution.

497 Traditionally, psychoanalytic institutions had guaranteed the trans-
498 mission of their work, which in this case refers both to how psycho-
499 analytic knowledge is being passed on generally, as well as to how new
500 psychoanalysts are being trained, via a strict set of rules and regulations,
501 controlled by an “executive board”, which sits at the top of the institu-
502 tional hierarchy. Possibly inspired by what he had observed in England
503 during the Autumn of 1945 and emboldened by what he himself had
504 experienced in his tumultuous relations with representatives of the SPP
505 and the IPA, Lacan decided to organize his own School in a radically
506 different way, although for many of its members this would prove to be
507 an unfeasible, potentially deleterious initiative.

508 Dissolution

509 Working from the basic axiom that a psychoanalytic institution cannot
510 function without psychoanalysts, Lacan came up with the provocative
511 claim that a psychoanalyst derives his authorization only from himself
512 (*le psychanalyste ne s'autorise que de lui-même*) (Lacan, 1995 [1967],
513 p. 1), by which he meant that only someone's own analytic experi-
514 ence, i.e. the analysis that someone has undertaken, can equip him or
515 her with the necessary “qualifications” to practice psychoanalytically,



516 and not the successful completion of a “pseudo-academic” training
517 programme, let alone the endorsement by an institutional hierarchy.

518 Although many people (mis)interpreted this principle as Lacan effec-
519 tively suggesting that anyone should have the right to call himself a psy-
520 choanalyst—with potentially disastrous consequences for the clinical
521 standards, the public image and the future of the discipline—in practice
522 he argued in favour of the recognition of one single criterion for eval-
523 uating whether someone could be considered a psychoanalyst, and be
524 authorized to practice: the personal experience of having been through
525 the process of psychoanalysis.

526 Nonetheless, when presenting this principle to the EFP in October
527 1967, Lacan also considered the possibility of the School formally recog-
528 nizing that someone had effectively been trained as a psychoanalyst and
529 was working psychoanalytically, whereby he outlined two avenues for this
530 recognition. First, the School may decide to bestow the title of “Analyst
531 Member of the School” (AME) upon those practicing psychoanalysts
532 who have demonstrated their analytic ability, in whatever form, and with-
533 out the psychoanalysts themselves asking for this recognition. Second,
534 analytic trainees and practicing analysts may themselves ask for institu-
535 tional recognition, in which case they are required to speak about their
536 own psychoanalytic journey, individually and independently, to three
537 “passers”—members of the School who are roughly at the same point of
538 their own trajectory and therefore “equals”—who subsequently transmit
539 what they have heard to a decision-making body (the so-called “cartel of
540 the pass”), which then deliberates as to whether the candidate should be
541 given the title of “Analyst of the School” (AE) (Lacan, 1995 [1967], p. 1).

542 Lacan made it clear that these titles should not be interpreted in a
543 hierarchical way, as the AMEs being superior to the AEs, or vice versa,
544 but simply as different “steps” (*gradus*), each with their own duties and
545 responsibilities. At the same time, he also reduced the power tradition-
546 ally accorded to the training analyst, since he no longer wished to dif-
547 ferentiate between a training analysis and a “regular analysis”. Lacan did
548 not see the need for potential analytic trainees to be treated differently
549 from “normal patients” and did not want the training analysts to have
550 the power to decide, or even to advise on how and when trainees should
551 be recognized as psychoanalysts. In this non-hierarchical structure, and



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

241

552 the radical decentralization of institutional power that Lacan attempted
553 to bring about, here, we can once again detect an echo of Bion's
554 ground-breaking experiments with leaderless groups.

555 The recruitment and selection of new psychoanalysts was not left to
556 people in a position of authority, but candidates were able to self-select,
557 insofar as they simply draw on their own analytic experience to apply
558 their skills, demonstrate their capacity or satisfy independent observers.
559 Much like the selection panel had operated in Bion's leaderless group
560 experiments, the actual decision-making body does not evaluate the
561 candidates directly but relies for its judgment on a set of non-partisans
562 "witness statements". What matters is not whether someone has passed
563 a requisite number of tests with flying colours—say a portfolio of exam-
564 inations and coursework and the minimum amount of analytic sessions
565 with a training analyst—but whether someone's subjective analytic
566 experience shows sufficient clinical promise for that person to practice
567 psychoanalytically.

568 So, did it all work? Because Lacan decided to dissolve his own School
569 some fifteen years after it was created, one may be tempted to respond
570 with a resounding "no". However, much like the Stalinist atrocities may
571 not in themselves be a sufficient reason for confirming the intrinsic fail-
572 ure of the great communist experiment, Lacan's dissolution of the EFP
573 may not as such be a reliable indicator of the fact that the entire organi-
574 zational edifice was built on extremely loose foundations.

575 Despite Lacan's well-meaning attempt to diffuse institutional power,
576 the EFP did not live up to the grand expectations that were raised on
577 the day of its first inception. In transforming traditional hierarchical
578 patters of operation into a "circular organization", Lacan was firmly
579 convinced that the work of the School could be accomplished, and
580 that doctrinal inertia could be averted, yet the institutional "consist-
581 ency" that he believed would come with experience did not materialize,
582 or gradually transformed itself again into a more conventional series of
583 arrangements, with teachers and pupils, thinkers and disciples, leaders
584 and followers, masters and servants.

585 The problem, no doubt, was to a large extent Lacan himself, who
586 would always be the superior "plus one", the one who would not only
587 stand out from the others because having been the one to found the



242 R. Moncayo

588 School (and therefore also being the only one who could subsequently
589 legitimately disband it), but the one who was de facto intellectually
590 unassailable, clinically infallible, institutionally unimpeachable.

591 Much like Bion in his Northfield experiments, Lacan recognized that
592 the School expected him to demonstrate his authority as the leader of
593 the organization in his capacity of Director of the School. Much like
594 Bion, he accepted this responsibility, without therefore always com-
595 plying with what the group was expecting of him. Yet this position
596 of “suspended leadership”, which constitutes an alternative position
597 of agency—closer to that operating within the discourse of the ana-
598 lyst than that which is at work in the discourse of the master, follow-
599 ing the distribution of functions in Lacan’s famous “theory of the four
600 discourses” (Lacan, 2007 [1969–1970])—gradually changed into a new,
601 uncritical attribution of power.

602 Lacan’s innovative mechanism for securing the institutional rec-
603 ognition of psychoanalysts who wish to be recognized as such, which
604 came to be known as the “procedure of the pass”, gradually showed its
605 fractures. Witnesses were not believed to be as non-partisan and inde-
606 pendent as could be hoped for. Testimonials were believed to be con-
607 taminated by the witnesses’ knowledge of the identity of the candidates’
608 own psychoanalysts. New artificial hierarchies started to emerge, and
609 the work transference did not always manifest itself as creatively and
610 productively as Lacan had wished for.

611 In a letter of 5 January 1980, Lacan announced that the School he
612 had created some fifteen years earlier would be dissolved (Lacan, 1990
613 [1980]). One could no doubt see Lacan’s decision, here, as an act
614 of despair or frustration, or as an act signalling his own admission of
615 organizational failure, yet one could also interpret it in a different light,
616 as the intentional initiation of necessary transformational change. In the
617 opening paragraphs of his letter, Lacan reminded his readership of the
618 main reasons as to why he had decided to create the EFP: “[F]or a labor
619 [...] which in the field opened by Freud restores the cutting edge of his **AQ3**
620 truth—which brings the original praxis he instituted under the name
621 of psychoanalysis back to the duty incumbent upon it in our world. “I
622 maintain [this objective]”, Lacan posited, and that “is why I am dissolv-
623 ing” (ibid.: 129–130). Hence, the dissolution of the organisation is a



624 necessary precondition for the work towards the accomplishment of the
625 primary task to be sustained. For the “circular organization” to survive,
626 it must occasionally be dissolved and re-created, especially at a time
627 when it seems to have reached a standstill, and when the members may
628 be least expecting (or wanting) it, owing to the installation of a certain
629 professional and socio-intellectual comfort.

630 Like the work-group that is the cartel, the “circular organization” has its
631 life-span and must be disbanded, permuted and re-constructed to sus-
632 tain itself as such. On 11 March 1980, towards the end of his last pub-
633 lic seminar, Lacan invited the former members of his School to mourn,
634 which also constitutes a kind of work, the death of their institutional
635 home, and to become “de-Schooled” and “de-glued” (*d'écolé*), whilst at the
636 same time announcing that a new organizational structure would be cre-
637 ated, with the same structure of small working groups at its basis (Lacan,
638 1982 [1980], p. 87). If the *esprit de corps*, had been adversely affected by
639 the work transference and enactments of transference work within the
640 organization, this necessitated the dissolution of the School, and no dis-
641 solution should stand in the way of the re-creation of a new *esprit de corps*.

642 The Viability and Future of the Lacanian School 643 as a Psychoanalytic Organization

644 As a theorist critical of psychoanalytic institutions, Lacan occupied him-
645 self with the recruitment and selection of candidates (for psychoanalytic
646 formation), with the way in which (psychoanalytic) formation is deliv-
647 ered and monitored, with how the end of the formation process should
648 be conceived, with how candidates who have finished their training
649 should be recognized institutionally, and with typical “managerial” pro-
650 cesses of (analytic) appraisal, evaluation and promotion. He was con-
651 cerned about the stratification, the hierarchical structure, the allocation
652 of authority, the distribution of power and the function of leadership
653 in (psychoanalytic) institutions. He was deeply involved in setting the
654 parameters for assuring institutional quality and standards, guaranteeing
655 the organization’s normative primary task, and securing its social and
656 epistemological sustainability.



657 Despite Lacan's critique of the organizational structure of psychoan-
658 alytic institutions, and despite following Bion's experience with leader-
659 less work groups and having the leader function in a state of suspended
660 authority (an organizational model that Bion did not apply to the
661 British Psychoanalytic Society), Lacan's reformations never completely
662 deviated from the three functions that Eitingon (1922–1925) originally
663 assigned to a psychoanalytic clinic: therapeutic, formative, and research.
664 Lacan's school formed psychoanalysts, practiced psychoanalysis, and
665 engaged in research and publication of written work.

666 In addition, in the Founding Act of his school Lacan emphasized
667 denouncing the deviations and compromises that blunt and degrade
668 psychoanalysis. This aim is not that different from the aim outlined by
669 the the International Psychoanalytic Conference of 1925 that

670 sought to prevent the premature amalgamation and synthesis of psycho-
671 analysis with other fields, research methods, and clinical practices. Given
672 Freud's several initial problems with students who dissented/deviated
673 from his teaching, the early international psychoanalytic movement was
674 concerned with preserving and preventing the destruction of Freud's the-
675 ory and practice. (idem, p. 223)

676 Moreover,

677 The process of increased institutionalization and standardization of
678 authority within psychoanalysis generated criticisms and questioning
679 from the very beginning. Hans Sachs (Safouan, 1995) pointed out that
680 wherever there is organization and hierarchy, the discovery of the new,
681 and the possibility of change and transformation, becomes suppressed
682 and repressed. Every institution is conservative in nature, and aims at its
683 own survival and self-preservation and, therefore, has low tolerance for
684 creative and inventive minds and subjects. (Moncayo, 2008, p. 224)

685 This would certainly apply to Lacan as an outstandingly creative and
686 inventive psychoanalyst who thought that hierarchy and standardiza-
687 tion was blunting the creative edge of psychoanalysis. Nevertheless, it
688 remains unclear whether Lacan's organization succeeded in replacing
689 traditional hierarchies, since even in the Pass procedure, the 'passers'



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

245

690 introduced their own distortions to what was heard from the analysand
691 and eventually a committee of analysts of the school decided whether a
692 proper analysis had taken place. So, the hierarchy was maintained and
693 produced two different class of analysts: those who passed the pass and
694 those who did not but are still practicing analysts. Obviously given the
695 structure of the organization, analysands would tend to choose analysts
696 from those who had passed the pass.

697 Although the personal analysis is the necessary bedrock of analytic
698 training, the question remains whether the personal analysis is sufficient
699 criterion for the formation of psychoanalysts. A psychoanalyst of the
700 school serves the public by offering psychoanalysis to those Lacan calls
701 'Little Shoes,' but a psychoanalytic organization requires candidates who
702 enter the school to become psychoanalysts and need a personal analysis
703 as part of this process (the Truly Necessary for the school).

704 However, Lacan always emphasized that a didactic analysis for pur-
705 poses of formation was always a personal analysis like any other. In
706 fact, an applicant should not be accepted into formation if they cannot
707 present a symptom for analysis and instead view a personal analysis as a
708 didactic process to learn the theory and practice of analysis (The Truly
709 Necessary must be Little Shoes first).

710 At the Lacanian School of Psychoanalysis of the San Francisco Bay
711 Area we followed Safouan (an early student of Lacan) in continuing
712 the practice of control analysis or supervision as a necessary component
713 of analytical formation (Safouan, 2000). Control analysis is second in
714 importance but is not a replacement for the personal analysis. Lacan
715 was concerned that the regulated supervision of the practice of analysis
716 could become an organized resistance to the personal analysis and the
717 work with the unconscious.

718 During the 1974 Rome Congress of the *E.F.P.* (the Freudian School
719 of Psychoanalysis), a consensus was building in the Lacanian field that,
720 supervision, as a bureaucratic requirement, institutionalizes a resistance
721 to analysis. Supervision, as an institutional requirement of so many cer-
722 tified years and hours, functions as an obsessional defense against dealing
723 with difficulties inherent to the practice of analysis and the field of trans-
724 ference. Lacan believed that obligations with regards to the position of



725 the analyst exempt or excuse a subject from the personal responsibility of
726 having decided to do or not to do something. (idem, p. 29)

727 LSP made an early decision to require that analysts adhere to the licens-
728 ing laws of California for the various professions. A license is the prod-
729 uct of an alliance between the master's discourse or the discourse of
730 government and the university discourse used to regulate government,
731 business, and professional practice. A license does not authorize an anal-
732 yst to practice psychoanalysis. In fact, since licenses do not require a
733 personal analysis, all the regulations involving supervised experience
734 miss the boat as to what guarantees best results for a member of the
735 public benefitting from psychoanalysis.

736 When people approached Lacan for control he would refer them
737 to analysis. Of course, this can vary if the person is a candidate of the
738 school or the person already is in analysis or already had an analysis. The
739 point here is that analysis is the first principle of formation, not that it's
740 the only one.

741 There are forms of professional and even psychoanalytic practice
742 for which formation does not require a personal analysis. An example
743 would be the practice of psychoanalytic psychotherapy where super-
744 vision, for example, becomes an analysis of the countertransference as
745 projective identification from the analysand to the analyst.

746 The point is not to critique various professional perspectives, but
747 rather to understand, in our current context, how Lacan may have been
748 responding to a demand for supervision as a demand for analysis or
749 even as a resistance to analysis.

750 In any case, what is a control analysis or supervision of psychoanalysis
751 (to use arbitrary semantic terms for a moment without delving too much
752 into the limitations of their literal meanings)? Supervision has always
753 existed alongside the personal analysis in psychoanalytic institutions,
754 sometimes with the same analyst but more likely with two different anal-
755 ysts. As we shall see, control and supervision are both arbitrary deficient
756 terms to describe an analytical state of suspended authority. A control
757 analyst neither controls nor has 'super-vision' like superman. If anything,
758 control analysis is a form of 'other-audition': what the analyst hears
759 in what the analyst heard of the analysand's speech that the candidate



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

247

760 analyst does not know that they know. This is what Reik (1998) called
761 listening with the Third ear. The Third is the place where the sense organ
762 and the object of sound meet *savoir* or unconscious knowing or a form of
763 un-self-conscious-knowledge (a form of subjective objectivity).

764 The control analyst also helps a candidate analyst articulate or put
765 into use the theory in relationship to the practice of analysis. In addition,
766 it is also implied that a candidate analyst participates in seminars,
767 case conferences, and the study of psychoanalytic theory and practice as
768 fundamental aspects of analytical formation.

769 These two practices (personal and control analysis) plus the study of
770 the theory constitute the triptic of psychoanalytic education and formation.
771 But ultimately for Lacan the analyst is authorized by their own
772 symptom become *sinthome* in life and the personal analysis. At the same
773 time the entire organization stands on the subject's desire as the motivating
774 factor. At LSP candidates have a responsibility to keep the record
775 of what they have done by way of meeting the requirements of the
776 School. The record is a testament to their desire for analysis and professional
777 formation. This minimizes the bureaucratic dimension and at
778 the same time prevents that formation simply become a demand of the
779 Other, or a discourse of the master, or the discourse of the university.

780 Although Lacan declared that the Pass procedure had failed he

781 Lacan never gave up the idea of the privileged role of the personal analysis
782 for the practice of analysis but he did give up trying to evaluate it in any
783 kind of institutional or objective fashion. Instead he turned his attention
784 to the theoretical question of the *sinthome* as what ultimately authorizes
785 an analyst. (idem, p. 31)

786 However, although standarization or objective evaluation of analysis
787 is ultimately impossible, there are criteria by which to determine if
788 an analysis is taking place in the proper sense of the term. For example
789 with regards to the transference to the 'subject supposed to know (*sujet*
790 *suppose savoir*) two things need to take place: (1) A positive transference
791 needs to established; (2) The analyst has to remove himself/herself from
792 the position of the subject supposed to know without losing the positive
793 transference that allows the Ucs. of the analysand to manifest.

AQ4



794 When the positive transference is established the analyst says very
795 little to the analysand and approves most of what they say, except in
796 extraordinary circumstances, of course. The analyst accepts the defenses
797 that the ego uses to describe their problems and hears the saying that
798 emerges in the space between words and within the narrative statement
799 (the said).

800 The positive transference cannot be described as a desire of the anal-
801 yst to be liked because otherwise this would be transference and some-
802 thing that the analyst had to work out in his/her own analysis. In fact,
803 the desire of the analyst not to be idealized in the transference supports
804 the strength of the positive transference and can be considered a fruit of
805 the personal analysis. The positive transference is not a response to the
806 desire to be liked and loved but rather to a strategy of *savoir* and a ques-
807 tion of correct method. The desire to be liked and admired is a charac-
808 teristic of the historical master in the formula for the master's discourse:
809 $\frac{S_1}{s} \rightarrow \frac{S_2}{a}$. The master's lack demands that subjects/servants locate the
810 *objet a* in them.

811 The social organizational consequence of the first criterion to carry
812 out or evaluate an analysis, is that the analyst accepts the leadership of
813 the position but then uses it in a different way. This different use is the
814 relinquishing of the position of SsS, a veritable symbolic castration of
815 the position of the master that transforms the position from a master
816 position to an analytical position. This is the democratic principle that
817 Lacan envisioned. A free association that permits the Unconscious or
818 the unconscious signifying chain and the Real to emerge. The analyst is
819 an S_0 instead of the S_1 of the master. The S_0 is the *objet a* in the place of
820 the agent in the formula for the analyst's discourse. The analyst moves
821 from the position of the beloved imaginary object (*a/phallus*), to the
822 position of the absence or emptiness of the *objet a*.

823 But what authorizes an analyst? Lacan (1967) famously stated that **AQ5**
824 the analyst is authorized by himself/herself and then he added and a
825 few others. What does this mean? It does not mean that an analyst is
826 self-taught and self-appointed as an analyst without any psychoanalytic
827 formation or association to a Lacanian school. From this point of view
828 self-authorization on the basis of a personal analysis alone or on the
829 basis of a professional degree or license could be equally problematic.



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

249

830 Sometimes people may combine these elements on their own (including
831 attendance to seminars or study groups) in which cases a school may
832 accept those analysts (as well as others trained in other analytic organ-
833 izations) as Analysts Member of the School so long as they support
834 the School and its principles. The Analyst of the School is still neces-
835 sary since the reference to the barred Other of the school allows for the
836 transmission and articulation of the triptic of analytical formation (anal-
837 ysis, control, and *savoir*). However, at LSP we have eliminated the cat-
838 egory of Beatitudes or Training Analysts chosen by their peers and any
839 Analyst of the School can be chosen by a candidate as a supervising or
840 control analyst.

841 An analyst is authorized by the desire that drives their forma-
842 tion rather than by the requirements of an institution. The others of
843 a school are merely witnesses of the work the candidate analyst has
844 accomplished. At LSP the analyst in formation is responsible to keep
845 the record of how they have fulfilled the requirements of the school.
846 Formation begins with a declaration to others of the subject's desire to
847 be a psychoanalyst (what is called a Palimpsest) and concludes with a
848 statement of their desire, on the basis of a record, to finish their forma-
849 tion. What we call the 'Passage', is the act of presenting a paper or case
850 to the community and assume the name of Analyst of the School (an
851 act of Nomination, therefore). In addition, they may speak to an analyst
852 outside the school about their personal experience of the Unconscious
853 in analysis.

854 At LSP we encourage candidates not only to participate in seminars
855 but also to lead seminars in a state of suspended authority. This notion
856 of suspended authority here means two things: (1) That the seminar
857 leader shares the teaching seat with participants; and (2) That leading a
858 seminar does not mean that the leader no longer takes seminars led by
859 other analysts/candidates/faculty of the school. One of the potential pit-
860 falls of this model is that a seminar may become a fiefdom/chiefdom or
861 a way for the candidate to ascend through the ranks of the organization.

862 On the other hand, the school is not without the consequences of
863 a meritocracy on the basis of the candidates own scholarly work and
864 research as an end in itself. The analyst, more than being identified with
865 a profession or with the name and gain associated with professional



250 R. Moncayo

866 expertise, is a metaphor for the subject who knows about non know-
867 ing and unconscious knowing. In addition, by the same token that the
868 analyst suspends the position or attitude of the master, a psychoanalytic
869 school needs to be open and receptive to inborn and cultivated talent
870 without invidious comparison to others. Such talent builds the reservoir
871 of savoir of a school which is what Lacan was able to accomplish while
872 running the risk of becoming the only voice and text of the school.

873 It should not be the sole responsibility of one single individual to
874 create or dissolve a school. In addition, it is important to differenti-
875 ate between constructive and destructive/nihilistic forms of emptying
876 out or dissolving/changing a structure. As argued in previous chap-
877 ters, structures are already empty, and are only reified by the impreg-
878 nations of the ego, the master, and the Imaginary. The 'few others' of
879 authorization represent the necessity of a demystified and barred Other
880 (not a master institution) to function as a guarantee of the psychoana-
881 lytic organization as an open system subject to change and evolution,
882 both positive and negative. This criterion may be more important than
883 thinking that all organizations should be periodically dissolved and
884 reinvented. In fact, Lacan's dissolution of his school, led to the estab-
885 lishment of a new organization that according to some has become
886 even more undemocratic than the IPA. In addition, many alternative
887 Lacanian organizations have sprung up that continue to exist to this day
888 without being dissolved by their founders.

889 Finally, what is the difference between a study group, a cartel, a sem-
890 inar, and a work group. Which one is a work group in the sense that
891 Bion meant it? A study group can be a leaderless group but often has
892 a leader that comments and expounds on a text being read. The cartel
893 with the plus one is a way to combine both factors except that the plus
894 one does not teach but rather assigns and coordinates the work tasks of
895 the group. A cartel does not resolve the problem of the difference in tal-
896 ent and motivational desire among members of a group.

897 Leadership may still emerge within a group since a school is the work
898 and talent that members bring to the school. However, talent here is
899 not resolved in the direction of artificial intelligence or the intellec-
900 tual power of computation and information within a binary system
901 (like a robot or automaton who wants to be smarter than people or



902 other people). Talent ends in *savoir* or a form of unknown knowing
903 (*l'insu qui sait*) that cancels out the ego ideal of the master and points
904 rather to the human subject of the Real that responds to and follows
905 from Tyche and Nous rather than automaton or a robot of instrumen-
906 tal/technical reason.

907 A seminar allows for the leadership of talent and effort while at the
908 same time being a work group in the sense that the leader as an analyst
909 functions as S_0 in a state of suspended (ego master) authority and shares
910 the teaching seat with participants who can also present their work.
911 In the work group, Bion accepted the leadership bestowed upon him
912 by his own work and the group but used it in a different way according
913 to a category of reason known as *savoir* in Lacan and knowing of O in
914 Bion. The latter continues a tradition of mind in Western philosophy
915 known as Nous from the pre-Socratics, through Aristotle, to Husserl's
916 phenomenology and Heidegger, and the Frankfurt School. This trans-
917 mission of mind is absent in the master's discourse and the university
918 discourse and remains alive in the analytic tradition invented/discovered
919 by Freud.

920 References

- 921 Arnaud, G. (2002). The Organization and the Symbolic: Organizational
922 Dynamics Viewed from a Lacanian Perspective. *Human Relations*, 55,
923 691–716.
- 924 Arnaud, G. (2003). A Coach or a Couch? A Lacanian Perspective on Executive
925 Coaching and Consulting. *Human Relations*, 56, 1131–1154.
- 926 Arnaud, G., & Vanheule, S. (2007). The Division of the Subject and the
927 Organization: A Lacanian Approach to Subjectivity at Work. *Journal of*
928 *Organizational Change Management*, 20, 359–369.
- 929 Beattie, T. (2013). *Theology After Postmodernity: Divining the Void—A Lacanian*
930 *Reading of Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University
931 Press.
- 932 Bicknell, M., & Liefoghe, A. (2010). Enjoy Your Stress! Using Lacan to
933 Enrich Transactional Models of Stress. *Organization*, 17, 317–330.
- 934 Bion, W. R. (1946). Leaderless Group Project. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*,
935 10, 77–81.



252 R. Moncayo

- 936 Bion, W. R. (1961 [1948–1951]). Experiences in Groups. In *Experiences in*
937 *Groups and Other Papers* (pp. 27–137). London: Routledge.
- 938 Bion, W. R. (1961 [1952]). Group Dynamics. In *Experiences in Groups and*
939 *Other Papers* (pp. 139–191). London: Routledge.
- 940 Bion, W. R., & Rickman, J. (1961 [1943]). Intra-group Tensions in Therapy:
941 Their Study as the Task of the Group. In W. R. Bion (Ed.), *Experiences in*
942 *Groups and Other Papers* (pp. 11–26). London: Routledge. **AQ6**
- 943 Bloom, P., & Cederström, D. (2009). The Sky's the Limit: Fantasy in the Age
944 of Market Rationality. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22,
945 159–180.
- 946 Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, Post Modernism and Organizational Analysis
947 2: The Contribution of Michel Foucault. *Organization Studies*, 9, 221–235. **AQ7**
- 948 Carter, P., & Jackson, N. (2004). Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. In
949 S. Linstead (Ed.), *Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought* (pp. 105–
950 126). London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage. **AQ8**
- 951 Caudill, D. S. (1997). *Lacan and the Subject of Law: Toward a Psychoanalytic*
952 *Critical Legal Theory*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- 953 Cederström, C., & Hoedemaekers, C. (Eds.). (2010). "Preface", *Lacan and*
954 *Organization* (pp. xiii–xviii). London: MayFly Books. **AQ9**
- 955 Cho, K. D. (2009). *Psychopedagogy: Freud, Lacan, and the Psychoanalytic Theory*
956 *of Education*. Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 957 Contu, A., Driver, M., & Jones, C. (2010). Jacques Lacan with Organization
958 Studies. *Organization*, 17, 307–315. **AQ10**
- 959 Cooper, R. (1989). Modernism, Post Modernism and Organizational Analysis
960 3: The Contribution of Jacques Derrida. *Organization Studies*, 10, 479–502. **AQ11**
- 961 Costas, J., & Taheri, A. (2012). 'The Return of the Primal Father' in
962 Postmodernity? A Lacanian Analysis of Authentic Leadership. *Organization*
963 *Studies*, 33, 1195–1216.
- 964 de Maré, P. B. (1985). Major Bion. In M. Pines (Ed.), *Bion and Group*
965 *Psychotherapy* (pp. 108–113). London: Routledge & Kegan. **AQ12**
- 966 Driver, M. (2009a). From Loss to Lack: Stories of Organizational Change
967 as Encounters with Failed Fantasies of Self, Work and Organization.
968 *Organization*, 16, 353–369.
- 969 Driver, M. (2009b). Struggling with Lack: A Lacanian Perspective on
970 Organizational Identity. *Organization Studies*, 30, 55–72.
- 971 Driver, M. (2009c). Encountering the Arugula Leaf: The Failure of the
972 Imaginary and Its Implications for Research on Identity in Organizations.
973 *Organization*, 16, 487–504.



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

253

- 974 Driver, M. (2014). The Stressed Subject: Lack, Empowerment and Liberation.
975 *Organization, 21*, 90–105.
- 976 Eissler, R. S. (1954). 106th Bulletin of the International Psycho-analytical
977 Association. *The International Journal of Psycho-analysis, 35*, 267–290.
- 978 Etchegoyen, R. H., & Miller, J. A. (1996). *Silence brisé. Entretien sur le mouve-*
979 *ment psychanalytique*. Paris: Agalma.
- 980 Fotaki, M. (2009). Maintaining the Illusion of a Free Health Service in
981 Post-socialism: A Lacanian Analysis of Transition from Planned to Market
982 Economy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 22*, 141–158.
- 983 Freud, S. (1914). Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through (Further
984 Recommendations on the Technique of Psycho-analysis II). SE, XII,
985 145–156.
- 986 Freud, S., & Breuer, J. (1895). *Studien über Hysterie, G. W., I*, 75–312. **AQ13**
- 987 Glynos, J. (2011). On the Ideological and Political Significance of Fantasy in
988 the Organization of Work. *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, 16*, 373–393.
- 989 Harding, N. (2007). On Lacan and the Becoming-ness of Organizations/
990 Selves. *Organization Studies, 28*, 1761–1773.
- 991 Harrison, T. (2000). *Bion, Rickman, Foulkes and the Northfield Experiments:*
992 *Advancing on a Different Front*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- 993 Hendrix, J. S. (2006). *Architecture and Psychoanalysis: Peter Eisenman and*
994 *Jacques Lacan*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- 995 Jagodzinski, J. (2005). *Music in Youth Culture: A Lacanian Approach*.
996 Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 997 Johnsen, R., & Gudmand-Høyer, M. (2010). Lacan and the Lack of
998 Humanity in HRM. *Organization, 17*, 331–344.
- 999 Jones, C., & Spicer, A. (2005). The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship.
1000 *Organization, 12*, 223–246.
- 1001 Kenny, K. (2009). Heeding the Stains: Lacan and Organizational Change.
1002 *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 22*, 214–228.
- 1003 King, P. (Ed.). (2003). Introduction: The Rediscovery of John Rickman and
1004 His Work. In *No Ordinary Psychoanalyst: The Exceptional Contributions of*
1005 *John Rickman* (pp. 1–68). London and New York, NY: Karnac Books. **AQ14**
- 1006 Kosmala, K., & Herrbach, O. (2006). The Ambivalence of Professional
1007 Identity: On Cynicism and Jouissance in Audit Firms. *Human Relations, 59*,
1008 1393–1428.
- 1009 Lacan, J. (1976 [1949]). Règlement et doctrine de la commission de l'ensei-
1010 gnement. In J.-A. Miller (Ed.), *La scission de 1953. La communauté psychan-*
1011 *alytique en France I* (pp. 29–36). Paris: Navarin.



254 R. Moncayo

- 1012 Lacan, J. (1976 [1975]). Interventions dans la séance de travail sur ‘Du plus
1013 une’. *Lettres de l’École freudienne*, 18, 219–229.
- 1014 Lacan, J. (1982 [1980]). D’écologie. *École de la cause freudienne—Annuaire et*
1015 *textes statutaires*. Paris: ECF.
- 1016 Lacan, J. (1988 [1953–1954]). *The Seminar, Book I, Freud’s Papers on Technique*
1017 (J.-A. Miller, Ed., J. Forrester, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University
1018 Press.
- 1019 Lacan, J. (1990 [1963]). Introduction to the Names-of-the-Father Seminar.
1020 In J. Copjec (Ed.), *Television/A Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment*
1021 (J. Mehlman, Trans., pp. 81–95). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- 1022 Lacan, J. (1990 [1964]). Founding Act. In J. Copjec (Ed.), *Television/A*
1023 *Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment* (J. Mehlman, Trans.,
1024 pp. 97–106). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- 1025 Lacan, J. (1990 [1980]). Letter of Dissolution. In J. Copjec (Ed.), *Television/A*
1026 *Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment* (J. Mehlman, Trans., pp. 129–
1027 131). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- 1028 Lacan, J. (1994 [1964]). *The Seminar, Book XI, the Four Fundamental Concepts*
1029 *of Psychoanalysis* (J.-A. Miller, Ed., A. Sheridan, Trans.). Harmondsworth:
1030 Penguin.
- 1031 Lacan, J. (1995 [1967]). Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst
1032 of the School (R. Grigg, Trans.). *Analysis*, 6, 1–13.
- 1033 Lacan, J. (2000 [1947]). British Psychiatry and the War (P. Dravers &
1034 V. Voruz, Trans.). *Psychoanalytical Notebooks of the London Circle*, 4, 9–33.
- 1035 Lacan, J. (2006 [1953]). The Function and Field of Speech and Language in
1036 Psychoanalysis. In *Écrits* (B. Fink, Trans., pp. 197–268). New York, NY and
1037 London: W.W. Norton.
- 1038 Lacan, J. (2006 [1956]). The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of
1039 Psychoanalysts in 1956. In *Écrits* (B. Fink, Trans., pp. 384–411). New York,
1040 NY and London: W.W. Norton.
- 1041 Lacan, J. (2006 [1958]). The Direction of the Treatment and the Principles
1042 of Its Power. In *Écrits* (B. Fink, Trans., pp. 489–542). New York, NY and
1043 London: W.W. Norton.
- 1044 Lacan, J. (2006 [1962]). Kant with Sade. In *Écrits* (B. Fink, Trans., pp. 645–
1045 668). New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton.
- 1046 Lacan, J. (2006 [1968–1969]). *Le Séminaire, Livre XVI, D’un Autre à l’autre*,
1047 texte établi par J.-A. Miller. Paris: du Seuil.
- 1048 Lacan, J. (2007 [1969–1970]). *The Seminar, Book XVII, the Other Side of*
1049 *Psychoanalysis* (J.-A. Miller, Ed., R. Grigg, Trans.). New York, NY and
1050 London: W.W. Norton.



11 The Lacanian School as an Organizational Structure

255

- 1051 Lacan, J. (2014 [1962–1963]). *The Seminar, Book X, Anxiety* (J.-A. Miller, Ed.,
1052 A. Price, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.
- 1053 Letiche, H. (2004). Jean Baudrillard. In S. Linstead (Ed.), *Organization Theory*
1054 *and Postmodern Thought* (pp. 127–148). London, Thousand Oaks and New
1055 Delhi: Sage. **AQ16**
- 1056 Letiche, H., & Essers, J. (2004). Jean-François Lyotard. In S. Linstead (Ed.),
1057 *Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought* (pp. 64–87). London,
1058 Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage. **AQ17**
- 1059 Linstead, S., & Thanem, T. (2007). Multiplicity, Virtuality and Organization:
1060 The Contribution of Gilles Deleuze. *Organization Studies*, 28, 1483–1501. **AQ18**
- 1061 Miller, J. A. (Ed.). (1976). *La scission de 1953. La communauté psychanalytique*
1062 *en France I*. Paris: Navarin.
- 1063 Miller, J. A. (Ed.). (1977). *L'excommunication. La communauté psychanalytique*
1064 *en France II*. Paris: Navarin.
- 1065 Miller, P. A. (2007). *Postmodern Spiritual Practices: The Construction of*
1066 *the Subject and the Reception of Plato in Lacan, Derrida, and Foucault*.
1067 Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- 1068 Milovanovic, D. (2003). *Critical Criminology at the Edge: Postmodern*
1069 *Perspectives, Integration, and Applications*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- 1070 Moncayo, R. (2008). *Evolving Lacanian Perspectives for Clinical Psychoanalysis:*
1071 *On Narcissism, Sexuation, and the Phases of Analysis in Contemporary Culture*.
1072 London: Karnac Books. **AQ19**
- 1073 Nobus, D. (2013a). That Obscure Object of Psychoanalysis. *Continental*
1074 *Philosophy Review*, 46, 163–187. **AQ20**
- 1075 Nobus, D. (2013b). What Are Words Worth? Lacan and the Circulation
1076 of Money in the Psychoanalytic Economy. *Modern psychoanalysis*, 38,
1077 157–188.
- 1078 Nobus, D. (2016). Esprit de Corps, Work Transference and Dissolution:
1079 Lacan as an Organizational Theorist. *Psychoanalytische Perspectieven*, 34(4),
1080 355–378.
- 1081 Reik, T. (1998 [1948]). *Listening with the Third Ear*. New York: Farrar, Straus
1082 and Giroux.
- 1083 Roudinesco, E. (1997 [1993]). *Jacques Lacan* (B. Bray, Trans.). New York, NY
1084 and London: Columbia University Press.
- 1085 Safouan, M. (2000). *Jacques Lacan and the Question of Psychoanalytic Training*.
1086 London: Macmillan.
- 1087 Stavrakakis, Y. (2008). Subjectivity and the Organized Other: Between
1088 Symbolic Authority and Fantasmatic Enjoyment. *Organization Studies*, 29,
1089 1037–1059.



- 1090 Van Haute, Ph. (2002 [2000]). *Against Adaptation: Lacan's 'Subversion of the*
1091 *Subject'—A Close Reading* (P. Crowe & M. Vanker, Trans.). New York, NY:
1092 Other Press.
- 1093 Vanheule, S., Lievrouw, A., & Verhaeghe, P. (2003). Burnout and
1094 Intersubjectivity: A Psychoanalytical Study from a Lacanian Perspective.
1095 *Human Relations*, 56, 321–338.
- 1096 Vanheule, S., & Verhaeghe, P. (2004). Powerlessness and Impossibility in
1097 Special Education: A Qualitative Study on Professional Burnout from a
1098 Lacanian Perspective. *Human Relations*, 57, 497–519.
- 1099 Vidaillet, B. (2007). Lacanian Theory's Contribution to the Study of
1100 Workplace Envy. *Human Relations*, 60, 1669–1700.
- 1101 Vidaillet, B., & Gamot, G. (2015). Working and Resisting When One's
1102 Workplace Is Under Threat of Being Shut Down: A Lacanian Perspective.
1103 *Organization Studies*, 36, 987–1011.

Author Query Form

Book ID: **461782_1_En**

Chapter No: **11**



Springer

the language of science

Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below and return this form along with your corrections.

Dear Author,

During the process of typesetting your chapter, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ1	The closing quote does not have a corresponding opening quote in the sentence '...Psychiatry served to forge the ...'. Please insert the quote in the appropriate position.	
AQ2	Reference 'Turquet (2014)' is cited in the text but not provided in the reference list. Please provide the respective reference in the list or delete the citation.	
AQ3	The opening quote does not have a corresponding closing quote in the sentence 'In the opening ... "[F]or a labor ...'. Please insert the quote in the appropriate position.	
AQ4	The opening quote does not have a corresponding closing quote in the sentence 'For example ... the 'subject supposed ...'. Please insert the quote in the appropriate position.	
AQ5	Reference 'Lacan (1967)' is cited in the text but not provided in the reference list. Please provide the respective reference in the list or delete the citation.	
AQ6	Reference 'Bion and Rickman (1961 [1943])' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ7	Reference 'Burrell (1988)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ8	Reference 'Carter and Jackson (2004)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ9	Reference 'Cederström and Hoedemaekers (2010)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ10	Reference 'Contu and Driver (2010)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ11	Reference 'Cooper (1989)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ12	Reference 'de Maré (1985)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ13	Reference 'Freud and Breuer (1895)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	
AQ14	Reference 'King (2003)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	
AQ15	References 'Lacan (1990 [1980], 1994 [1964], 1995 [1967])' are given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite them in text or delete them from the list.	
AQ16	Reference 'Letiche (2004)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ17	Reference 'Letiche and Essers (2004)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ18	Reference 'Linstead and Thanem (2007)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite this in text or delete this from the list.	
AQ19	Please check if the inserted publisher name and location for the reference 'Moncayo (2008)' is correct.	
AQ20	References 'Nobus (2013a, b, 2016)' are given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite them in text or delete them from the list.	