

Madeline Andrews¹

In a work entitled *Freud and the Non-European*, Edward W. Said states that, “to say of Freud’s relationship with Judaism that it was conflicted is to venture an understatement. At times he was proud of his belonging, even though he was irremediably anti-religious; at other times he expressed annoyance with and unmistakable disapproval of Zionism”². Said notes that for Freud the dilemma of exile and belonging was triangulated with the question of the non-Jew, a dilemma taken up and interrogated by Freud, in the last of his major theoretical works, *Moses and Monotheism*³. Freud notes that prior to its publication, this particular work tormented him “like an unlaid ghost”⁴. The spectre that haunted Freud was associated with the formulation of a theory, based on the proposition that the founding father of the Jewish race was a non-Jew, an exception, that Moses was an Egyptian. What became of these researches was not an historical or anthropological document, but rather, a piece of psychoanalytic writing bearing the mark of an intimacy, which questions of origin, inheritance and foundation may produce.

Lacan’s intervention in the field that Freud founded was primarily discursive, one that deciphered in the intimacy of the letter of the Freudian text, a symbolic function distinct from the rule handed down by the imaginary father. As such, Freud’s Moses carried something in excess of his theory of the paternal, beyond his analysis of the imaginary father as founder, and exception, (to his race). Lacan formulated the paternal as a function of the real of discourse. Registered at the level of the signifier, it is this mark of the real that founds the subject of desire as an effect of nomination, of the Names of the Father, which poses a limit to identification with the Other. The One of the exception, or *père-version*, is that which installs the subject as desiring, as anxious, in relation to a logical law, which exceeds the possibility of authorization from the Other.

It is this anxiety that calls for the necessity of naming, for the writing of letters. Resistance to knowledge is not a consequence of the Freudian unconscious, but produced by a field of discourse capable of theorizing at its limits, the writing of a non-specular, remainder. Lacan theorized this remainder as the sonorous letter and litter of the speaking being, designated by the letter a, and transmitted through a jouissance of writing. Thus, via the virtual medium of the television, undaunted by the prospect of stupidities being attached to his image, Lacan addressed himself to an audience that he anticipated as capable of hearing, rather than presupposing, the letter of his discourse: “I do not base this idea of discourse on the ex-sistence of the unconscious. It is the unconscious that I locate through it – its ex-sists only through a discourse”.⁵

As a symptom of discourse, beyond the constraints of geographic and cultural borders, psychoanalytic writing traces a real border, a littoral, at the limit of the symbolic, forcing the letter into circulation. Thus, not only the possibility, but the necessity of psychoanalysis to participate, beyond the walls of a School and the walls of the clinic, in a dialogue whereby the same wall is always encountered, the wall of

language. Lacan spoke of this wall, a wall that at the limits of what can be said, we may nonetheless leave a mark upon – (a)mur. It is the mark of the love letter, (a)mour, which makes of transference a work of writing that does not recede before the formidability of such an encounter.

The discourse of psychoanalysis, from its inception, has insisted as a work of transmission indebted to the function a naming, a foundation of unreason, capable of responding to the deleterious effects of narcissism, paternalism and the effects of the group. The transmission of psychoanalysis has been beset by such effects, leading to impasses whenever recourse to an identification with the Other, has repressed the necessity of writing. On the basis of an ethic of desire that supports a reading of the unconscious to the letter, *Écritique* continues to publish texts that bear the mark of a transference to psychoanalysis, singularly authorized by such an inscription. We reiterate here, what was proposed by the editors of *Écritique* at the beginning of this millennium (a time to which the present edition refers): *Écritique* is concerned with psychoanalysis in extension, that is, the theorization of any question arising from the ethical function of a School, that is, transmission, testimony, act.

Écritique, now in its seventh volume, introduces a new format, having changed from a paper circular to a web-based periodical. *Écritique: Letters of the Freudian School of Melbourne, School of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, will continue to be accessible to local and international readers of psychoanalysis, through the internet at regular intervals. Previous volumes will also be accessible on the website of *The Freudian School of Melbourne*. Via a technology that participates in an opening of psychoanalysis onto other fields, we anticipate an exchange of letters with other schools of psychoanalysis and other discourses (such as literature, art, and science), which offer a critique of psychoanalysis.

Contributors to the present volume are local and internationally practising psychoanalysts, many of whom have played a critical part in the opening of a dialogue concerned with the *après coup* effect of Lacan's word, since the event of his death. Transcripts of interviews conducted in 2001 with three psychoanalysts: José Zuberman, Oscar Zentner and Ricardo Landeira, are published here in English translation for the first time. In response to questions concerned with 'the situation of psychoanalysis', each one testifies from a different place, to the unique structure and function of the *Lacanoamerican Reunion* that was set in motion by Lacan's visit to Caracas in 1980.

In the paper, *Lacanoamerican*, Michael Plastow notes that for three decades a tyranny of a distance both geographical and cultural, has not constituted a barrier to members of the *Freudian School of Melbourne* participating in the reunion, that confluence of voices in which each writer speaks from a place neither displaced, nor privileged, but singularly marked by a desire. In *The Affair of the Secretary and the Psychoanalyst*, Peter Gunn interrogates the function 'secretary' in relation to the function 'school'. He points to the intimacy of an erotics that, contrary to a jouissance of knowledge secretly known or unknown in advance, functions as the embodiment of a jouissance, which via the imperative of a saying, promotes a *discourse* – a discourse that gives "due weight to his field, the domain of the unknown unknowns". This "due weight" is propelled by an anxiety that does not wait, an angst that the psychoanalyst and psychoanalytic writing carry. In 1963, Lacan noted that: "It was before the God of Moses, in the last analysis, that Freud's pen stopped writing. But Freud is surely

beyond what his pen transmits to us ... God is something one encounters in the real, inaccessible. It is indicated by what doesn't deceive – anxiety”.⁶ It is with this anxiety that before the blank page, writing forces itself, and us, to take up that appointment with the real, insofar as we are prepared to risk it.

¹ Madeline Andrews. Member, *The Freudian School of Melbourne, School of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*.

² Said, Edward, W. *Freud and the Non-European*. London: Verso, 2004. 35-36.

³ Freud, Sigmund. *Moses and Monotheism*. Vol. XXIII. *Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. Anna Freud et. al. Trans. James Strachey. London: Vintage, 2001.

⁴ Freud. *Moses and Monotheism*. 103.

⁵ Lacan, Jacques. *Television*. Trans. Denis Hollier et. al. London: W. Norton. 1990. 14.

⁶ Lacan, Jacques. “Introduction to the Names of the Father” . *Television*. Trans. Denis Hollier et. al. London: W. Norton. 1990. 90.