SUPERVISION IN PSYCHOANALYSIS
A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE
(till 2000)

Lieven Jonckheere

I
FREUD

1. Training analysis (*Lehranalyse*[1])

- first Freud only suggests auto-analysis (1910)
- later Freud suggests *Eigenanalyse* or analysis for the analyst (learning to tolerate a piece of the truth, 1911) - not obligatory (e.g. to Bernheim Freud said: "start practising PA, we tackle the problems whenever you encounter them on the way"
- Finally, in 'Unendliche und Unendliche Analyse' (1937), Freud advised analysts to return regularly to the couch.

2. Controlanalysis - supervision

- "Soll die PA an den Universitäten gelehrt werden?" (1918) = educational program in accordance with the logic of PA
  - Theory
    - study of analytical literature
    - exchange of ideas (*Gedankenaustausch*) during scientific meetings of PA associations
  - technique (*prakische Handhabung der analytischen Technik)*
    - *Analyse der eigenen Person*
    - *Analyse von Patienten unter der Kontrolle erfahrener Kollegen*
- Implicit supervision
  - Comments in letters (e.g. Edouardo Weiss with his case of a depressive painter)
  - Collective supervision during the Wednesday evenings

[1] All quotations in italics

II
FREUDIANISM[2]

1. Introduction of *Kontrollanalyse* by Eitingon (1920-1925)

- training analysis
  - mythical origin with the verdict of Nunberg (1918): 'training analysis is required'
  - training analysis organised by Eitingon, Abraham and Simmel in the institutes at Berlin and Vienna – training analysis is not necessarily as 'deep' as therapeutical analysis (in line with Freuds minimalism)
- Eitingon immediately added *Kontrollanalyse*[3]
  - After training analysis – but training analysis takes longer, so supervision has to start during training analysis (according to Fleming & Benedek with the gain of an *enlivened personal analysis*)
  - Training analyst may not supervise – in former days the first patient was mostly referred by the training analyst, who became the supervisor for this case (leading to identifications of the novice with his training analyst – no problem for Benedek, with her *excitement of continuing the discoveries which had begun with one's own analysis*)
- In 1925 the classical triad of training analysis, supervision and theory is established

2. The debate between Ferenczi (= Hungarian School) and Eitingon (= Anna Freud[4] = IPA) (1925)

- Ferenczi
  - genetic viewpoint, pedagogy (inspired by "Entwicklungsziele der PA"(1924))
  - First training analysis is 'deeper' than therapeutic analysis, in order to guarantee the *Belastungsfähigkeit* and *Elastizität* of the analyst (= Ferenczis maximalism versus Freuds minimalism) – finally *Kontrollanalyse* 'deepens' training analysis
  - Supervisor = training analyst – supervision = analysis of countertransference, *dealing with the unresolved complexes of the candidate as they emerge during his work with his patient*[5]

- Eitingon
  - Teaching the technique of analysing transference
  - e.g. according to Balint[6] supervisor has to draw attention to the patients formal, non-verbal behaviour, such as *the changing expressions of the patient's face (first observed and described by Freud, but I have not been able to find any reference to his interpreting it to the patient), his way of lying on the couch, of using his voice, of starting and finishing the session, his intercurrent*

---

[2] Based on M. Balint, The psychoanalytic training system, IJP, 1948, xxix, pp. 163-173; J. Fleming & R. Benedek, Psychoanalytic supervision, Grune & Stratton, New-York – London, 1966, pp. 1-19 (Introduction & A Historical Review of Supervision in Psychoanalysis); V. Kovacs, Lehranalyse und Kontrollanalyse, IJP, 1936, XVII, pp. 517-524; H. Deutsch, Analyse sous controle (Controlanalysis, traduit de l'Américain par Isabelle Coutiet), Ornicar? Revue du Champ freudien, 1987, 42, pp. 86-93.

[3] IJP, 1923.

[4] her analytical 'uncle' after her own training analysis

[5] cfr Freud "Unendliche Analyse" (1926) driften analysant wekken driften analyticus die in didactische nog niet aan bod waren gekomen (juist in verband met Ferenczi, nee, eerder Ferenczi's negatieve overdracht – in elk geval Ferenczi's probleem van preventie ivm *d de l'analyste*)

[6] Michael Balint, Changing therapeutical aims and techniques in psychoanalysis, IJP, 1950, XXI, 117-124.

illnesses, even a passing malaise and especially his way of associating (all these first mentioned by Ferenczi) … only gradually have we become aware of the immense value for therapeutic purposes of the consequent noting and interpreting of as many of these formal elements as possible. Nowadays this is fully recognised, and has become part and parcel of our everyday work, especially of our teaching activity in supervising candidates

– Supervisor should not be training analyst, supervisor is able to discover technical faults without knowing personally the supervised analyst

3. Polarisation of the debate on *Analysenkontrolle*: Vilma Kovacs and the Balints versus Helen Deutsch and Anna Freud (1927-1935)

3.1. Hungarian School

Vilma Kovacs[7]

- Not only supervision but also theory considered from focal point of training analysis
- Supervision during training analysis allowing training analyst to 'analyse' the countertransference
- Aim is to learn the *richtige Handhabung der Gegenübertragung, die einer der wichtigsten Faktoren der analytischen Arbeit ist* (beside the interpretation of transference), a *spezielle Hygiene* consisting of a *Kontrolle der Gefühle der Gegenübertragung*
- Training analyst sends first patient when he judges that the transference of analyst has been sufficiently analysed, when analyst has become sufficiently 'realistic' (*Heilenwollen* is no longer the result of an identification with the training analyst but a sublimation) – sequence or hierarchy of pathologies in supervision, according to their potential to arouse countertransference
  - First cases should be hysteria or obsessional neurosis because in these cases the transference is maximal and the countertransference minimal
  - Then come the obsessional character and the character neuroses which require more analytical experience (in 'controlling' one's own countertransference)
  - Finally, in the future neurotic criminals, psychoses, addictions (morphine, alcohol) will require still 'deeper' analysis (implying more 'control' of countertransference)
- Novice analyst considered a hysteric (D. Silvestre)

Michael (& Alice) Balint[8]

- *Transference is not brought about by the patient alone, transferring his feelings on the analyst as a well-polished mirror, a lifeless thing – some elements on the side of the analyst unavoidably trouble this ideal of perfect sterility*, and provoke transference. This transference-provoking 'desire' of a particular analyst betrays itself in:
  - *his name, his sex, his age, his home (*cushion, couch, chair and the entire design of his cabinet)
  - *the way in which the end of the session is announced*
  - the 'style' of his interpretation
- these 'elements' are 'traits' (*einziger Zug*) of the identification of the analyst with his training analyst, he adopts his 'style' (*the real source of all these recurring features is transference* on the training analyst)
- countertransference
  - the analyst *transfers all these elements of his personality onto his patients*
  - for Kovacs (Ferenczi) countertransference is the rest of the hysteria of the analyst - for the Balints countertransference is the identification with the training analyst – but for both countertransference is analysed in supervision
- control analysis = control of training analyst
  - analyses countertransference or identification with training analyst, which the analyst 'transfers' to

[7] Vilma Kovacs, Lehranalyse und Kontrollanalyse, IJP, 1936, XVII, pp. 517-524 (lecture in 1927).

[8] Michael Balint (written in collaboration with Alice Balint), On Transference and Counter-transference, IJP, 1939, XX, pp. 223-230 (lecture in 1935).

his own patients[9]

– *the danger of being stuck fast in such a transference (on training analyst) is one of the arguments in favour of the demand that a least one part of each control analysis shall be conducted by some analyst (or better by some analysts) other than the training analyst* – anticipation compromise of 1937

[9] Here the supervision aims at the formal elements of the analyst's behaviour. Later, in 1949, for Michael Balint supervision would also aim at exactly the same *formal elements of the patient's behaviour (the changing expressions of the patient's face, his way of lying on the couch, of using his voice, of starting and finishing the session, his intercurrent illnesses … and especially his way of associating. Noting and interpreting (in terms of objectrelations) of as many of these formal elements as possible has become part and parcel of our teaching activity in supervising our candidates.* This means that supervision does not only 'control' the identification of an analyst with his training analyst, but also the identification of the patient with his analyst. Cfr Michael Balint, Changing therapeutical aims and techniques in Psychoanalysis, IJP, 1950, XXXI, pp. 117-124.

3.2.IPA

Helen Deutsch[10]

- Rado, Sachs, Deutsch = prominent training analysts IPA – nevertheless no summaries of their interventions, not published with exception of Deutsch (publication 1960(!), probably Anna Freuds doing)
- Training analyst may not supervise
  - aim of supervision is separation of analyst from his training analyst
  - Countertransference of training analyst makes it impossible for him to evaluate if his analysant will make a good analyst – supervision of the training
  - Liquidation of transference on training analyst – prevention of continuation of training analysis during supervision
- Supervision after training analysis
  - Ideal
  - *Realpolitik* (training analysis becoming longer, financial pressures, foreign students, etc) sometimes imposes supervision during training analysis
- Analyst free to choose one supervisor
  - from a list (of training analysts?)
  - false arguments for combination of several supervisors
    - combining techniques into a 'global' technique
    - selecting the technique which fits a particular personality (a particular countertransference)
- four cases (not more!) under supervision of the institute
  - 1 and 2 completely supervised by same supervisor
  - 3 and 4 supervised at intervals by other supervisor (idea of emancipation, nevertheless most analysts tend to choose an 'elder' analyst, thus falling back into the transference of the training analysis)
  - typical cases of hysteria, obsessional and anxiety neurosis in order to make familiar with different types of resistance and transference
- obscuring identifications of supervised analyst
  - identification with his training analyst
    becomes a master through identification with his traits (*einziger Zug: wie er sich räuspert und wie er spuckt*)
    identification with his patient
    becomes hysteric through identification with his complexes, the complexes of the analyst form an obscuring 'sediment' – supervision only makes sense when the training analysis has succeeded in clearing out this 'sediment', analyst should be an completely transparent intermediary, he has to efface himself
    - supervisor can analyse the absent patient as if he were present, looking over the shoulder of the supervised analyst into the Ucs of his patient
    - supervisor can empathise (pally interest) with supervised analyst, direct communication of both

[10] Helen Deutsch, *Analyse sous controle* (Controlanalysis, traduit de l'Américain par Isabelle Coutiet), Ornicar? Revue du Champ freudien, 1987, 42, pp. 86-93(lecture in 1927, first publication in 1960 – summary on basis of French translation).

their Ucs

– when training analysis was incomplete Deutsch cannot supervise cases of this analyst without 'seeing' the patients herself

- reporting supervised cases by means of free association
  - Trying to write down the words of his patients the analyst often misses the point (formations de l'inconscient), too much interference of theoretical knowledge
  - Direct communication of Ucs of patient to Ucs of analyst
  - Cfr Balints[11] (1947) argument for free association in supervision: *The control analyst is a real person with strong convictions, theoretical likes and dislikes, preoccupations and personal limitations. He is not bound by the analytical situation, he can – and often does – represent his views and convictions, with all his weight; moreover, the candidate has a much weaker stand in this situation, he has not the privilege of using his free associations – his strongest defence – any more, he is taught and controlled or 'supervised', not analysed*
  - There will always be exception who can report their cases in a purely intellectual manner (without free association)
- strategy of the supervisor[12]
  - at first the supervisor remains passive and attentive – only intervenes when patient is 'in danger'
  - (theoretical) organisation of material
  - no theoretical teaching
- control seminar
  - control seminar precedes individual supervision
  - not by the training analyst
  - critique, no theory
  - two cases till their 'natural' end
    - 1 reported by novice - 1 by experienced analyst
- novice analyst considered as a master (D. Silvestre)

[11] Michael Balint, On the psychoanalytic training System, IJP, 1948, XXIX, p. 171.

[12] cf. infra the two 'phases' of supervision according to Lacan: first 'phase of the rhino' corresponds to the free association – then comes the 'phase' of construction of knowledge, starting from the breaking point of the *équivoque.*

Anna Freud[13]

- in 1935 Anna Freud already had read a text of Helen Deutsch (the Vienna viewpoint), with the main idea that *there's more to supervision than analysing the countertransference*
- background is the case of her own supervision by Lou Salomé in Young-Bruehls biography of Anna Freud (her demand for control)[14]
- *Supervised clinical work, analysing under supervision* (individually)
  - Joint decision of training analyst and analyst when to start supervisions (during the training analysis)
  - The main purpose is the development of *receptiveness to and understanding of*
    - *the derivatives of the unconscious*
    - *skill in handling transference and resistance phenomena*
  - supervision of an adult case and a child case (analyst *trained in both and may specialise in either* – analyst has to choose from two *sets of supervisors*
  - *Calculated fine art* cfr Fleming & Benedek
  - *Major issues* are *passive versus active learning, dependence versus independence, personal style versus prescribed procedure (there will always be some who learn best the hard way, i.e. by trial and error)*
- *Sharing or pooling of clinical material*
  - *Weekly, threemonthly and yearly reports in increasingly higher level of abstraction*
  - This material goes to *clinical working groups*, in order to gain insight in *the mental apparatus at work under a variety of pressures and conditions* – two axes:
    - Patients with the same age (genetic viewpoint), all clinical types
    - Patients with the same clinical type, all ages and *developmental stages*
  - Clinical corrections of universitary illusions
    - Medically formed psychiatrists see *mental agencies in their comparatively undamaged stage*
    - Experimental psychologists see *overdetermination and impossibility of isolating variables*
    - Educationists see fixations which limit their influence

[13] Anna Freud, The ideal psychoanalytic institute: a utopia' (1966), in: The writings of Anna Freud, vol VII Problems of psychoanalytic training, diagnosis and the technique of therapy, IUP, New York, 1971, pp. 73-93.
[14] Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, Anna Freud. A Biography, Summit Books, New York, 1988.

4. Towards a compromise (1937)[15]

Hungarian School (Ferenczi)

- Emphasis on the agression of the supervised analyst (Landauer)
- Succeed in imposing the idea of a first phase of *Kontrollanalyse* = *analysis of the candidate being supervised* (his countertransference) by the training analyst
- Accept in a second phase the separation of training analyst and supervisor - see the danger of the identification with the training analyst *demand that at least one part of each control analysis shall be conducted by some analyst (or better by some analysts) other than the training analyst.*[16]

IPA (Vienna & Berlin)

- *supervisor* in a better position than the training analyst to evaluate (Bibring, also Deutsch in 1927)) = start of the politics of power, the control of the training analysts by the supervisors
- succeed in imposing the idea of *Analysenkontrolle* = *supervision of the analysis conducted by the candidate* (teaching the technique of interpretation of transference) by a supervisor who is not the training analyst
- accept the idea of a first supervision during the training analysis, enabling the training analyst to analyse the first 'bit' of the countertransference of 'his' analyst
  on the other hand Balint[17] (1950) critically remarks that *unfortunately control work as a rule finishes before the analyses can be carried out to their termination*, before the end of the training analysis: *a very unsatisfactory state of affairs both for the candidate and the supervisor – and not least for the patient* - which means that the training analyst does all of the supervision[18]

[15] Same references as note 2.

[16] Michael Balint (written in collaboration with Alice Balint), On transference and counter-transference, IJP, 1939, XX, pp. 201-208.

[17] Michael Balint, On the termination of psychoanalysis, IJP, 1950, p. 198.

[18] This can also mean that most analysts return to their training analysis when they are confronted with problems in the supervision.

III
POSTFREUDIANISM

World War II shifts debate to USA
- inspired by Bibring
- teaching the technique (interpretation and handling resistance)
- evaluation of the training analysis = 'controle' of the training analyst, politics of power in the institution

Fleming & Benedek[19]

- egopsychology, inspired by Anna Freud - in spite of the Hungarian background of Benedek
- Training analysis as prerequisite for supervisory learning, supervision as an extension of the experience of training analysis, training analysis initiates and supervision continues the development of the student's personality as an instrument for his professional work
- *Educational qualifications of the supervisor*
  - *The skills which lead to effective teaching (= supervision) are essentially the same which the student (= analyst under formation) needs to develop in himself for therapeutic work. Basic aspects of the relationship between therapist and patient are the common the relationship between student and supervisor. Both are built on rapport, understanding, objectivity and judgement. (…) What skills derived from his experience as an analyst enable a supervisor to be more effective in teaching*
  - Paradigm of teaching and learning – analysis is education, supervisor and analyst have the same educational qualities

[19] Joan Fleming & Ruth Benedek, Psychoanalytic Supervision, Grune & Stratton, New York – London, 1966 (only the introduction and the first historical chapter).

Société Psychanalytique de Paris (SPP)[20]

- *Didactique* (personal analysis)
  - Candidacy examined by *commission de l'enseignement* (visit to several members of al list of training analysts) – authorised tot start training analysis
  - Choice of training analyst from a list (*engagement écrit* of candidate that he will not use of title of analyst before homologation of his formation)
- *scolarité* (theory)
  after 150 sessions training analyst proposes candidate for
  - theoretical courses (courses childanalysis only after 6/9 months of *contrôles*)
  - stages
- supervision (*Controle*)
  - Training analyst decides when the moment has come
  - talks of candidate with teaching commission, who give candidate two cases, with two supervisors (no explicit prohibition on training analyst?)
  - Supervisors inform the commission about the progressions of the candidate
  - commission decides when supervisions have come to an end (end of training) and authorises to defend thesis[21]

Laplanche & Pontalis[22]

Psychanalyse contrôlée = analyse sous controle

- *PA conduite par un analyste en cours de formation, une fois son analyse didactique suffisamment avancée– condition préalable de son habilitation à la pratique*
- *dont il rend comptre régulièrement à un analyste experimenté*
  - *qui le guide dans la compréhension et la direction de la cure, supervision de l'analyse du patient (Analysenkontrolle)*
  - *qui l'aide à prendre conscience de son contretransfert vis à vis de son patient (Kontrollanalyse)*
- *permettre à l'élève de saisir en quoi consiste l'intervention proprement psychanalytique, par rapport à d'autres modes d'action psychothérapeutique*

[20] Anonymous, Règlement de l'analyse didactique et de la scolarité à l'Institut de Psychanalyse (de la Société Psychanalytique de Paris), in: La scission de 1953, La communauté psychanalytique en France – 1, documents édités par Jacques-Alain Miller, Navarin, Paris, 1976, pp. 68-69.

[21] Jean-Jacques Rabanel seems to have more information: in the SPP there would have been a list of supervisors, each supervisor was limited in the number of supervisions, supervision was not possible with the training analyst.

[22] Jean Laplanche & J.-B. Pontalis, Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse, PUF, Paris, 1973, p. 353.

Robert Wallerstein[23]

- president IPA, survey in his typically universitary style, wanting to forge *the collective voice of PA* (cfr *common ground of PA* or Forty-two *lives in treatment*)
- place of *supervised analytic work* in *training sequence* – r*elatively little was said about supervision*, no unitary vision
- only formal requirements and problems, professional standards:
  - *3-4 supervised cases, at least one should be carried to its natural termination under supervision* sometimes 2 cases in monthly *consultation, this is not supervision, but the consultant will help if asked*
  - *minimum number of required supervision hours*: 200 in 1950, 150 in 1957 – this *minimum is almost always far exceeded*
  - each case has a different supervisor
  - supervision evaluations are done jointly by the several supervisors
  - training analyst may not be one of the supervisors
  - danger of starting supervision too early, *Educational committee* decides when
  - supervision at times leads to *re-analysis*, to *training interruption, or even to expulsion from candidacy*
  - *In Canada where PA is now covered as a reimbursable benefit under the national health insurance system, many supervisors are refusing to take cases into supervision unless they are private patients, 'outside the system'* (they take only patients which are not reimbursed)
  - Partial training *to carry out PA-informed research within their own discipline or even research on or within PA itself*: only training analysis and theory, no *supervised PA treatments*
  - Controversy between *reporting and non-reporting training analyst* – training analyst has a role or not in the *assessment of his/her candidate and in the monitoring of the candidate's progression through the institute* (decision to allow his analysant to theoretical teaching, to supervisions, and even influence on his habilitation)
  - *Important that the personal analysis extend far into the period of supervision*

[23] Robert Wallerstein, Perspectives on psychoanalytic training around the world, IJP, 1978, 59, pp. 477-503.

IV
LACAN

Lacan not only developed an explicit theory of training analysis and its final goal, called the *passe* or pass, but he also set up a procedure for the evaluation of this pass. Unfortunately, he never tried to do the same for supervision. Nevertheless, dispersed throughout his writings and seminars we find enough casual remarks that can enable us to follow the development of his ideas on supervision – while successively 'traversing' three periods, three different psychoanalytic institutions: first the "Société Psychanalytique de Paris" under the official wings of the "International Psychoanalytic Association", then came his imaginary companionship with Daniel Lagache, in the "Société Française de Psychanalyse", and finally, *aussi seul que je l'ai toujours été dans ma relation à la cause psychanalytique*, Lacan founded his own "Ecole freudienne de Paris"

1. "Société Psychanalytique de Paris" (SPP)

First of all Lacan became a training analyst of the "Société Psychanalytique de Paris", and as such – just because he was a training analyst - he was charged with important institutional responsabilities. In this high office Lacan was responsible for drafting two important documents of the SPP, trying to arrange among other things supervision: the first dating form 1949 - the second from 1953, in the heat of the famous debate around his unorthodox technique (with the so called 'short sessions'), that would cause his departure.

"Règlement et Doctrine de la Commission de l'Enseignement" (1949)

The first time Lacan mentions supervision is in 1949, in the so called "Regulations and doctrine of the Teaching Commission" of the SPP[24]. We recall that 1949 is also the date of his first subversive move against the prevailing doctrines of egopsychology, with his revelation of the function of *méconnaissance* of the imaginary, in his writing on the looking glass phase. In spite of this first theoretical masterstroke against the psychoanalytic establishment, at that time Lacan would remain rather conservative in his ideas on the practice of supervision. We can say that he remained faithful to the classical, imaginary point of view on supervision – the viewpoint of the IPA or the "International Psychoanalytical Association". It can even be argued that, ironically enough, on some points Lacans first conception of supervision even has the advantage of being more orthodox and more explicit in its orthodoxy than the orthodox view of the IPA.[25] This is why it seems appropriate to develop his first views at some length, as a kind summary of the previous, postfreudian points of view.

First of all Lacans proposition is based on the classical triad, which Lacan calls the *trois degrés*, the three degrees: de experience of the so called *analyse didactique* or training analysis, the supervision variously called

---

[24] Jacques Lacan, Règlement et Doctrine de la Commission de l'Enseignement déléguée par la Société Psychanalytique de Paris, *Revue Française de Psychanalyse*, 1949, nr. 3, pp. 426-435 – According to J.-J. Rabanel (*Différence des systèmes de controle à la SPP et à l'ECF, D'un règlement vers une volonté institutionelle*, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, 130, 1994, p. 28) in his text Lacan stresses the responsibility and the initiative, while the final, official text of the SPP, in 1953 (cfr supra) is much more formal and puts under obligations.

[25] For instance the stress on the 'medical responsibility': psychiatric qualifications are recommended; and lay analysts should only analyse patients referred by doctors.

analyses sous contrôle, épreuves opératoires de contrôle ou stage de contrôle, and finally the theoretical teaching culminating in the presentation and discussion of a theoretical paper (thesis).

It is important to note that at that time, in the *Société* or Society, an analysis is not yet to be judged from its end, in retrospect or *nachträglich* like Freud would have said, but an analysis is already to be judged before its beginning. Not: this has been a training analysis – but: this will be a training analysis. The candidate or the student, like he's called, should make clear his intention to start a training analysis before beginning it. This request is examined by all the members of the Teaching Commission, on the basis of several interviews with the candidate. When judged sufficiently 'normal' by this Commission, when the Commission descries in him the germs of an analyst to be, then the candidate is free to choose his training analyst from a list of so-called *membres titulaires*. The special capacities or qualifications (*capable de transmettre cette formation dans la psychanalyse didactique*) of these holders or functionaries remain obscure. Anyhow, after this preliminary 'selection' analysis can begin under the *tutelle*[26]. This guardianship, tutelage or legal restreint of the training analyst means, among other things, that the training analyst incites his candidate to begin his theoretical instruction. But also that the candidate agrees not to start practising analysis without the permission of his training analyst. In this way the training analyst becomes the only judge of the moment to start the first analyses, which are the analyses under supervision.

From here on I quote, in a slightly commented translation, the relevant passages of the "Regulations and Doctrine of the Teaching Commission" of the SPP, drafted by Lacan in 1949.

When the training analyst judges that the candidate is ripe for his first analysis under supervision, he sends him back to the Commission that has to confirm this authorisation and has to accept the candidate as *stagiaire*, this is student on work placement or candidate-analyst. This means that supervision is considered of as work placement.

These first cures are supervised by two other training analysts, to be chosen by the candidate from the list excluding his own training analyst - the training analyst acting as supervisor would complicate too much the resistance's and transference's (*interférences de résistances et de transfert*). The student on work placement is supposed to go on for some time with his training analysis, because not only the training analysis but also the supervision benefits from *une coexistence aussi prolongée que possible*, the longest possible coexistence of both.

In the system of the SPP, as exposed by Lacan, to all appearances the two supervisors are in the best position to decide whether a candidate will make a reliable analyst or not. As a matter of fact these supervisors not only evaluate the result of the training analysis, but also the clinical capacities of the candidate. Consequently the supervisors can suggest (via the Commission) that the candidate should do another *tranche* of analysis, another slice – in case the candidate should already have finished his training analysis (which is usually not the case). It is also the responsibility of the supervisors to make sure the candidate completes his theoretical

[26] *Tutelle* = custody, charge, guardianship, declaring someone minor or under age, legal restreint – tutelage = an act or process of serving as a guardian or protector, hegemony over a foreign country, instruction of an individual, a guiding influence – guardian = on who has the care of the person or the property of another (in Ducht, van Dale about *curatele*: (rechtst.) voogdij ten aanzien van het beheer van middelen over een meerderjarige die wegens krankzinnigheid, verkwisting of zwakheid van vermogens zijn eigen belangen niet kan waarnemen, zulks tengevolge van een rechterlijk vonnis, waarbij hij onder curatele is gesteld; -- (in vrijer gebruik): iem. onder curatele stellen, hem het vrije beheer van zijn zaken ontnemen; (fig.) kortwieken.

instruction. And finally both supervisors, by mutual agreement with the training analyst, determine whether there has been sufficient training analysis, sufficient work placement, sufficient theoretical instruction. At this magical moment the candidate can stand for *membre adhérent*[27]*,* ordinary or regular member, by presenting and defending an original theoretical contribution. If the candidate has come through this last test, the three *tuteurs* or tutors - as the two supervisors and the training analyst are called - advise to acknowledge the candidate as *membre adhérent*.
So far the standard procedure of the SPP, in 1949. Of course this procedure to some extent takes into account some exceptions. Take for instance the case of an analysis, with an ordinary member of the SPP, originally meant to be therapeutical, but that nevertheless has been brought to 'a good end'. Or a training analysis in a foreign association affiliated with the IPA (like the SPP). Analysants themselves can request the validation of such analyses, they can make them acknowledge as a regular training analysis. In these cases the SPP reserves the right to require a supplement of analysis explicitly meant as training. On the basis of this training analysis candidates can be admitted to supervision. It is important to note that supervisions by training analysts of other associations, even when affiliated with the IPA, are never acknowledged. In any case two supervisions have to be done with at least two training analysts of the SPP. Once again this points to the predominant influence of supervision, or rather supervisors in the classical IPA-system. Supervisors seem to have more influence than the training analyst in determining the 'corporate identity' of members of a classical psychoanalytical association.

"Statuts proposés pour l'Institut de Psychanalyse" (1953)

This was Lacan in 1949. Four years later, in 1953, he would make a second proposition for the organisation of the education or formation. At that time he had become the provisional director of the newly founded "Institut de Psychanalyse", "The Psychoanalytic Institute", a subdepartment of the SPP. In this second proposition he took already a far more liberal stance. Unfortunately in this proposition Lacan was also clever enough to sail round the rock of training analysis and the role of training analysts - which precisely in his own case had become an acute problem for the SPP. So Lacan only tackled the general problem of the *enseignement*, the teaching. At that time a kind of urgency was felt, an urgency to formalise and to institutionalise the part of the formation outside the training analysis, *ceci aux fins d'affirmer le controle entier sur l'ordre de transmission de l'expérience* – an effort to control the whole of the training, probably in an attempt to beat about the bush of the institutionalisation and the control of the training analysis.

Now we come to the proposition itself. Just like in the proposition of 1949 it is the training analyst, by mutual agreement with the Teaching Commission, who decides whether a candidate or student has gone 'deep' or 'far' enough in his training analysis to start supervision (work placement) and theoretical instruction.

This theoretical instruction is structured in four seminars. The first seminar restores psychoanalytic concepts in their original meaning, which means studying Freud's writings. The second seminar critically examines classical psychiatric psychopathology. A special seminar is devoted to the new problems presented by childanalysis. And last but not least there's the *cours de technique contrôlée* - a kind of control seminar, a collective control, which confronts the candidate with *la fonction créatrice de la practice*, *l'analyse comme science du particulier* en *la relation des règles à leurs effets* – the psychoanalytic technique, which is not a matter of 'application' on every case of a given, ready-made knowledge, but rather a matter of 'invention' in

[27] Normal member (analyst practising therapeutical analysis) in opposition to *membre titulaire* (training analyst).

function of a particular case. This seems to be an allusion of Lacan to his own technique, of the 'short sessions', which at that very moment was under discussion in the SPP.

Students choose three out of these four seminars, taking into account their own background. They also have to decide which one of their three directors of seminar will be responsible for the whole of their theoretical formation. These three seminars should not be examined in an academic style, nevertheless they are leading to an important title, namely *agrée de l'Institut*, admitted to the Institute – which means that the Institute authorises, qualifies someone as competent to start practising psychoanalysis (*L'institut habilite le candidat à la pratique*).

At first sight this seems to be a rather liberal approach, not only in general but also in the field of supervision. Indeed, rather surprisingly this proposition on the *enseignement* or *formation* does not mention explicitly supervisory analysis. It only mentions the so-called *cours de technique contrôlée*, a kind of control-seminar. Unfortunately we lack more information on this kind of supervision: does it take place in groups or individually, is it done by the director of that seminar or by several supervisors, etc.? Most important of all we also gain the impression that supervision is not really made compulsory, because, depending on his background, the student can choose not to attend to the *cours de technique contrôlée* (attending only the three other seminars). But on the other hand it also seems logical that the seminar on child analysis an appropriate form of supervision is built in.

Nevertheless it remains that we do not know exactly how supervision was conceived of by Lacan, in 1953, at the end of his first institutional period, under the official wings of the IPA. We can only say that we have the impression that he goes a long way towards 'a more liberal approach'…

2. Société Française de Psychanalyse (SFP)

1953 is a first major turning point in Lacans institutional career, and consequently also in his ideas on supervision. On the one hand, as director of the *Institut* of the SPP, he still had made some effort to respect just a little the IPA standards on supervision, or rather to sail round the problem (mentioning only control seminars). However that did not prevent Lacan from becoming *persona non grata* as a training analyst, especially for the sake of his unorthodox technique of the short sessions. At that point, together with his companion at the time, Daniel Lagache, Lacan decided to go their own way, by founding their own institution the "Société Française de Psychanalyse", the "French Society of Psychoanalysis". Initially the SFP, just like the SPP, tried to receive the recognition of the IPA, but failed in doing this.

Fonction et champ de parole et du langage dans la psychanalyse (1953)

At the end of his IPA- and SPP-period Lacan wisely had kept silent on supervision. But at the beginning of this new institutional period with Lagache, in the SFP, he immediately pushes off with the question of supervision – although not from the critical institutional point of view. Indeed, in 1953, in the first chapter of the programmed manifesto of the SFP, namely the famous writing "Fonction et champ de la parole et du langage", he makes an

important 'theoretical' remark on supervision.[28]

The context of this remark is Lacan's emphasis, from this moment on, on the function of speech in the analytic cure. So he starts "Fonction et Champ" with an examination of the problematic relationship between the free association of the analysant on the one hand and the evenly poised or suspended attention (Freud's *gleichschwebende Aufmerksamkeit*) of the analyst on the other hand. At that time postfreudian theories explained the effectiveness of the free association, of the typical speech of the analysant, by referring to the famous triad of frustration-agression-regression. The frustration by the silent analyst is supposed to induce regression in the analysant. Concerning this regression Lacan points out that it is not so much a real phenomenon, something to be seen on the couch: the analysant losing contact with reality and behaving like a child. But it is more a regression of speech, the return of forgotten, repressed words or signifiers, for instance orally or anally coloured signifiers. Consequently the analyst does not have to focus on the supposed reality of his patient – the case of Ernst Kris, who checked, or 'controlled' whether a patient of his was really guilty of the plagiarism of which he obsessionally accused himself, a concern with the reality of the patient which finally lead to an *acting out* of the patient concerned. So, for Lacan there's even a danger in focusing too much on the reality of the *objet au-delà de la parole*, the object beyond speech or the reality of the object to which speech refers (the 'referent in reality'). We have to stay tuned to the signifier itself, to the musical play of the signifiers, what Lacan later would call the *équivoque*, the double meaning of the signifiers.

This permanent focus on the double meaning of the signifier, this evenly poised or suspended attention is precisely what supervision is all about. At this point Lacan even seems to suggest, in a ironical way, the necessity for the analyst of a kind of 'identification' with the 'distant' position of the supervisor – just because structurally this supervisor is in a better position towards the discourse or the signifiers of the analysant than the analyst himself. Indeed, normally – this is when it is not the supervisor himself who has sent the patient – this supervisor has not the opportunity to get in touch with the reality of the analysant. Now this 'distance' towards the reality of the analysant is precisely the condition for what Lacan calls the supervisor's *seconde vue* - a 'second view' which according to Lacan makes the experience of supervision at least as instructive for the supervisor as for the analyst supervised. Indeed, the less one is in touch with the reality of the patient, the less one looks for the 'real reference' of the signifier, the better one is able to focus his attention on the musical play of the signifiers, what Lacan later would call the *équivoque*, the double meaning of the signifiers. Now supervision should achieve this evenly poised or suspended attention by a kind of identification of the analyst with this superior position of the supervisor, his second view – which Lacan eventually called a *subjectivité seconde*, a second subjectivity, a kind of displaced subjectivity. But I'd better quote Lacan himself, in what seems to me one of his most important theoretical statements on supervision: *Si le contrôlé pouvait être mis par le contrôleur dans une position subjective différente de celle qu'implique le terme sinistre de contrôlé, le meilleur fruit que tirerait le contrôlé de cet exercice serait d'apprendre à se tenir lui-même dans la position de subjectivité seconde où la situation met d'emblée le contrôleur. Il y trouvera la voie authentique pour atteindre ce que la formule classique formule de l'attention diffuse, voire distraite de l'analyste n'exprime que très approximativement. Car l'essentiel est de savoir ce que cette attention vise: assurément pas un objet au-delà de la parole du sujet …* Or in the translation by Alan Sheridan: "If the supervised person could be put by the

[28] Apart from that the SFP would not really go to the heart of training analysis, the *règles de la didactique (…) il ne remet pas en question les principes d'habilitatation* – it did not really question the principles of 'authorisation' in psychoanalysis. This would only happen in 1964, with the creation of the "Ecole freudienne de Paris". Cf D. Silvestre, *Quelle garantie hors la passe?* Revue de l'ECF, Travaux, 20, février 1992, p. 24.

supervisor into a subjective position different from that implied by the sinister term *contrôle* (advantageously replaced, but only in English, by 'supervision'), the greatest profit he would derive from this exercise would be to learn to maintain himself in the position of second subjectivity into which the situation automatically puts the supervisor. There he would find the authentic way to reach what the classic formula of the analyst's vague, even absent-minded, attention expresses only very approximately. For it is essential to know towards what that attention is directed; and it is certainly not directed towards an object beyond the subject's speech …".[29]
We should also note that, by defining the evenly poised attention of the analyst as a kind of displacement of subjectivity from the analyst tot the supervisor in order to stay tuned to the signifier, Lacan explicitly opposes the idea that this evenly poised attention leads to a 'communication' between analysant and analyst, an intuitive and direct *transaudition* of the analysant's Unconscious by the analyst's unconscious, an intuitive understanding of the analysant's transference by the analyst's countertransference – which by the way is a typically Kleinian idea. For Lacan on the contrary an analyst should analyse as if he was his own supervisor, he analyses the story of his analysant as if it was told to him by a another analyst.

Two closing remarks, for Lacans ideas on supervision, in the period of the SFP (this is from 1953 to 1964).

The first is but a little terminological detail. In the quote you may have noted that Lacan has a problem with the French term *contrôle* or 'control', which has a sinister connotation, probably of manipulation. At that moment the English term 'supervision' would seem to be more appropriate. But as we will see Lacan will also become critical of the term supervision.

Finally I have to make an important theoretical remark. Lacan's 'interpretation' of Freud's evenly poised attention - as a position of secondary or displaced subjectivity being the result of supervision, of an identification with the position of the supervisor – this interpretation seems to be a precursor of Lacan's later 'interpretation' of the psychoanalytic position as an object. Indeed, at the time of "Fonction et Champ", in 1953, Lacan still conceived of the relationship between analysant and analyst as a form of *intersubjectivité*, intersubjectivity, a relation between two subjects mediated by language, the symbolic order. Nevertheless we have to establish immediately that from the very beginning the analyst is not defined as a subject on the same level as the analysant: he's not what we could call a 'primary subject', the case of the hysterical analysant - but only a 'secondary subject', in identification with the position of the supervisor. As if supervision makes a first discrete break in the intersubjectivity, and paves the way for the later conceptualisation of the position of the analyst in the real (not the reality), as an object – as the *semblant* of the object (a) or (o).

So far Lacan on supervision in the "Société Française de Psychanalyse", at the occasion of its foundation in 1953.

3. Ecole Freudienne de Paris (EFP)

Acte de Fondation, 21 juin 1964

In founding the "Société Française de Psychanalyse", together with his companion Lagache, in 1953, Lacan

[29] J. Lacan, Function and field of speech and language, in: Ecrits, A Selection, translated by Alan Sheridan, Tavistock, Routledge, 1977, p. 45.

had immediately felt the need to make an important theoretical statement on supervision. In the same way supervision would become one of the crucial issues at the start of his last institutional adventure, the foundation of his own "Ecole Freudienne de Paris", in 1964. Indeed, even in the SFP Lacans unorthodox technique as a training analyst had remained a stumbling block, a real that always returned at the same place. So finally Lacan felt impelled to found his own School, *aussi seul que je l'ai toujours été dans ma relation à la cause psychanalytique* – as lonely as I always have been in my relationship to the psychoanalytic cause.

In the "Acte de Fondation"[30] of the EFP Lacans conception of supervision has become at the same time more realistic and more general.

On the one hand, in this "Freudian School for psychoanalysis", *contrôle* has become one of the crucial signifiers. We could even say that the idea or the concept of a 'School' implies *controle* or supervision on all its levels or in all its sections. So a school is nothing less than a generalised form of supervision for all kinds of psychoanalytic work:

- First of all supervision of the *psychanalyse didactique* or *psychanalyse pure* – supervision of the training analysis that tries to restore Freud's truth,
- But also supervision of the *psychanalyse appliquée* – supervision of applied psychoanalysis or psychoanalytic therapy that performs the (social) duty of psychoanalysis in the world,
- And finally the supervision of the *recensement du champ freudien* – supervision of the critical screening of the use of psychoanalytical knowledge in other fields, in order to locate psychoanalysis in relation to science.

Normally these three activities - the training analysis of the analyst, the therapeutic analysis of the patient and the scientific analysis of culture – should be supervised by an external instance. Nowadays this external supervisor is science. Unfortunately, in the case of psychoanalysis, according to Lacan, science fails to judge and supervise psychoanalysis, with the result that *ce n'est plus du dehors que la psychanalyse peut attendre une exigence de controle qui serait à l'ordre du jour partout ailleurs. C'est l'affaire seulement de ceux qui, psychanalystes ou non, s'intéressent à la psychanalyse en acte.* In the absence of an external, scientific supervision, psychoanalysis has to arrange for its own, internal supervision by founding Schools composed of analysts and non analysts (meaning people who have done a psychoanalysis, but do not practice it).

It is also important to note that Lacan immediately created a particular instrument in order to realise this project of internal and external supervision of pure, applied and scientific psychoanalysis in his School, and that instrument is the *cartel*, 'cartel'. The term itself is not mentioned in the "Acte de Fondation", in 1964. But the concept of the cartel is already present in what Lacan calls a *petit groupe*, a little group. Everybody, including the experienced analysts and the training analysts, is invited to submit his activities to the supervision of a cartel: *nul n'aura à se tenir pour rétrogradé de rentrer dans le rang d'un travail de base. Pour la raison que toute entreprise personnelle remettra son auteur dans les conditions de critique et de controle où tout travail à poursuivre sera soumis dans l'Ecole*[31] - in the School every personal undertaking is submits its author to the conditions of critique and supervision. To some extent this supervisory function of the cartel is personified by the so called *plus-un*, an outside chosen by the members of the cartel and who has to make sure that the work

[30]J. Lacan, Acte de Fondation, 21 juin 1964, *Annuaire et textes statutaires de l'Ecole de la Cause freudienne*, Paris, ECF, 1982, pp. 71-78.

[31]J. Lacan, o.c., p. 71.

of every member of the cartel is discussed and has some outcome. This cartel, with *plus-un*, supervises all three levels or sections mentioned above: the analysis of the analyst, the analysis of the analysant and the analysis of culture.

Clinical supervision of psychotherapists in training analysis

So, first of all the concept of a School implies a kind of generalisation, or conceptualisation of the idea of supervision. This is the context for the development of a more realistic approach of clinical supervision. In his "Acte de fondation", as a kind of starting point, Lacan only mentions supervision of professional psychotherapists who continue to earn their living while being in training analysis. This means that he does not say anything about the compulsory, institutionalised supervision of the analyst under training, at the end of his training analysis. Nor does he touch upon the more interesting problem of the analyst's demand for supervision – either at a particular, accidental point of impasse in his cures, or at the structural point of his *passe*.

In 1964 Lacan limits himself to the supervision of psychotherapists who continue to earn their living while being in training analysis – a problem that mostly was ignored at that time by training analysts. For Lacan on the contrary *quelque chose est ici en jeu d'une responsabilité que la réalité impose au sujet, quand il est practicien, de prendre à ses risques. Feindre d'ignorer ce fait est l'incroyable fonction qu'on conserve dans la pratique de l'analyse didactique: le sujet est censé ne pas pratiquer, ou tenu pour violer de son fait une règle de prudence, voire d'honnêteté. Qu'à observer cette règle le sujet arrive à faire défaut à sa fonction, n'est pas hors des limites de ce qui se passe, on le sait, d'autre part. L'Ecole ne saurait s'abstraire de cet état de choses désastreux, en raison même du travail qu'elle est faite pour garantir. C'est pourquoi elle assurera les contrôles qui conviennent à la situation de chacun, en faisant face à une réalité, dont fait partie l'accord de l'analyste. Inversement, une solution insuffisante pourra motiver pour elle une rupture du contrat.*[32] For Lacan it would be unethical of the training analyst to defend an analysant to go on practising psychotherapies, to earn his living and to assume his social responsibilities towards his patients - for instance by condemning this psychotherapeutic activity as 'imprudent' or even 'dishonest'. So the training analyst, or rather the School, has to take its responsibilities and to make sure that a qualified supervision is made available during the training analysis of the psychotherapist who wants to become an analyst. On the other hand it is also strongly suggested that the psychotherapist should accept this offer of supervision. If not, he risks the interruption of his training analysis.

Be that as it may, in any event the School has to offer a qualified supervision during the training analysis of the psychotherapist who wants to become an analyst. This is all the more the responsibility of the School since *il est constant que la psychanalyse ait des effets sur toute pratique du sujet qui s'y engage. Quand cette pratique procède si peu que ce soit d'effets psychanalytiques, il se trouve les engendrer au lieu où il a à les reconnaître.* Psychoanalysis is responsible for the psychotherapies of its analysants, because being in psychoanalysis his psychotherapies can be conceived of as a form of generalised acting-out. In this sense a supervision becomes necessary in order to protect the patients of an psychotherapist from the negative acting-out effects of his own psychoanalysis in progress.

[32] J. Lacan, o.c., p. 75 - *dès le départ et en tout cas un controle qualifié sera dans ce cadre assuré au practicien en formation dans notre Ecole* (p. 72).

"Proposition du 9 octobre 1967,
sur le Psychanalyste de l'Ecole"

The next important step in the institutional history of the EFP, after the "Founding Act" of 1964, is the *"Proposition du 9 octobre 1967, sur le Psychanalyste de l'Ecole"* ("Proposition of the 9th of October 1967, on the Psychoanalyst of the School").

This writing introduces the *passe*, with its two sides, its two scansions. First of all the *passe* is the experience of a kind of turning point at the end of an analysis, variously called *déstitution subjective* (subjective destitution), *traversée du fantasme* (traversing of the fantasy), *le désir de l'analyste* (the desire of the analyst). From this point of *passe* on an analysant can authorise himself as a psychoanalyst, *l'analyste ne s'autorise que de lui-même*.

But secondly, and this side of the *passe* is not to be neglected either, the *passe* has also a social side. It is also a testimony of this lonely moment of subjective destitution, of traversing the fantasy, of the desire of the analyst - a testimony that can establish a particular relationship with other people that have crossed this point. The *passe* should be able to create a new community of analysts, *une Ecole* (School). By doing the passe one can become *Analyste de l'Ecole* (AE = Analyst of the School). In the vein of his conceptualisation of the School as a generalised form of supervision or control Lacan immediately conceives of this procedure of the passe as a kind of supervision of the analyst by the School, *un contrôle non inconçu de ses suites* – the *passe* is a kind of supervision in the sense that the School checks whether the point of subjective destitution has been reached, whether the fantasy has been crossed, whether the desire of the analyst is present. The pass supervises whether *un analyste ne s'autorise que de lui-même*.

Some months after this Proposition of the *passe* Lacan examined the criticisms it had provoked ("Discours à l'EFP", 6 December 1967). There supervision is mentioned at several occasions. [33]

First of all Lacan claims to have respected *non sans raison ce que méritait l'expérience de chacun en tant qu'évaluée par les autres.* Consequently he's astonished to learn that *quiconque, pour s'y croire chef de file, nous assourdisse des droits acquis de son 'écoute', des vertus de son 'controle' et de son goût pour la clinique, qu'il prenne l'air entendu de celui qui en tient un bout de plus qu'aucun de sa classe.* And he concludes that *l'impropre n'est pas qu'un quelconque s'attribue la supériorité voire le sublime de l'écoute, ni que le groupe se garantisse sur ses marges thérapeutiques, c'est qu'infatuation et prudence fassent office d'organistion*. From this passage it seems that especially the class, or the caste of supervisors had insurmountable problems with Lacan's new proposition of the *passe* – indeed, supervisors said that, with this proposition Lacan had put *des non-analystes au controle de l'acte analytique* – non-analysts at the control-gate or checkpoint of the analytical act. I think this refers to the *passeurs*. These *passeurs* are analysants who are at the same point of *passe* as the analysant submitting to the procedure of the *passe*, the *passant*, but with this crucial difference that these *passeurs* cannot testify yet of their own *passe*. On the other hand they readily 'identify' with the testimony of the pass of someone else, and they are very well able to transmit the other's testimony to the School. Passeurs are still the *passe*, as Lacan says. So the analytical act was no longer under 'control' of the supervisors, but analysants (*passeurs*) took control. For his School Lacan tried to promote a principle of organisation that was different from the classical supervision, with its mixture of arrogance and prudence as exemplified in the idea of their sublime form of listening (*sublime de l'écoute*)

Until now I only mentinoned the Analyst of the School, the analysant who authorises himself as an

[33] J. Lacan, Discours à l'EFP, 6 décembre 1967, Scilicet, 1970, 2/3, pp. 14, 18 en 24.

analyst on the basis of his own analysis and who offers this pass to the supervision of others, analysts and non-analysts alike, the supervision of a School – and not only the supervision of supervisors. But this Analyst of the School is only one of the two titles created by the Proposition of 1967. There is also the so-called *Analyste Membre de l'Ecole* (AME) or Analyst Member of the School.

This title was attributed to *des gens qui plus modestement se contenteront de s'éprouver comme analystes. Là c'est l'Ecole qui simmisce et de façon toujours positive. Elle défère le titre d'AME sans qu'il y ait besoin pour cela d'aucune postulance. Ceci sera le fait de l'organe stable en devenir, le Jury d'Agrément. Et ce titre constitue une invitation de l'Ecole à se présenter à la qualification d'AE.*[34] The title AME was attributed to analysts who who are satisfied with experiencing themselves as analysts in their practice and who do not ask for more (for the moment being). So it is the School, and in particlar the 'Jury of Agreement', that attributes the title without the practising analyst having to postulate. In this way the School invites the practising analyst to do the pass, to postulate for the title of AE. This is the 'internal use' of the title AME.

On the other hand this title of AME was also created in order to guarantee towards the social field that a practising analyst had sufficient 'experience', that he could operate as an analyst. It meets the requirement of a *distribution prudente de la responsabilité collective*, the School has to distribute her collective responsibility in a careful way.[35] To some extent the title of Analyst Member of the School also seems to guarantee that an analyst has sufficient 'schooling'.

Now what can be the role or function of clinical supervision in this social guarantee by the School? In his answer to the criticisms on his Proposition of 1967 Lacan does not state explicitly that this guarantee implies that an analyst has submitted himself to the exercise of clinical supervision.

The only explicit statement on clinical supervision appears in his answer to the criticisms on his Proposition of 1967. There supervision is not a question of supervision of a 'case' (*controle d'un 'cas'*), it really should be supervision of the analyst. Indeed, supervision is recommended whenever the analyst as a *sujet dépasse son acte*, wherever the analyst falls back on his own subjectivity and in doing so exceeds or transgresses his analytical act. In *passe* on the contrary the analytical act exceeds or destitutes the subject, *un sujet que son acte dépasse*, the analyst is not a subject but an object. So, supervision tries to bring the analyst back to his responsiblity, his act, his desire (*correction du désir de l'analyste*) - as discovered in the *passe*.

With regard to the institutionalisation of supervision it cannot yet concluded from the proposition of 1967 that the Analyst Member of the School (AME) should be the analyst who submits his cures to the supervision of the School.

This is already indicated more clearly in a later writing, "Principes concernant l'accession au titre de psychanalyste dans l'EFP" ("How to obtain the title of psychoanalyst in the EFP" - 19 december 1968). There it is said that the School can guarantee *à l'égard du dehors l'activité professionelle de ses membres quand elle est effectivement psychanalytique* or the School can guarantee *la capacité professionelle des psychanalystes qui se veulent relever de l'Ecole*. By the titel Analyst Member of the School the School can guarantee towards the outside world the psychoanalytic quality of the professional activity of its members who want to be known as such. Therefore the School has to know something of the *pratique effective* of its analysts, the reality of the practice of its analysts. And here *l'avis du ou des controleurs*, the advise of one or several supervisors can be an element, but it is not necessary nor is it the only element - other *témoignages concordants sur la pratique de*

[34] J. Lacan, Une procédure pour la passe (annexe à la Proposition du 9 octobre 1967 dans sa version orale), Ornicar? Revue du Champ freudien, n° 37, avril-juin 1986, pp. 11. There Lacan also proposes that the 'training analyst' of an analysant who has succeeded in becoming AE, should be attributed the title of AME.

[35] "Adresse du Jury d'accueil à l'Assemblée avant son vote" (25 janvier 1969)

candidat, other concordant testimonies on the practice of an analyst will also do. Conclusion: in the EFP supervision did not seem to be a necessary condition to obtain the title of Analyst Member of the School.

1975

For a third set of remarks of Lacan on supervision, within the context of the EFP, we have to jump to 1975.

But preliminary to these remarks you have to know that, running counter to the IPA-orders, Lacan often was the supervisor of his own analysants – just like in the Ferenczi-tradition. This was for instance the case with Yasmine Grasser[36]. At the end of her analysis with Lacan she yields to what she calls his absolute and final demand: at the end Lacan kept saying to her "and supervision?" - "*Et le contrôle?". "A cette demande absolue et 'dernière', âpre, sans détour, qui exigeait tout sans rien attendre, je finis par répondre 'oui*"'. Viviane Marini-Gaumont[37], Jean-Claude Razavet[38] and Eric Laurent[39], all in their own particular way, also combined analysis and supervision with Lacan. Marini-Gaumont for instance started her supervision with Lacan after having finished her analysis with him (in order to mark the difference with her training analysis the supervision took place on the only day in the week where Marini-Gaumont never had had a analytical session). And Razavet suddenly interrupted his analysis with Lacan for a single session of supervision.

Let's come now to Lacans remarks on supervision in 1975. These remarks give us an idea of Lacan's practice in supervision – this time not the offer of supervision for the psychotherapist nor the compulsory supervision of the analyst under training, but supervision of the Analyst of the School, the analyst who has authorised himself via the *passe*, *des gens qui se sont autorisés eux-mêmes, selon ma formule, à être analystes*.

For instance right at the start of his Seminar XXIII[40], on the *sinthôme*, the sinthom, Lacan distinguishes two stages: first the stage of the rhinoceros, and secondly the stage of the *équivoque*, the ambiguity or double entendre, or even the pun.

First *il y a l'étape où ils font comme le rhinocéros: ils font à peu près n'importe quoi et je les approuve toujours, ils ont en effet toujours raison.* First there's the stage where they, the analysts under supervision, behave like the rhino: they do anything and I always accept, approve, because as a matter of fact they're always right. In his American conference of the 1st December 1975[41] says the following about this stage of the rhino: *au début tout au moins j'encourage plutôt l'analyste – ou celui ou celle qui se croît tel – je l'encourage à suivre son mouvement. Je ne pense pas qu'il soit sans raison que quelqu'un vienne lui raconter quelque chose au nom simplement de ceci: qu'on lui dit que c'était un analyste. Ce n'est pas sans raison parce qu'il en attend*

---

[36] Y. Grasser, *Une demande insistante*, Revue de l'ECF, Travaux, 20, février 1992, p. 130.
[37] V. Marini-Gaumont, *Tryptique*, Revue de l'ECF, Travaux, 20, février 1992, p. 131.
[38] J.-C. Razavet, *Le controle comme rectification subjective*, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, 1992, 114.
[39] E. Laurent, Quatre remarques sur le souci scientifique de Jacques Lacan, in: Connaissez-vous Lacan?, Seuil, Paris, 1992, pp. 41-43.
[40] J. Lacan, *Le Séminaire, Livre XXIII, Le Sinthôme*, 18-11-75, Ornicar? 1976-1977, 8, p.
[41] J. Lacan, *Conférences et entretiens aux universités Américaines*, *Columbia University Auditorium School of International Affairs* (2 december 1975), Scilicet, 1976, 6/7, pp. 42 en 46.

quelque chose. In the beginning Lacan encourages the analyst to follow his own 'movement' or inspiration. In this way Lacan 'shows' that he accepts that the person asking for supervision is an analyst, that he functions as an analyst for this particular analysant about whom he comes to talk.

One of these Lacanian rhino's[42] was Philippe La Sagna[43]. In the beginning of his supervision Lacan kept repeating to him "*Vous êtes formidable, c'est tout à fait ça".* Everything he did as an analyst was alright, he simply was formidable, tremendous – which is rather ironic because the words 'formidable' as wel as 'tremendous' both mean 'terrifying'. So Lacan suggested, with a pun, that in his interventions as an analyst La Sagna was as formidable, as tremendous, as terrible and terrifying as a rhino. Like the rhino every analyst 'smells' where to go to, he's on the right track - but he goes too fast, with the blind violence of the rhino. And indeed, at the end of Lacan's encouragement's La Sagna has to assess that the effects of his tremendous interventions are not that tremendous. And at that point he protests to Lacan: "*Vous m'avez dit que c'était tout à fait ça. Mais ça ne peut pas être ça"* – "you said to me that I was right, but it cannot be right". To which Lacan replied, in the laconical and ironical style of his famous *"je ne te le fais pas dire"* – "Now that you say it yourself": "*Je suis tout à fait content que vous en soyez aperçu vous aussi*" – "I am relieved that you also have remarked".

Once the analytical rhino had spent all of its fury, the second, more subtle stage of supervision with Lacan consisted of learning how to manipulate the ambiguity or double meaning of the signifier in the discourse of the analysant: *car c'est uniquement par l'équivoque que l'interprétation opère, il faut qu'il y a quelque chose dans le signfiant qui résonne – nous n'avons que ça comme arme contre le symptôme, l'équivoque.* It is only by the manipulation of the double meaning of the signifier that interpretation has an impact on the symptom. Interpretation has to present the same double meaning that is inherent in the symptom, on the point of ambiguity interpretation has to match the symptom.

In one of his conference at the American Universities, also in 1975, Lacan goes more deeply into this matter[44]. There his starting point is his irritation at the fact that most analysts do not have anything to say in their cures, irritation at the silence of analysts that betrays their fear of interpretation. For Lacan this is *tout de même un tort, une déviation* – this is an unethical deviation from Freud's courage. We suppose that the first stage of Lacan's supervisions, where he encourages analysts to rant and rave like rhino's, that this is also a kind of hygienic measure directed against their usual silence. Be that as it may, supervision finally has to stop the supervised analytical rhino before a new dimension in the discourse of his analysant, the Other, symbolic dimension that Lacan calls with a pun or double meaning: the *dit-mansion*, *l'endroit ou repose un dit* – the mansion, with an 'a', where the word lives. The analyst has to hear the pun of the signifier in discourse of the analysant on his symptom. And at this point the analyst is supposed to say something, he's *supposé dire la vérité*, supposed to speak the truth, which means that he has to oppose the pun of his interpretation to the pun of the symptom, because, as Lacan reminds once again, *le symptôme et cette sorte d'intervention de l'analyste sont du même ordre* – the symptom and the interpretation of the analyst are of the same order. The analyst has to speak the way the symptom speaks, in the same suggestive way, with the same puns and double meanings. And this is what, according to Lacan, supervision teaches.

An instructive example of how Lacan managed to stop the analyst-rhino before such an *équivoque* is given by Eric Laurent[45]. *J'exposais une fois toutes les difficultés que j'avais à dissuader un des premiers sujets*

---

[42] The rhinoceros is another mythical beast in the Lacanian bestiarium, see my bestiaire lacanien for other mythical, beasty 'imaginations' of the desire of the Other.

[43] P. La Sagna, *Oui, mais comment le dire?* Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, 1999, 102, p.

[44] p. 42.

[45] E. Laurent, o.c.

qui se confiaient à moi de se refaire le nez. Eric Laurent was explaining to Lacan that he was working very hard, like a rhino, to put one of his patients of his project of an operation on … his nose. *M'ayant laissé barboter un moment, Lacan me pose une question: son nez est-il vraiment disgracieux? Sur mon opinion que non, il m'enjoignit de lui dire fortement que le noveau né n'était pas de saison.* First Lacan accepts Laurent as a competent analyst, he let's the rhino have his fling. And then he brings him to a standstill. First by asking if the nose of his analysant is ugly in reality. When Laurent denies this, Lacan feels free to draw attention to a pun, a play with words, a double entendre in the discourse of the analysant as transmitted by Laurent. The analysant's desire for a *nouveau nez*, a 'new nose' is deliberately misunderstood by Lacan, or interpreted as a kind of substitute for his forbidden, repressed desire for a child, a new born child or *nouveau né*. "But be carefull", he warns Laurent when leaving, "use all your analytical tact in dealing with this double entendre" – *"Mais attention, avec tout le tact psychanalytique nécessaire."* So by this supervision Eric Laurent has been introduced in the fine art of proceeding tactfully with the équivoque, the ambiguity, the double entendre or pun in the discourse of the analysant. To the wild (savage) pun in the symptom the interpretation opposes a mild, tactful or discrete pun. And that is what an analyst can learn in supervision.

As a consequence of this emphasis on the ambiguity of the signifier Lacan also becomes more critical of the English term 'super-vision'. I remind that earlier he had preferred supervision to the French term *contrôle*. Now, in 1975, Lacan has become less dissatisfied with the French *contrôle* – it does not suggest, according to Lacan, that psychoanalysis would believe that something can be controlled. Nevertheless the term *contrôle* is not restored, but for supervision in his own EFP, Lacan proposes his own neologism or pun: *super-audition* – super-audition, with all the ambiguity of this term, also in English.

Until now we distinguished two stages in the Lacanian supervision: first the stage of the rhino, and secondly the stage of the pun. However, another side of this second stage of supervision with Lacan is revealed in the testimony of Jean-Claude Razavet.[46] There we are confronted with another, darker side of Lacan. Not the Lacan who stresses the *dit-mansion*, the play of the signifiers in the discourse of the analysant, with the necessity for the analyst of continuing discreetly in the same light and casual vein. But in the case of Razavet we bump against the Lacan who plays the incarnation of the object of the jouissance, the Lacan who embodies the *Trieb*, the drive or drift. Suddenly he shows the supervised analyst how to keep appearances, how to keep up the appearance of the object of jouissance. And more often than not this has something very violent over it.[47]

Take for instance the case of Razavet. Razavet's analysant is an obsessional man. On the one hand he complains of depressive spells, with the words: "*je suis sombre"* – "I feel gloomy, I feel dark". On the other hand he had felt less *sombre*, less 'dark' the moment he had decided to become a *clerc de notaire,* a notary's clerk. Oddly enough this analysant, with his obsessional complaint of feeling 'dark', was swarthy, a black man indeed. But not only his symptom is based on a pun, this is also the case for his auto-therapy, for his wanting to become a *clerc de notaire*. Unfortunately in the English signifier 'clerk' the double meaning of the original French signifier *clerc* is lost – indeed, o, French *clerc* is homophonic with *clair*, meaning 'clear' in the sense of 'bright', 'light'. Concerning his analysis Razavet remarks that, in the first period of his transference, this obsessional man behaved like a black slave towards his white master, but little by little this exaggerated positive transference was disturbed by violent fantasies of throwing his analyst out of the window of his office.

---

[46] J.-C. Razavet, *Le controle comme rectification subjective*, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, 1992, 114.

[47] Cfr infra J. Guey, die het accent legt op de agressie.

Finally these fantasies became so overwhelming, so 'realistic' that Razavet became terror-stricken and litteraly fled to Lacan for supervision of this case. In between we have to remark that Razavet was also in training analysis with Lacan, but this is not the point here. I quote Razavet's account of Lacans rather peculiar reaction and advice – in a dialogue. "But why don't you throw him out of the window?" – "It's not a window, in reality it's wardrobe with mirrors" – "Well, then just buy yourself a knuckle-duster, or don't you know what that is?" – and before Razavet can answer Lacan extracts a knuckle-duster from his pocket, and holds it under the nose[48] of the bewildered Razavet. By this intervention of Lacan Razavet is 'mobilised', he's not rooted to his seat any longer. And the next time his analysant threatens to throw him out, at the borderline of fantasy and reality, Razavet gets up and shows himself saying: "If you continue like that, I will throw you out". After this intervention the agression of the patient calms down.

What do we have to think of this odd sequence? Razavet, in his comment, rightly points out that, with his manipulation of this very real object, of the knuckle-duster, Lacan on the contrary stresses the dimension of *semblant*, of semblance, the appearance's which an analyst has to keep up in the transference. And this can also be a semblance of violence or agression.

Another testimony of this kind of intervention of Lacan, as a supervisor who blocks, provokes and shakes awake, is to be found in the case of Viviane Marini-Gaumont.[49] We saw how Razavet, but also Laurent, exerted themselves, like rhino's, in order to prevent a *passage à l'acte* of their analysants, and finally entered supervision as part of their efforts. Despite all her efforts in supervision with Lacan Marini-Gaumont did not succeed in preventing a *passage à l'acte* of one of her analysants. And in her next session of supervision she declares to Lacan: "Yesterday I have got rid of this analysant" – a lapsus which surprises her, because se did not inform yet the analysant concerned. *Et mon étonnement fût redoublée par la réponse de Lacan, campé devant moi, l'oeil vif, scandant d'une voix ferme: "C'était la seule chose à faire".* Her surprise before her own lapsus is doubled by Lacan's answer, who in a rather violent manner confirms her decision: "it was the only thing to do".

Eric Laurent also had the opportunity to assist at the spectacle of his supervisor Lacan in his brilliant role of *semblant*, or semblance of the object. In the case of Laurent the object demonstrated clearly was the oral object. I quote Laurent. *Lors d'une séance (de controle) le Dr Lacan la suspend et me raccompagne avec un air invraisemblablement, théâtralement mauvais, la bouche ouverte, sans dire un mot. Je me suis dit qu'il allait me manger tout cru et pourtant je n'avais pas la moindre idée de la raison. Ruminant en sortant, sans m'en rendre compte, j'entrai dans une boulangerie et demandai un certain type de gâteau, faisant un lapsus bienvenu qui me réveilla sur l'enchaînement des causes qui m'avait conduit à vouloir manger non pas des cervelles fraîches mais des gâteaux frais. Le lendemain, le remerciant pour cette leçon de psychanalyse sur les modalités de 'se faire manger', je lui confiai que j'aimerais savoir en faire autant avec mes propres patients. "Oh! me dit-il en me raccompagnant gentiment, il faut pour cela beaucoup d'expérience!"* – in my translation: At a given moment Lacan suspends the session of supervision and accompanies me to the door, looking incredibly angry, but in a theatrical way, his mouth hanging open, without uttering a word. I said to myself: but he'll get his hands on me, he's going to swallow me (lust mij rauw, like we would say in Dutch), and I don't know why. Lost in such thoughts I entered pastry shop and asked for a particular type of cake, committing a lapsus that suddenly instructed me on the chain of causes that had let to my desire for precisely that cake. The next

[48] It is rather ironical that the nose seems to play a peculiar role in many stories of analytical rhino's in supervision with Lacan.
[49] V. Marini-Gaumont, *Tryptique*, Revue de l'ECF, Travaux, 20, février 1992, p. 130

day, while thanking Lacan for this psychoanalytic lesson on the modalities of 'to make oneself be eaten', I confessed how much I would love to be able to do the same with my own patients. "Oh, he said kindly, while escorting me to the door, this supposes quite some experience."

What Lacan teaches here, according to Laurent, is the place of *savoir-faire* in the clinic. The French expression savoir-faire is difficult to translate in English: it correpsonds to knowing what to do, in a particular circumstance - in the case of the psychoanalyst we could say it is knowing how to behave as the object of a particular drift, a knowledge that is based on clinical experience. So, to some extent supervision also teaches this *savoir faire l'objet*, this knowing how to stand for the object.

We wind up this little survey of Lacan's interventions in the second stage of his supervisions with the testimony of Augustin Menard[50]. From 1974 till 1981 Menard had every two weeks a session of supervision with Lacan (from his account it is not clear whether Lacan was also his training analyst – as often was the case). Like all other testimonies of supervision Menard also emphasises Lacan's *présence extraordinaire* as an analyst. But it must be said that, in the case of Menard, this extraordinairy presence of Lacan manifested itself in a rather ironical reversal. I quote Menard*. Il était juste en face de moi, à très peu de distance: il baisse la tête et commence à s'endormir, puis à ronfler profondément (…) il est sorti de son sommeil, a respiré profondément, m'a regardé dans les yeux et m'a dit: "Je réfléchissais profondément à ce que vous venez de me dire"* – in my translation: Lacan was in front of me, very closely: gradually his head drops and he falls asleep, snoring deeply (…), seconds later he wakes up, takes a deep breath, looks me right in the eye and declares: "I was thinking deeply about what you we're saying". At that point the dumbfounded Menard concludes: *Là aussi on ne pouvait pas s'attendre à ce qu'il allait dire à ce moment là. Ce qui correspond aussi à son extrême liberté.* Even at that moment he found something unexpected to say. And that also gives evidence of his extreme liberty – according to Menard's comment.

Finally this extraordinary, seemingly excessive liberty seems to be the key to all Lacan's interventions in the second stage of his supervisions. Nevertheless this liberty is not absolute, as Lacan warns us himself, for instance in the examples of his interventions in the case of Eric Laurent. On the one hand, in his interpretation of the *équivoque* of the signifier, his interpretation of the pun in the symptom, the analyst may not proceed as wildly as that symptom – he must remain tactful in his play on the signifier – tact which in the last resort, in the final analysis seems to depend on some obscure 'poetical capacities' – so the freedom in the act of interpretation is akin to the poetic licence. And on the other hand much experience is needed before an analyst can make a good 'actor', an actor who is able to play convincingly his roles as the *semblant* or semblance of all of the four objects (a). In conclusion we can repeat one of Lacan's most famous sayings, that has often been repeated by true Lacanians, especially with regard to Lacan's supervisions: *"faites comme moi, ne m'imitez pas"* – "do like me, don't imitate me". This inimitable or unparalleled character of his liberty, this right to disagree with himself - in a civilised manner, as Oscar Wilde insisted - once was made clear by Lacan himself to Eric Laurent. I quote Laurent. *J'exposai combien j'avais ressenti d'irritation envers un sujet qui savait fort bien se rendre insupportable. J'avais à son exemple (de Lacan), disais-je, laissé libre cours, dans une certaine mesure, à mon affect. Il m'arrêta et me demanda de rendre compte de quoi je m'autorisai donc pour soutenir cette position. J'expliquai alors en détail pourquoi la position de ce sujet envers son père impliquait cet affrontement du courroux de l'Autre. Le controle me parut terriblement long et sévère, le plus dur oral que j'eus à affronter. Il me releva de cette mise en abîme du combat de l'Autre d'un: 'Je vous fais confiance pour*

[50] A. Menard, *Rencontre*, Revue de l'ECF, Travaux, 20, février 1992, p. 131.

l'analyse de ce sujet' – in my translation: one day I was explaining to Lacan how much I had been irritated by a subject who as a matter of fact knew how to make himself impossible. Following the example of Lacan I had to some extent ventilated my affects towards this subject. Lacan stopped me and asked me to argument this position. I started explaining at great length why the position of this subject towards his father implied this confrontation with the annoyance of the big Other. That day supervision seemed terribly long and severe, the most difficult oral examination I ever was submitted to. Finally Lacan saved me from this interminable fight, saying "I trust you for the analysis of this particular subject" – but do not try to imitate me any longer with the next subject. Supervision goes against the imitation of the liberty of the Other, and should bring every analyst to his own particular liberty.

V
LACANISM
ECOLE FREUDIENNE DE PARIS

Short history:

- 1974: Rather late the first open debate in the EFP on supervision - animated by Clavreul and Safouan (1974), at Lacan's instigation (?) – we witness the beginning of a kind of gap between the elder (Safouan, Clavreul) and the younger generation (the rest)[51]
- 1975: Lacan comments in Sém XXII and in his "Lectures in the American universities"[52]
- 1976: the anonymous article in "Scilicet" (1976) resumes the position of the EFP[53]

Jean Clavreul[54]

- American female sociologist investigates 'rumour that supervision is non existent in EFP'. True in so far as the two ritual supervisions of two year's duration, in strict articulation with training analysis, have been abolished. But on the other hand EFP-analysts do 3-4 'informal' supervisions, during 5-10 years and even more
- Supervision starting from the *passe*
  - unlike in the *passe* an analyst does not go for recognition in supervision
  - Analyste qui ne s'autorise que de lui-même, s'autorise à parler de sa pratique (…) Analyste peut pas faire autrement que de parler, c'est ça qui constitue la nécessité du controle
  - Analyst who authorises himself as an analyst by speaking about his own training analysis, also authorises himself to speak about his cures. At the end of his training analysis, as part of his passe, an analyst cannot help speaking (in a particular way – irony), and this is what makes supervision a necessity

[51] Lettres de L'Ecole freudienne (Bulletin intérieur de l'Ecole freudienne de Paris), novembre 1975, 16 (= VIIième congrès de l'Ecole freudienne, Rome, 31/10/64 – 03/11/64). The debate on *la question des contrôles* took place on Saturday 2 November 1964 - with the collaboration of Jean Clavreul, Moustapha Safouan, Claude Dumézil, Brigitte Chardin, Eric Porge, Alain Didier-Weill and Michel Silvestre. Due to lack of time Diane Chauvelot, Jean-Claude Razavet and Daniel Sibony could not take the floor.

[52] Cfr above.

[53] Name not known until today, although this article shows many resemblance's with the intervention of Michel Silvestre.

[54] Jean Clavreul, Introduction a "La question des contrôles" and Remarques après l'exposé de Safouan, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 204, 220-221, 254.

Claude Dumézil[55]

- reasons to demand for supervision *(D de controle)*
  - doubts whether what I'm doing with a particular patient is analysis or not: "Am I an analyst in this case?"
  - looking for something Else, for the Other analyst (*comment fonctionne un autre analyste que le mien*), the Other hysteria (*un autre analysant que moi*), the Other Institution (*une autre école que celle à laquelle j'appartiens*)
- qualities of supervisor
  experience of transference love (e*xpérience de l'amour de transfert*) - cfr analyst has to be an *érotologue* (Safouan)
- danger in supervision
  - supervisor as hysteric: mutual seduction of Ucs of analyst and supervisor (*séduction mutuelle des inconscients*), when both are divided subjects (Safouan, with the older generation) seems to holds this view on the analyst as a subject)
  - supervisor as master: *désêtre* supervisor as object (a) runs counter to any idea of mastery (*toute vélléité de maîtrise*)

[55] Claude Dumézil, Du bon usage des contrôles, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 222-224.

Moustapha Safouan[56]

- term
  supervisory analysis (a*nalyse de controle*) instead of supervision (in French, for analysts, *controle* has an anal, obsessional connotation)
- Other analyst
  Analyst recognises another analyst in addition to his training analyst and himself (*analyste s'adresse à un autre analyste*)
- Reference to article by Shapiro & Sachs (on collectieve supervision)[57]
  - two analysts supervise a group of psychiatrists supervising a psychotherapist (supervision of supervision) – they point out that the group of supervisors and the supervised therapist do exactly like the patient: they all 'transfer' knowledge on the other (*autre*[58] *supposé savoir* = SSS) – all believe in the existence of the Other of the Other
  - At this point in the group of supervising 'masters' the 'hysterical exception' opposes to the two supervising analysts (as SSS) the character of the guru - by telling the parable of the rich man who left everything behind in search of the truth: finding finally his long sought after guru the only truth he learns is that "life is a fountain" (Duchamp); the man gets angry, "I did not come all that way to hear you say that life is a fountain", whereupon the guru severly replies "You did not come all that way to make me clear that life is not a fountain, do you?" For Safouan this guru is a paradigm for psychoanalytic supervision:
    - reveals an unknown point of ignorance in the subject
    - by an act (*efficacité au niveau de la performance*) that is not based on some power (*ébranlement de la catégorie du pouvoir*)
    - he does not abuse of his power in the transference for indoctrinating with his own ideologies (*liberté à l'endroit du contre-transfert et du transfert*), but he's beyond transference, beyond the lie of love that obstructs desire (*mensonge de l'amour qui entrave l'assomption du désir*[59]).

[56] Moustapha Safouan, (Vers une) théorie de l'analyse de controle, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 205-220.
[57] Shapiro, David Sachs, (something on collective supervision), Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1974.
[58] The other and not the subject, according to Safouan.
[59] cfr Socrates, Sém VIII

- Lacan as supervisor of Safouan
  - Case
    - patient where absence of doubt causes panic
    - Safouan is baffled
    - Lacan's intervention: anxiety is the answer to the desire of the Other as all to well known (*désir de l'Autre en tant que su*)[60]
  - Supervision = superanalysis
    - Safouan's transference more on Lacan than on his training analyst Schlumberger
    - analytical position personified by supervisor and not by training analyst - supervision is more analysis than training analysis - desire of supervisor as the strongest expression of desire of the analyst = desire to take advantage of the situation (*désir de saisir l'occasion, affirmé au plus haut point du côté de l'analyste contrôleur*, Safouan asks Lacan: "do I take advantage of this opportunity to go further with the analysis of my transference?"
    - Supervisor analyses transferences and countertransferences of the analyst supervised, who's subjective division by the transferential demand (*Demande*) of his patient appears in a kind of message on the message saying "maybe I was wrong" (*message sur le message: "je me trompais peut-être"*) - supervisor analyses the subjective division that had not been remarked in training analysis (*non marqué par la barre*)
    - Analytical position as exemplified by the supervisor is the complete subjective division, it is not the position of the object (a) (in this discussion on supervision the younger generation already opposes this object-position to the 'perfect hysteria' of Safouan).
- Freedom of the supervisor

  His response has to be adapted to the cases (*réponses diversifiées à la mesure de la particularité*)
  - Irony (example of the guru)
  - silence when supervised attributes his problems to his own 'taste' or 'character' (= acting out?)
  - proposing alternative interpretations where supervised has 'blind spots' and can himself tolerate this interpretation

    case:
    - impotent man: fantasises fellatio with standing man
    - Safouan: "this is me, as your brother"
    - Lacan: "scene of fantasy is not limited to two characters, I'm also present" (supervisor as 'third' in every supervised cure[61])
- relationship *passe* and supervision
  - unfortunately mostly supervision starts before the *passe*, not yet an analyst (of the School)
  - disillusion in the *passe*:
    - through his *passe* Lacan had hoped that the analyst would be able to say 'someting new with regard to desire and love', passants as making new theory
    - Safouan regrets that *passe* did not make the analyst an *érotologue*, all he has to say about love and desire remains within oedipal limits, and so it's still the poets who have to teach us something new
    - maybe analysis did not advance in EFP, but it still exists thanks to Lacan, while everywhere else

[60] cfr lack of the lack (*manque qui manque*, Sém X), cfr Freud supervising Breuer does not take away Breuer's feeling of guilt, but only his anxiety (*il ne le déculpabilise pas, il le désangoisse*, Sém XI, p. 144)

[61] cfr droom Didier-Weill

analysis is dead

- hope in supervision:
  - finding 'the new' in therapeutic cures, where a slow but constantly recurring breaking away from the common (therapeutic) ideals has to take place (*controle se justifie dans son principe au-delà des limites des analyses que nous menons à l'heure actuelle* als *une rupture lente, toujours renouvelée avec tout ce qui se niche dans le discours universel comme idéaux*)
  - the creators of theory remain the supervisors

Brigitte Chardin[62]

- passe and supervision
  - Supervision is the necessary answer to the lonely truth of the desire of the analyst in the *passe* (*vérité où s'affirme dans la solitude le d d'analyste)*
  - Modification of the relation to the fantasy, symbolic knowledge does not cover any longer the real of truth – institutional obligation of supervision restores knowledge on the level of the supervisor (*infatuation narcissique du savoir*)
  - Proposes new term *contrôlant*, which has become generally accepted (analogy with *analysant* and *passant*)
- Two sides of supervision
  - Signifier
    'Third position' or 'distance' of supervisor allows him to dectect the double entendre of the signifier (*écho multivoque[63]*)
    Object, the voice[64]
    - supervision reveals the voice (*voix*) as central object –voice of training analyst as last support for division of the subject (*problématique subjective*)
    - End of training analysis as 'fading' of the voice of training analyst - at that point the newborn analyst identifies with this lost voice and starts speaking with 'his master's voice (*voix du maître*) - cfr the typical deep sighs of the 'Lacanian' – supervision forces the analyst to speak with his own voice[65]

[62] Brigitte Chardin, Les limites de la cure, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 225-232.
[63] cfr *subjectivité seconde* and *équivoque* in our treatment of Lacan's ideas on supervision.
[64] We have seen how Lacan was irritated by the silence of analysts in their cures, they should have the courage to speak … with their own voice.
[65] cfr Balint on the problem of these identifications with the training analyst in supervision.

Eric Porge[66]

- Supervision should not check the already existing theory (*controle d'une théorie déjà inventée*) but should lead to the invention of a new theorie that has to be checked (*invention d'une théorie à contrôler*)
- Demand for supervision (*Demande de controle*) answers a double unbearable (*insupportable*) for the analyst in his own *passe*:
  - that in the beginning his analysant loves him on a false basis, because in his transference he supposes him to know (*Sujet supposé Savoir*) – with the background of the experience of the fall of the SSS in his own training analyst the analyst feels like an impostor (*imposteur*)
  - that at the end of the transference of his analysant he will be rejected, his *désêtre* as object (a)
- etymology
  controle comes from *contre rôle,* which is a double record (*registre tenu en double*)
- Supervision is not analysis of training analysis – nevertheless supervised in position of analysant, and supervisor in position of analyst (*la relation entre le patient et le thérapeute est réfléchie comme en miroir dans la relation entre le thérapeute et le superviseur*), supervisor has to reveal the desire of the supervised analyst and the desire of his patient behind his demand for supervision
- The voice as object of supervision
  - The drift that makes necessary supervision is the invocative drift, supervision allows sublimation of this drift (*la pulsion rendant nécessaire le controle serait la pulsion invocante, la spécificité du controle serait de permettre la sublimation de cette pulsion invocante (objet d'intérêt public, élève l'objet de la voix à la dignité de la chose),* supervision gives the analyst his own voice instead of the identification with 'his master's voice'
  - Responsibility of analyst (as a voice)
    - He has to say something to his patient (*il doit répondre au pt*), for instance *"Rien, peut-être?"*[67]
    - He's answerable to the supervisor for what he does with his patien (*il doit répondre au contrôleur de ce qu'il fait avec le patient*)
    - the course of the drift (*trajet pulsionnel):* to hear a patient (*entendre un pt*) – making oneself be heard by the supervisor (*se faire entendre du contrôleur*)

[66] Eric Porge, Essai de théorisation sur le contrôle, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 233-237.
[67] Sém IX: "rien, peut-être" – "peut-être rien".

Alain Didier-Weill[68]

- becoming analyst in the passe (*devenant analyste sur le divan*) – being analyst in supervision (*devenu analyste dans le controle*)
- case of supervision:
  - transference analysant:
    "how can you guarantee me that you're not an impostor?"
  - countertransference analyst:
    - wants to prove that he's not an impostor (*pris dans ce transfert*)
    - inhibited by a shame to have a look at his analysant (*honte de regarder, ne s'autorise pas à ce droit de regard*)
  - transferential dream analysant:
    on a train without ticket – ticket inspector (*contrôleur*) with penetrating gaze (*regard perçant*) – feelings of shame (*honte*), at loss for words, tong-tied (*défaillance de la parole, rien à dire*)
    analysant dreams in the place of his analyst, analyst could have dreamt the same dream (*analysant rêve à la place de son analyste, l'analyste aurait pu faire le meme rêve*)
  - turning point transference:
    analyst should be subject-supposed-to-know, like the supervisor (ticket inspector):
    - who wants him to confess the truth (*exige qu'on avoue la vérité*)
    - who's entitled to a look (*droit de regard*) leading to the reveleation of the subject's division
    - who cannot be deceived - fear of deceiving his analyst truth is bound to come out through lies (*révélation de la division … vérité par le mensonge, peur de ne pas être mis en cause par son analyste et de le tromper*)
    - who does not play games, does not fall back on apriori given rules that banish all non sense (*règle du jeu grâce à laquelle tout non-sens est banni*), this means staking out the field of non sense where the speech of the analysant originates (*cerner la zone d'absurde et de non sens d'où la parole de l'analysant doit s'originer*) – supervision teaches the 'art' of analysing with one's desire, without hidden countertransferential rules (*art de l'analyste*)
  - analyst in supervision:
    - hears double meaning of signifier *contrôleur* (ticket inspector - supervisor) the moment he relates dream to supervisor, in his transference on supervisor (*je n'ai entendu le signifiant 'contrôleur' qu'à l'instant même où je parlais de ce rêve au contrôleur = transfert de l'analyste*)
    - supervision when analyst feels guilty of his imposture as subject-supposed-to-know - has not to be ashamed of being an 'impostor', because he really is one with regard to the *SSS* (*parce que l'analyste doit pouvoir inventer le lien d'articulation entre pratique et théorie qu'il peut ne pas avoir à rougir de honte s'il est mis en question comme imposteur … honte quand se dévoile au regard du SSS qu'il fait semblant, qu'il ne croît pas à ce qu'il fait*)
    - invention of 'link' between practice and theory
- desire supervisor:
  same atopia (*pas repérable*) as desire analyst, not directed by a hidden rule, eg "be like me, a member of this institution" (*soutenir l'institution*)

[68] Alain Didier-Weill, Du controle et du s'autoriser, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 238-245.

Michel SILVESTRE[69]

- change in logical 'statute' of supervision:
  from possibilty (*possible*) to necessity (*nécessaire*)
- etymology:
  - *rôle*
    - roll to insribe a name (*où l'on s'inscrit*)
    - trace of an important event or word (*trace de quelque événement ou parole importants*)
    - part or role, personified by an actor (*appris par coeur, il l'incarne*)
  - *contre rôle* = double of a register (*registre qu'on tenait en double*)
  - *contre* = against, analyst and supervisor face each other (*se regardent*) + *rôle* = what the analysant says is a teaching (*enseignement*)
- supervision as a relationship with the Other analyst
  - *passe*, with the fall (*désêtre*) of the training analyst and the selfauthorisation of the new analyst (*ne s'autorise que de lui-même*)
  - new analyst is not the only analyst, supervisor as first Other analyst (*comme analyste il n'est pas l'unique ni le premier, il y a quelque part un autre analyste*) – demand for supervision out of curiosity for the Other analyst (*Demande de controle par curiosité, pour voir comment s'est fait un analyste*) – surprise that one can identify with this Other analyst, in spite of different ways of operating, one can only be an analyst by varying from the Other analyst, the Other is equal in his difference (*surprise qu'il s'y reconnaisse, même a contrario, dans un "moi je ne fais pas comme cela", on ne peut se compter un qu'à différer de l'Autre, c'est de l'Autre analyste qu'il va falloir différer* – one must be carefull not to idealize this difference as the essence (*être*) of the analyst
- supervision as a relationship with the analysant
  - analysant is the real supervisor (in the sense of 'control')
  - difficulties with the transference of the analysant
    - fear of transference, of the desire behind the demand: "why me? Why is he doing this to me?" (*c'est à moi que l'analysant a adressé sa Demande d'analyse et c'est moi qui ai à en supporter le désir*)
    - fantasies stage a relationship between analysant and supervisor (passing on the Demand and the desire of the analysant)
    - difficult to transmit the discourse of the analysant to the supervisor (*de son analysant il n'en dit pas ce qu'il veut*, *opacité d'une cure*), especially the points of transference-resistance where the analyst himself is implied or represented eg in transference dreams (*il y est pour quelque chose, il y est représenté, présence masquée dans les dires de son analysant = effet, marque de transfert, cfr rêves de transfert*) – supervision has to make the analyst aware of all the transference on his person (*éclairer sa lanterne d'analyste*)

[69] Michel Silvestre, S'en tenir au controle, Lettres de l'EFP, 1975, 16, pp. 246-253.

- supervision as a relationship of the analyst with himself
  - he relates his interventions (as far as he remembers them), and discovers that he does not really know how he invented them, they came to him like a lapsus[70] *il se surprend à ne plus du tout savoir d'où ça lui est venu, ça lui a échappé*)
  - supervision discovers (*mise à jour*) and deciphers (*déchiffrement*) such symptoms of the analyst (*difficultés lui reviennent comme symptôme*)
  - these new 'symptoms' in supervision do not necessarily impose to resume the training analysis
    - supervision does not pursue an ideal of 'doing well' (*bien faire*) or 'perfectioning the training analysis' (*parfaire l'analyse de l'analyste*), analyst not in the position of master
    - the analyst expects from supervision that it will efface his present in the cure, nevertheless this presence is necessary: this is the paradox of the semblance of the object in the cure (*effacement de lui-même qu'il vient assurer auprès du contrôleur constitue cependant la trace nécessaire de la place de l'analyste qu'il soutient auprès de son analysant – le maintien de ce paradoxe lui confirme que c'est en analyste qu'il parle*)
- supervision as a relationship with science (knowledge)
  - making theory in supervision, but who makes this theory: supervisor, supervised analyst, patients?
  - Freud advised against theoretical elaboration during the cure itself, writing is second to speech - nevertheless without writing it is impossible to reflect on the effect of speech (*écrit est second par rapport au langage, néanmoins sans l'écrit il n'est d'aucune façon possible de revenir à questionner l'effet de langage*)
  - Supervision as practice of the theory, allows the discourse of the analysant to create new theory (*pratique de la théorie par quoi seulement la parole de l'analysant peut produire de la théorie*) – cfr Freud as *scribe* of the hysteric, rewriting his theory after the discourse of his patients, Freud was supervised by his own writings
  - supervision realises the (theoretical) inscription of the cure – but the possibility of inscription is limited, not everything of a cure can be inscribed (*limite de cette inscriptibilité*) – this limit makes supervision necessary (*nécessaire*)

[70] Like a hysterical lapsus or like an indifferent ready-made as with Duchamp?

Anoniem SCILICET [71]

- IPA = logic of the multiple (*multiple*)
  - Supervision as control of influence of training analyst on new analysts – ideal of neutrality of analyst, without countertransference (= transference on training analyst)
  - Insititutional aim of progression in hierarchy
  - Medical paradigm of supervisor
    - Supervisor relieves training analyst (*analyste de relais*) analysing countertransference
    - Educator, tutor
    - Protector of patient, relieves supervised analyst when necessary (*protecteur du malade*)
    - Defender of respectability of institution
  - Guarantee of the identity of analyst (ideal)
    - "Do like the rest of us", common *savoir faire* becomes the standard – analysts form an ensemble (*ensemble*) on the basis of a common attribute (*attribut commun*), a common 'pattern'
    - supervision 'checks' whether required attributes are present

- Logic of the One (*l'Un*)[72]
  - Analyst refuses institutionalisation of supervision - he even refuses supervision in itself, out of fear of becoming dependent again on an analyst – after fall of his training analyst, no recognition whatsoever of another analyst, only position towards an analyst is position of analysant
  - Transference of analysant as only guarantee for analyst
    - In classical institution analyst is authorized by some master (supervisor) – for Lacan analyst should authorize himself on the basis of his own training analysis (*passe*) – here the analyst authorizes himself on the basis of the transference of his analysants,"I have analysants who love/hate me, so I must be an analyst"
    - Quantity (therapeutical success) and quality (a patient becoming analyst himself[73]) of patients guarantee that one is an analyst
    - Does not want to be *dupe*[74] of hysterical discourse of analysant nor of his own analytical discourse
    - Transference is not enough to 'make' an analyst - cfr common fear of débutante to be an impostor: in his transference the analysant is mistaken about the analyst (SSS) - cfr Fliess was not Freud's analyst despite Freud's transference on him)

[71] Anonymous, D'un discours (hystérique) à l'autre (analytique), l'institution dite du controle, Scilicet, 1976, 6/7, pp. 204-222.
[72] Cfr *anarlyste*, in the words of Jacques-Alain Miller.
[73] To some extent this was also Lacan's idea.
[74] Les non dupes errent, those who think they are not the dupe, err.

- EFP = logic of the School and the *passe*
  - Supervision as opportunity to learn analytical metier (*métier*)
  - desinstitutionalisation of supervision, refusing external obligation
  - supervision corresponds to internal necessity at end of training analysis – freedom of choice of moment for supervision (not necessarily at end of training analysis) and of supervisor (not necessarily a senior analyt (*ancien*)) – this freedom explains rumour that supervision is abolished in EFP
  - supervision not of analyst, but of the analysis[75]
    - Analyst cannot bear his being foreclosed, his final *désêtre* or his tiny existence as object (a) in the discourse of the analysant (*place de rejet … ce peu d'existence que lui confère sa place dans la* cure) – he cannot bear being the dupe of the discours of his analysant and of his own analytical discourse
    - In a reaction to this 'unbearable lightness of his being' *il se trouve dans l'impossibilité d'en rester là*) he cannot help
      - interpreting, in order to manifest himself as non-dupe, analyst always want to have the last word (= countertransference of his own ideals and prejudices)
      - diving into several forms of 'work' with colleagues (*se précipiter dans une de ces multiples formes de 'travail' où ils confrontent leur expériences*)
        - scientific writing
        - supervision guarantees that the analyst can bear repeating his passe in every cure, that he can continue to bear his position of dupe of the discourse of his analysant and of his own discourse

- Freudian paradigm for supervision in Freud's first analyses
  - Freud's dialectics
    - Invention of psychoanalytic discourse in response to, as dupe of hysterical discourse (infantile sexual theories) – first hysteria and second psychoanalysis
    - Hysterical discourse only 'heard' in the psychoanalytic discourse – first psychoanalysis and second hysteria as a discourse (in former days hysteria was only a 'disease')
  - Breuer as first analyst (Anna O)
    - Breuer tells his wife of his troubles with Anna O - her 'supervision' fixes him in his hysterical position towards Anna's being in love with him
    - Breuer tells Freud of his 'analysis' with Anna, Breuer as first analyst immediately seeks supervision (*première relation d'une analyse est liée à un premier controle*) – Freud's supervision supports Breuer in his scientific interest (*soutenu dans son intérêt scientifique*) and also "he does not take away his guilt feelings, but only his anxiety"[76]
  - Freud's first analyses
    Supervised by his own writings (*écrit*) and his future readers

- Lacanian paradigm in his analysis of Poe's "Purloined letter"
  - analyst = policeman - illusion of mastery, blinded by his position in the discourse of the analysant

[75] cfr *pas de formation de l'analyste, mais des formations de l'inconscient* – which is a pun on the French word *formation* meaning both 'education' and 'formation'
[76] cfr Lacan, Sém XI, p. 144: *il ne le déculpabilise pas, mais assurément il le désangoisse*

(*maîtrise, placé au lieu d'aveuglement constitué par le discours du patient*)

- supervisor = detective Dupin – 'sees' that the thief is a poet and mathematician and that the letter has to be found in relation to that subject's fantasy (*peut voir l'essentiel, que le ministre voleur est poète et mathématicien et que la lettre ne peut être trouvée que dans son rapport au sujet qui le détient, c'est-à-dire dans son fantasme*)
- Becoming an analyst (*passe*) is the mutation from policeman to detective Dupin (*devenir analyste c'est se transformer de préfet en Dupin*) – which means taking the position of the supervisor[77]
- Supervisor = narrator of the story, the scribe who only asks questions in order to establish that the story (of the cure, by the supervised analyst) stands the test (*narrateur … scribe qui n'est là et ne pose de questions que pour constater que l'histoire tient debout*) – the possibility of interpretation (by the analyst) depends on the existence of an unalterable initial 'writing', the 'letter' (= the holy text of the first, wild interpretation by the symptomatic discourse of the analysant) (*seul l'écrit, le texte initial intact s'offre à l'interprétation – l'interprétation de l'analyste laisse la possibilité d'autres interprétations, laisse intact, avec un statut d'écrit ce que l'analysant a apporté lui-même avec sa propre interprétation*) – supervision guarantees that the interpretation by the analysant (in his symptoms) will not get 'repressed' or completely substituted by the analyst's interpretations (that is for instance the case when transference is 'translated' as a simple repetition of a particular oedipal history) and that the analysant's interpretation remains enigmatic to the analysant himself

[77] 'the second subjectivity' of Lacan in 1953.

VI

ECOLE DE LA CAUSE FREUDIENNE

1. ECF criticism on supervision in EFP

In 1980 Lacan dissolved the EFP. Jacques-Alain Miller, Colette Soler, Eric Laurent, Michel Silvestre and some other disciples of Lacan founded the "Ecole de la Cause freudienne". This school was adopted by Lacan before his death. Shortly after its foundation the ECF held a 'Forum', in order to discuss the problems in the EFP: in the first place the *passe* of course, but also "Le controle et la pratique analytique". At the start of a new Lacanian institution supervision ("who will supervise?") is always a crucial point. At that time Serge André, Gérard Miller and, to a lesser extent, Guy Clastres were the first to get up to speak on supervision in a way that promised well for the future. But a little later José Guey rather viciously criticised the anonymous article in "Scilicet", and introduced a new confusion between training analysis and supervision.

Serge ANDRE[78]

- starting problem ECF
  - veterans, dignitaries (*notables*) or experienced disciples of Lacan (*élèves expérimentés*) have gone
    - interruption supervisions
    - with whom to start new supervision?
  - no Lacanian theory of supervision, only a cry for desinstitutionalisation
- what was supervised in the EFP?
  - To unravel impasses of débutante (*dénouer les impasses que le jeune psychanalyste rencontre* = *Analysenkontrolle*), supervision of analysant of supervised analyst
  - To discover the unanalysed (*renvoyer à un inanalysé* = *Kontrollanalyse*) – unfortunately more often than not this makes débutante resume his training analysis … with supervisor whose experience guarantees that this time analysis will be complete and the *passe* will be no problem (*reprise de sa propre analyse … sur le divan du contrôleur qui offre la garantie de son expérience au déroulement moins aventureux d'une passe … assimiler le controle et la passe*) – finally this boils down to 'supervision' of training analyst (*controle de l'analyste et de son didacticien*)
- Supervision as demand for knowledge (*demande de savoir*) in EFP
  - Analytical s*avoir faire*
  - Psychiatric knowledge (master)
  - Stage of a training (university)
- Who supervised in EFP?
  - Well known psychiatric disciples of Lacan (é*lève-psychiatre connu de Lacan*) –analysts with a 'surplus' (psychiatrist, professor, artist, educationalist, etc) as prothesis for the lack (*désêtre*) of the training analyst in the *passe* – recognition by this supervisor guarantees a place in the institution (*reconnu par ce contrôleur … aidera à prendre place dans l'institution*)
  - Sneaky restoration of the category of training analysts (*réinstaurer par la bande la catégorie du didacticien*), now the analyst is not the product of the passe, but the product of the experience of the supervisor (*expérience mise au service de la direction de la cure*)[79]
- Effects of supervision in the EFP*?*
  - On the supervisor
    Not known (*personne n'a jamais fait connaître ce que serait l'enjeu du point de vue du contrôleur*) – 'makes' theory, consolidates the 'surplus', supervises training analysts, …
  - On the cure
    Mysterious miracle (*doctrine du miracle très difficile à formuler*)
  - On the supervised
    - Relief or escalation of feelings of guilt (*soulagement ou accentuation de la culpabilité*)
    - Capacity to resume his role in the transference (*plaisir ou réassurance de pouvoir de nouveau 'faire un transfert'*)

[78] Serge André, Réflexions sur le controle, Actes du Forum de l'Ecole de la Cause freudienne (28 and 29 March 1981), pp. 9-11.
[79] cfr G. Miller against experience

- Development of 'scientific' knowledge about supervision in ECF
  - supervision divides the analyst as a subject (*sujet divisé du controle*)
    - in the cure the analyst is an object (*objet a*) - as such he's the symptom of the subject, the symptom of the cure (comme *sujet qui se prête à une analyse, le psychanalyste en devient le symptôme*)
    - in supervision the analyst becomes a subject (*sujet 'hystérique'*) – the cure can become his symptom (*symptôme du sujet psychanalyste*) – resuming the training analysis with the supervisor is a bad solution at that point, because it hides the horror of the act (*horreur de l'acte*) by bridging the gap between the cure as a symptom of the analyst as a subject and the analyst as a symptom of the cure (*reprise de l'analyse (avec contrôleur)* is slechte oplossing, *referme la béance ouverte entre le symptôme du sujet psychanalyste et le psychanalyste comme symptôme*)
  - dialectics with four
    - analysant becomes analyst via passe, by traversing the fantasy (*traversée du fantasme*)
    - analyst becomes supervised via symptom
    - but how does the supervised become a supervisor?
  - Object of supervision

    Supervision verifies whether there's an analyst or not in a particular cure (*ce qu'il y a à contrôler, c'est qu'il y a ou non psychanalyste*) – *passe* establishes passage from analysant to analyst (to be analyst), but it still has to be checked how someone maintains himself in this position when another (analysant) asks for it (how to be an analyst)(*passe met à jour passage de l'analysant à l'analyste, reste à vérifier comment cette position du psychanalyste peut être tenu vis à vis du sujet qui nous demande de nous y tenir*) – supervision verifies how the analytical discourse comes about in a particular cure *(vérifier l'avènement du discours analytique*) - cfr Porge: supervision defines the responsibility of the analyst (*délimitation du responsabilité de l'analyste*)
  - Means for supervision

    Subject-supposed-to-know and experience are not enough

Gérard MILLER[80]

- Starting situation ECF
  Veterans (*anciens*) are gone – debate on supervision has become possible
- History
  - First supervision of Breuer's Anna O by Freud
  - No written traces of historical IPA-discussions on supervision [81]
  - Lacan himself only very rarely written comments
- Lacan in EFP: desinstitutionalisation = 'two liberties'
  - Free choice of timing of supervision
  - Free choice of supervisor
- Reason to demand for supervision (*Demande de controle*)
  The most common feeling in an analyst, the fear of being an impostor in the transference (*le plus commun des sentiments analytiques, celui de l'imposture* tov *transfert*) - cfr Freud who cannot believe his place in the transference ("how did I deserve this love?") (*Freud incrédule, se refusant de croire au transfert … "qu'ai je fait pour mériter cela?"*) – analyst examines the legitimacy of his intrusions in the discourse of the analysant (*s'interroger sur la légitimité de ses intrusions dans le discours de l'autre*) [82]
- Types of supervision
  - ECF supervision tries to keep alive this worry about being an impostor in the transference (*maintient vivace cette inquiétude, ce sentiment de l'imposture*)
  - IPA supervision tries to reassure and to recognize the supervised as an analyst in an atmosphere of mutual complicity (*assurance, reconnaissance, complicité, "vous en êtes un, j'en suis un autre", copropriétaires de la PA*)
- Training analysts blocked the possiblity of an analytical supervision in the EFP
  - Desinstutionalisation did not work because the category of training analysts remained intact, supervision of supervision by the veterans (*controle du controle par les anciens*)
  - Balint: reform of supervisions leads to a confrontation with training analysts, with the older generation
  - Training analyst functions as substitute (*analyste de relais*), educator (*enseignant*) and protector (*protecteur)* and offers three guarantees: age, experience, place in the institution – but this are false guarantees, because the practice of analysis perverts analysts (*la pratique de la PA pervertit les analystes*) – as a result Lacan only was interested in the analyst on the basis of his own training analysis (*passe*, AE or Analyst of the School) and not so much on the basis of his practical experience (supervision, AME or Analyst Member of the School)

[80] Gérard Miller, Les deux libertés et les trois garanties, Actes du Forum de l'Ecole de la Cause freudienne (28 and 29 March 1981), pp. 11-12.

[81] Cfr Balint – and also my own experience with the reticence of ECF-dignitaries to answer my questions for more information on supervision in the ECF (Jean-Jacques Gorog, Marie-Hélène Brousse, with the exception of Colette Soler).

[82] After my own analysis I also had difficulties with the legitimacy of transference as the basis of my interventions.

Guy CLASTRES[83]

- The débutante seeks a support in the imaginary, a complicity of the supervisors that leads to an evasion (*esquive*) of the position of object (a) - cfr horror of the act (*horreur de l'acte*)
- Solution is the reintroduction of supervision in the proces of training analysis (during training analysis or at the endi of it, starting from the *passe*?)

DEBATE ECF[84]

Emphasis on the imaginary effects of recognition via supervision

- Eric LAURENT
  The passe can turn upside down supervision (*la passe peut bouleverser le controle*), we have to look at supervision from the viewpoint of the *passe*
- Nathalie THEVES
  Supervision can favour the love of descent or extraction (*amour pour une filiation*)
- François LEBOVITS
  Emphasis on the *passe* (with desire of analyst) instead of supervision (with desire of analysant) accounts for the loss of clinical casestudies (*raréfaction de la relation de cas à cause de l'accent mis sur le désir de l'analyste*)
- Patrick VALAS
  Lacan's analysis of "The purloined Letter" as paradigm for supervision

[83] Guy Clastres, Sur l'entrée dans la pratique, Actes du Forum de l'Ecole de la Cause freudienne (28 and 29 March 1981), pp. 15-16.

[84] Discussion "Le controle et a pratique analytique", Actes du Forum de l'Ecole de la Cause freudienne (28 and 29 March 1981), pp.16.

José GUEY[85]

- Viewpoints on supervision
  - Analysant: not the ego, but the discourse
  - Analyst: *pas de formation de l'analyste, mais des formations de l'inconscient* (the already mentioned pun on the French *formation*)
- Supervision starting with a demand (*Demande de controle*)
  - When agression (negative transference) of the analysant threatens to end analysis, agression that often preludes the start of hysterical discourse (*tendance agressive risque de provoquer la fermeture du progrès du discours … s'origine du discours d'un patient sur le point au moins de tourner au discours hystérique*)
  - Demand addressed to an analyst, consequently supervision is analysis (*ce qu'on peut attendre d'un analyste n'est rien d'autre qu'une psychanalyse*):
    - Narcissism of the supervised obliges the supervisor to mobilize the agressive tendency[86] in his demand
    - Free association
    - 'Supplement' of training analysis, but it does not complete training analysis (s*upplément, surcroît d'analyse, en plus qui ne complète ni ne supplée*)– this new confusion between supervision and training analysis is in the vein of Ferenczi[87]
    - In his 'supervisions' of his followers Freud limited himself to fatherly advice in order to spare them this 'hysterisation' (he did not want to give them a supplement of training analysis)
- Criticisme on the EFP (anonymous article in "Scilicet")
  Rather vicious criticism on:
  - Desinstitutionalisation with rumours of supervision being abolished – a School should take into account these rumours as a form of external supervision
  - *Passe* or becoming an analyst = becoming Dupin = identification with the ego of the training analyst
  - Supervisor = narrator, scribe
  - Freud as the first supervisor, of Breuer

[85] José Guey, Du controle, Analytica, 1984, 35, pp. 95-101.

[86] I recall that, in the second stage of Lacan's supervision, this 'agression' often was very prominent.

[87] Cfr Gennie Lemoine infra.

2. Some ladies try to develop a new conception of supervision[88]

Eugénie LEMOINE-LUCCIONI[89]

- new term: 'dialyse' instead of supervision
  'dialyst' (supervisor) functions as a kind of semipermeable skin or film, the result is the reorganisation of the text of the 'dialysant' (supervised) according to the holes of the countertransference of the 'dialyst' (*passoire que l'écoute du dialyste interpose de par son propre contre-transfert … nouveau texte redistribué selon la disposition des trous*)
- Analyst not only auto-authorizes himself, but he's also authorized by … some others who establish this auto-authorization (a*nalyste ne s'autorise que de lui-même* (analytische act) *… et de quelques autres (qui en prennent acte*) – supervisor (freely chosen on a transferential basis) is a privileged Other: he has to strip the desire of the analyst off the fantasy of recognition or guarantee, at the occasion of a particular case (*dégager le d de l'analyste d'un fantasme de reconnaissance ou de garantie, à l'occasion d'un cas précis*)
- In supervision the analyst becomes again an analysant
  - supervision is a second (training) analysis, allowing to speak about the first as the original one; nevertheless, as Lacan says, the truly original one is the second (supervision) (*dialyse fait fonction de seconde analyse et permet de parler d'une première analyse comme de l'analyse originelle, alors que la vraie originelle c'est la seconde dit Lacan, c'est-à-dire la dialyse*)
  - structure:
    - failure of love in first (training) analysis, with subjective destitution (*ratage de l'amour lors d'une première analyse & destitution subjective de l'analyste*)
    - reprise of failed analysis in supervision, focused on particular case, analyst also destituted as subject-supposed-to-know by his own analysant (*dialyse comme reprise de l'analyse articulée sur un cas particulier & analysant se destitue en outre comme Sujet supposé Savoir par son analysant*)[90]
- Commission of supervision in ECF
  - Supervisors should deposit written documents in order to substantiate the attribution of the title of Analyst Member of the Schoo (*AME*) the analyst who has proved himself (*ayant fait ses preuves*)
  - Title of *AME* guarantees that an analyst did several supervisions
  - Supervision guarantees
    - That an analyst has respected the real in several cures
    - That the desire of the analyst has been effective (*opérant*) in several cures - in the *passe* this desire is not effective, not at work
    - That an analyst has functioned as an analyst in the hysterical transference
    - Impossible to say "I am an analyst", at the very most one can 'behave himself' like an analyst – and this is what a School can guarantee (*impossible d'être analyste, de se dire analyste, on peut tout juste faire l'analyste, et c'est ce que l'école garantit*)

[88] Whereas theory about the end of training analysis seems to be a 'male affair', theory of supervision seems to be more of a 'female affair'. In any case, the number of women who have contributed to the theory of supervision is much higher than the number of men. Could this be one of the psychoanalytical versions of the 'war between the sexes'?

[89] Eugénie Lemoine-Luccioni, La garantie et le désir de l'analyste, Analytica, 1985, 41, pp. 77-87.

[90] Cfr supplement of training analysis, according to Guey.

Daniele SILVESTRE[91]

Supervision

- demand of the analyst, as an effect of the passe
- obligation of the institute that has to guarantee that an analyst has been formed by this institution (*l'institution a le devoir de garantir qu'un analyste relève de sa formation*)
- demand of the analyst is more important than the obligation of the institute (*controle relève du choix de l'analyste avant que de l'obligation réglementée par l'institition*)

[91] Danièle Silvestre, Le controle institutionalisé: deux voies, Ornicar?, 1987, 42, pp. 103-107 (this article gives a good summary of the articles of Helen Deutsch and Vilma Kovacs, mentioned above.

Colette SOLER[92]

- JAMiller claims the inspiration for Soler's views: "on some points she's so close to what I have said that I could countersign her article" ("*si proche est-elle sur un ou deux points de ce que j'ai dit là-dessus que je pourrais contresigner son article"*)[93]
- Demand for supervision
  Everywhere unasked-for supervision by the Other
  two possible answers:
  - Institutionalisation of this unasked-for supervision by the Other – as a condition for the authorization (*agrément*) to start practice, obligatory stage in training-scheme
  - No institutionalisation of this unasked-for supervision by the Other - this creates a demand for supervision (*s'impose à l'analyste ou nulle instance ne lui impose*)
    - This demand for supervision is explained by the structure of the analytical discourse (*passe*)
    - This demand for supervision is directed by transference - it addresses an analyst, who has made a name for himself and who can answer (*s'adresse à quelqu'un, spécifiable d'un nom propre et qui peut répondre*) - cfr Freud for his first disciples - cfr Lacan in his School after the abolition of all procedures of authorization to practice (*procédure d'agrément préalable à l'exercice de la PA*)
      - On the one hand, in the transference, the supervisor is supposed to know (*transfert lui impute le savoir*) and he's trusted to act according the analytical ethic (*confiance, espère qu'il ne dérogera pas à l'éthique de son discours*)
      - But on the other hand there's also a split in the subject-supposed-to-know of the transference, supervised knows that he will not relieve of the responsibiliyt of the analytical act (*faille du Sujet supposé Savor, on sait qu'il ne allègera pas de l'acte*)

[92] Colette Soler, Quel controle?, Ornicar?, 1987, 42, pp. 108-113.

[93] Jacques-Alain Miller, Liminaire "Nous?", Ornicar?, 1987, 42, pp. 5-6. This seems to be one of the very first expressions of the problems between Miller and Soler, that finally would finally come to a head in the 'flame wars' on internet in 1998-1999. See also note 88.

- The Other supervision = another relation with knowledge
  - Etymology
    contre rôle = double of a register that makes possible the verification of the first, second operation with regard to a given standard measure (*registre tenu en double qui permet la vérification du premier, opération seconde*)
  - But in psychoanalysis there's no given standard measure
    No universal analyst (*universelle du psychanalyste*), The Analyst does not exist[94] - the analytical act or position is outside the Other, the symbolic, the knowledge of the Other: "I am where I do not know" (*l'acte que l'A laisse en blanc*)
  - How to verify that 'there's analyst' (*il y a du psychanalyste*) when the analyst cannot be compared with a given standard – we need a logic that permits verification of the way the analyst incarnates the unknown side of the Other, the object (*logique qui permet d'explorer ce qui de l'Autre ne se sait pas et que l'analyste incarne: a*) – this can be done in two ways:
    - Directly, in the procedure of the *passe*, as a verification of the analytical act through its agent, as object a, as destituted subject (*vise l'acte analytique en son agent*, *destitution subjective*)
    - Indirectly, in supervision, as a verification of the analytical act through the cures, its effects of subjective division and hysterisation in the transference (*vise l'acte analytique par la médiation des cures qui le supposent, par les faits cliniques produits par le travail de transfert*) – this is a paradox: it's not the analysants who make an analyst, nevertheless supervision verifies whether 'there's analyst' for a particular analysant.

[94] Cfr The Woman does not exist, cfr *pas d'Autre de l'Autre.*

- Supervision and the four discourses
  No free association in supervision – this means that the supervisor does not automatically have to interpret from the analytical position, he's free to choose his discourse (*libéré des contraintes du mode d'interprétation … il a le choix d'élire le discours*) as an answer to the question "what do I have to do?"
  - compliance with the demand
    - discourse of the master
      the supervisor answers with a piece of dogmatic knowledge that implies the well-established whole of analytical knowledge (*trait de doctrine en position d'ordonner l'ensemble du savoir analytique … estampiller en maître le savoir sur le cas*)
    - discourse of te university
      supervisor answers with a complete instruction on the case (*professer sur le cas*)
  - no compliance with the demand
    - discourse of the hysteric
      supervisor answers with a provocation, forcing the supevised to elaborate himself a knowledge on the structure of te case (*provocation à une élaboration de savoir, des repères de structures*, omkering *D*)
    - discourse of the analyst
      - supervisor tries to expose the desire and subjective division of supervised[95], contrary to his analytical position in the cure as an ignorant object (*viser le sujet à son désir … faire du contrôlant un sujet divisé au travail, à l'opposé de la fonction de l'object (ignorant) qu'il est dans son opération d'analyste*)
      - compilation, elaboration and transmission of knowledge
      - verification that each particular case is structured by the analytical discourse (*vérifier à propos de chaque cas dans sa particularité qu'il est ordonné par la structure du discours analytique … limite à ce que l'analyste ne dépasse son acte*) – two sides[96]:
        - interpretation of *équivoques*, of double entendre of the signifier in the unconscious (*ce qui de l'inconscient s'est déchiffré*)
        - handling transference from the position of the object (*ce qui de savoir faire avec le transfert a opéré*)

        respect for the delicate balance between knowledge and the evenly poised attention (*jonction-disjonction entre l'élaboration de savoir et le maintien nécessaire de la docta ignorantia*)
      - ideal of elevating the particularity of each case to a scientific 'writing' (*recueil, élaboration et transmission du savoir … visée idéale d'élever la particularité du cas au mathème*)

[95] Cfr Serge André.

[96] Cfr the distinction we made in the second stage of supervision with Lacan.

3. Some gentlemen trie to link supervision with a guarantee by the School

In the beginning of the nineties the ECF tried to link supervision with a new signifier, the 'guarantee by the School' (*la garantie de l'Ecole*). In this context Jean-Jacques Gorog was the animator of the *"Soirées de la garantie"* ("The evenings of the guarantee")(1991-1992). The ECF made an effort to publish as soon as possible the contributions of Jean-Jacques Gorog himself, Eric Laurent, Jean-Claude Razavet[97] and Colette Soler (her second contribution).

Jean-Jacques GOROG[98]

- for Lacan supervision was important in practice, but he did not institutionalize nor did he theorize it
- supervision establishes a relationship between:
  - supervised (*controlant*) and supervisor
  - supervisor and training analyst of the supervised in order to explore the subjective effects of the speech of analysant (*effets de subjectivation*)
- Variety in supervision
  - Breuer with Anna O
    Freud as supervisor, relieves Breuer as her analyst
  - Father Graf with Hans
    Freud is the analyst, paradoxical position
  - Mimesis of supervision in the cure
    Some patients play the analyst for their own partner, analyze his/her unconscious and not theirs
- Analytical supervision
  - Supervisor does not relieve of the responsibility of the act
  - Supervisor has to have a minimal knowledge of the training analysis of supervised
  - Supervisor addressed as analyst, but does not work as analyst – has a specific role that can be compared to the third person of Freud's theory of the Joke (*plutôt y occupe-t-il une fonction spécifique … Dritte Person in de Witz*)
  - Supervisor verifies presence of desire of the analyst, which is beyond the countertransferential passions of love, hate and ignorance (*vérifie la présence et l'orientation de ce d plus fort que celui de prendre dans ses bras (amour) ou passer par la fenêtre (haine) son analysant*
  - Supervision with training analyst? At that time a heated debate in ECF – Gorog against: we can always spot the the remains of neurotic desire in the analyst as a subject, but that's not the point; supervision tries to expose a desire that is stronger, the desire of the analyst as an object (*on peut toujours reconnaître le névrosé dans celui qui parle d'un autre, mais le controle n'a pas à se régler sur le d du névrosé, mais sur ce d plus fort qui n'a pas d'existence hors de l'object qui le cause … le pas entre analyse et controle est ténu et pourtant décisif*)
  - Supervision determines a link with the School
- timing *D de controle*
  - enthusiasm at the start of practice when assessing the efficacy of psychoanalysis[99]

[97] Jean-Claude Razavet, Le controle comme rectification subjective, Lettre Mensuelle de l'ECF, décembre 1992, 114, pp. 20-22 has already been discussed (in the second stage of supervision with Lacan).

[98] Jean-Jacques Gorog, La pratique du controle dans l'Ecole, Lettre Mensuelle de l'ECF, janvier 1992, 105, pp. 24-26.

[99] For me this was exactly the reason to demand for supervision: I was surprised that I was surprised by the efficacy of psychoanalysis – as if I had never really believed in its efficacy, but I did not remember not believing in it (cfr Freud's 'memory

– disillusion and impossibility of analytical position only appears after some time

disturbance' on the Acropolis).

Colette SOLER[100]

- Answer to my personal letter:
  Supervision should have an institutional function in the problematic relationship of the analyst with the Other analyst (*la problématique relation à l'Autre analyste de la part de l'analyste … le controle en effet a, ou devrait avoir un fonction institutionelle à cet égard*)
- Starting point:
  Supervision by the Other is 'given', unasked-for supervision everywhere: the Other speaks of us (*Autre parle de nous*) – because supervision is inevitable it is to be preferred in its choosen forms (*controle parce qu'il est inévitable devient souhaitable dans ses formes choisies*)
- IPA-supervision:
  - Stage and technique of training (*formation*)
  - 'admitted' training analysts and supervisors (list), represent the power of the institution and orient the transferential choices (*représentants du pouvoir de l'association … orienter les choix transférentiels*)
  - no verifiable knowledge of what a finished analysis means (*aucun savoir vérifiable de ce qu'est une PA* achevée) – every garantuee is imaginary (*fictive*)
  - tries to damp the ferocious transference battles (*tempérer les luttes sauvages de transfert*), especially in the debate between followers of Anna Freud and Melanie Klein) –supervisors should refrain from influencing the transferences of the supervised (*contrôleur digne de ce nom s'abstient de faire peser son influence*) (because in reality they do)
- Lacanian supervision?
  - *Passe* as a direct supervision of the training analysis of the analyst - revealing the secret behind the transference (levée *du secret sur l'opération de transfert*), but only for those who are prepared to do this
  - Supervision as an indirect supervision of the analytical act (based on the fall of the Other, the split in the subject-supposed-to-know) - via its effects in the cure (*résultat au niveau de l'effectivité de la cure*)
  - Places a bet on the desire of every analyst and only relies on transference (*mise sur le d de chacun et on s'en remet au seul transfert*):
    - Free choice of training analyst and supervisor(s)
    - Free choice to do supervision or not
  - Very frequent in practice: institutional obligations do not have to be explicitated in order to function – where there are no obligations transference does the job even better
  - In itself the end of psychoanalysis does not give a basis for a bond or association (*lien*) between analysts, on the contrary it seems to make the mutual recognition of analysts all the more problematic (*la reconnaissance d'un analyste par un autre*) – maybe supervision can found the bond between analysts on the analytical cause itself (*cause analytique*), via:
    - the concept of the School
    - the notion of 'working transference' (*transfert de travail*)

[100] Colette Soler, Le controle avec l'analyste et le lien à l'Ecole, Lettre Mensuelle de l'ECF, décembre 1992, 114, pp. 23-26.

- supervision with one's own training analyst
  Soler is against, because:
  - this reduces the collaboration between analysts to the given transferential bond (*lien transférentiel déjà établi*), monopolization of transference with an effect of closure, fastening (*fermeture*)
  - supervisors are 'different', The Analyst does not exist, there's not a whole of analysts, each analysts supports the analytical act in a particular way, (*contrôleurs différents: aucun n'en vaut un autre, analyste est pas-tout, disparité réelle qui tient à l'être, diffférence dans la façon de supporter l'acte analytique*)
  - *Savoir faire de l'analyste ne s'enseigne pas*, daarvan geen *transmission* in controle
  - Lacan combined both, however, like Freud, Lacan was incommensurable (*hors pair*) – "Do like me, don't imitate me" (*"faites comme moi, ne m'imitez pas"*), and as a matter of fact Lacan did never imitate himself.

Eric LAURENT[101]

- IPA-supervision
  - Supervision of the supervisor – ideal supervisor (twenties)
  - Anne-Marie Sandler (1983) presents a more 'open institute', inspired by the 'Lacanian' Laplanche:
    - No more lists of training analysts and supervisors
    - Analyst has to prove in his own way that he's an analyst (eigen verantwoordelijkheid) = academic version of Lacan's auto-authorization (*analyste ne s'autorise que de lui-même*) without the procedure of the passe – gets round the responsibility of the institution
- Lacanian supervision
  - Supervision as an ethical duty of the School (*devoir éthique*), an answer to the desire to demand for supervision originatiing in the structure of the analytical discourse (*répondre au d de demander de contrôle qui provient de l'intérieur même du discours analytique*)
  - Supervised judge supervisors by their case-studies (*contrôlés jugent les contrôleurs par le travail dont ils peuvent faire publiquement état*)
  - real reason (desire) to demand for supervision only is exposed in a series of supervised cases (*insistance de sa question dans une série de cas*)
  - Supervisor makes sure that supervised:
    - speaks about another subject, and not only about his own subjectivity (*contrôlant parle de quelqu'un d'autre que lui*)
    - does not obstruct to psychoanalysis with his countertransferential prejudices and identifications
    - plays his role as a semblance of the object, being every thing[102] for every subject and being overtaken (passed) by his act that he cannot control (*faire semblant … être toute chose pour tout sujet, être dépassé par son acte dont on n'est pas l'auteur*
    - does not control the cure, but maintains himself as the immobile center around which the signifiers gravitate (*pouvoirs de la cure ne sont pas nôtres, non agir fondamental, être immobile)* – met als gevolg dat *S se déplace, est en mouvement*)

[101] Eric Laurent, Leur controle et le notre, Lettre Mensuelle de l'ECF, décembre 1992, 114, pp. 17-19.
[102] Four things: breast, shit, voice, gaze.

Eric LAURENT[103]
Supervision with Lacan:

- makes the supervised feel to what extent knowledge is articulated in the discourse of the analysant and that it can be transmitted (*faire sentir à quel point le savoir textuel est transmissible et articulé*)
  - he noted beautiful examples of *équivoque* or double entendre (*noter tout ce que le langage comporte de perles*)
  - like Proust in common speech he looked for future citations (*chercher dans le langage le plus quotidien ce qui fait trace de citation*)
- demonstration of (*structure démonstrative*):
  - the results of all kinds of interventions (*recherche que chacun mène pour justifier son action, fût-elle la plus spontanée*)
  - even the most spontaneous intervention has been 'calculated' (*le moins réfléchi se calcule en nous*)
  - requirement of reason (*exigence de raison*)
- teaches *savoir faire* as the semblance of the object, this has to do with experience (*"il faut pour cela beaucoup d'expérience"*)

[103] Eric Laurent, Quatre remarques sur le souci scientifique de Lacan, in: Marie-Pierre de Cossé Brissac and other, Connaissez-vous Lacan?, Seuil, Paris, 1992, pp. 37-46.

Hubert VAN HOORDE[104]

- supervisor in an analytical position or not?
- From training analyst – via supervisor – to the School (forum of colleagues)
- Negative viewpoint:
  Double entendre s*us-père-vision* = a superior overview, sitting on the shoulders of the father
- Positive viewpoint:
  Etymology *controle* = *contra rotulus* = not a double-entry bookkeeping but a copy for verification

Danièle SILVESTRE[105]

- Analyst of the School (*AE*)
  - Demand to become member of the school (*s'autorise de lui-même*)
  - Procedure of the *passe*, on the basis of the end of his own training analysis
  - Recognition remains an internal affair of the School
  - Criterion is a subjective mutation (*mutation subjective*) – not necessary to practice analysis (*ne préjugeant pas de la capacité à la pratique*) – School not limited to clinicians, même les non-cliniciens au contrôle (*non-analyste au controle*)
  - Make theory out of their personal experience of the end of their own analysis (é*aboration doctrinale à partir de leur expérience personelle*)
  - In the EFP a list of AE – no list of AE in ECF, only nominated for 3 years
  - In the EFP these Ae had to pick out *passeurs*
- Analyst Member of the School (*AME*)
  - Title cannot be asked for, nominated by the School
  - Procedure: a Jury (*jury d'accueil,* EFP) or Commission (*commission de la garantie*, ECF) can:
    - ask advise of supervisors (at least two, not the training analyst) about practice
    - inform about quality of work in groups and writings
    - ask for the agreement of the training analyst
    - has to motivate its decisions in a theoretical teaching (*enseignement où ses décisions prennent leur sens* - Rabanel)
  - Guarantee by the School towards the outer world or social field (*responsabiltié Ecole au dehors*) of professional competence and quality in matters of psychoanalysis (*compétence ou qualité professionelle psychanalytique*):
    - that one has proved to be able to sustain a psychoanalytical practice (experience, regularity, duration) (*se maintient dans la pratique … durée, régularité, expérience accumulée … analyste qui a fait ses preuves*)
    - that one has been trained by the School (*relève de la formation que l'Ecole dispense*)
  - no list of AME in ECF

[104] Hubert Van Hoorde, Controle-analyse-controle, Rondzendbrief uit het Freudiaanse veld, 1992, jrg XI, 52, pp. 17-20. As far as I know until now this has been the only publication on supervision in the context of the "Gezelschap voor Psychoanalyse en Psychotherapie". But I also have to mention my own intervention (not published) on supervision "De controle als vraag" ("supervision as a demand"), at the occasion of the "Intercommissiedag" of the "Gezelschap voor psychoanalyse en Psychotherapie" (23 may 1992).

[105] Danièle Silvestre, Quelle garantie hors la passe?, Travaux, Revue de l'ECF, 1992, 20, pp. 22-27.

François LEGUIL[106],[107]

- strict separation between the evaluation of the passe and the evaluation of supervision
  (*exclusive: ceux qui s'occupent de la garantie (controle) ne peuvent en aucune façon participer à la double commission de la passe (cartels) et réciproquement*)
- the title of Analyst Member of the School (*AME*) can only be obtained by doing supervisions with the ECF – with an *AME* or *AE*, or any analyst of the ECF (*AP* = *analyste practicien* or practising analyst)?
  (*nous ne concevons pas que l'on veuille se réclamer de l'Ecole et que l'on s'adresse en controle ailleurs*)
- Passe and title of Analyst of the School (AE) can be obtained on the basis of a training analysis outside the ECF
  (*cures qui ne se sont jamais effectuées chez des analystes de l'ECF*)

[106] En 1994 the ECF has a second try at linking supervision with the guarantee by the School, under the heading "La garantie et le controle dans l'Ecole" ("The guarantee and supervision in the School"). This time it is François Leguil who seems to take the lead, followed by Jean-Robert Rabanel, Alain Merlet, Claude This, Herbert Wachsberger and finally Lilia Mahjoub-Trobas (all interventions published in "La lettre mensuelle de l'ECF", juin 1994, 130).

[107] François Leguil, La théorie de la psychanalyse, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, juin 1994, 130, pp. 24-26.

Jean-Robert RABANEL[108]

- EFP
  - Lacan's intentions (1964)
    - Supervision of the act *(passe)* versus supervision of a case (clinical supervision)
    - One supervision (training analyst) versus different supervisions (not including the training analyst) (*multicontrôle*)
    - every analyst can be supervisor versus a list of supervisors
    - supervision as obligatory stage in training versus supervision demanded for by experienced analysts (which is responsible for a desinstitutionalisation)
      - analyst chooses 'his moment'
      - supervision does not have to be registrated
      - no specification of the number of supervisions (as a supervised and as a supervisor)

      the result was an increase in the demand for supervision
  - Failure of the EFP
    - Safouan (November 1974) the only account on supervision, at Lacan's request: due to the failure of the passe (to guarantee the analytical act by creating something new in the field of love) supervision faces a bright future (*faute de résultats concluants de l'expérience de la passe, le controle a un bel avenir devant lui*
    - *"Commission du Forum sur le controle de l'ECF"* (1981, cfr André) concludes that there has been a sneaky restoration of the caste of training analysts behind the mask of supervisors
- ECF (1981)
  - Institutional makes supervision the bond of a working community, implies supervision with different supervisors (*volonté institionelle que le controle serve de ciment à une communauté de travail, ce qui veut dire multiplicité de contrôles*)
  - Institutionalisation of supervision must make sure that the demand for supervision is not determined by the institutional influence of the supervisor (*minimaliser le conditionnement de la demande de controle par la position d'influence institutionelle du contrôleur*), demand for supervision should create the supervisor (*demande de controle crée le contrôleur*) – this means: no list of official supervisors

[108] Jean-Robert Rabanel, Différence des systèmes de controle à la SPP et à l'ECF. Dun règlement vers une volonté institutionelle, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, juin 1994, 130, pp. 27-31.

Alain MERLET[109]

- Demand for supervision
  Fear of being an impostor (*difficulté d'une position qui toujours confine à l'imposture*)
- Variants of supervision
  The possibilities of all kinds of supervision should be explored, including supervision cartels and supervision groups (*espérer une pratique plus diversifiée, moins standardisés (cartels, petit comité)* – adopted to the needs (cfr Lacan 1964)
- Supervision as a second training analysis
  Demand for supervision often is but a thinly disguised demand for analysis
- Offer of supervision during training analysis
  - Analysant thinks this is an authorization to authorize himself as an analyst
  - Supervision suggested by the training analys who imposes himself as supervisor – this leads tot transferential impasses – necessity of at least one supervisor who's not the training analyst
  - Psychotherapist in training analysis (cfr Lacan 1964)
    - Embarrassed (*emabarra*s) before analytical effects
    - Solicited as subject-supposed-to-know
- Demand for supervision in the experienced analyst
  - Simpel demand when confronted with unexpected effects of his practice that replace him in his former position as an analysant (*qui le renvoient à sa position d'analysant*)
  - Desire to know (*désir de savoir*), addresses himself to a colleague who's elaborating a particular clinical subject

Claude THIS[110]

- Psychotherapist in training analysis
  only talks about his 'work' – analysis turns to supervision without demand for supervision – leads to closure (*fermeture*)
- Demand for supervision by experienced analyst
  - Supervisor is not the former training analyst - several supervisors, each analyst can supervise another analyst, supervisor (if he's an analyst) is qualified as such by the demand of the supervised (*un parmi tous, contrôlant agrémente son contrôleur*)
  - Transmission of knowledge discovered in the discourse of the analysant (*transmission de tout ce qui se dévoile de savoir dans la cure*)
  - Transference in supervision, unlike transference in analysis, is supported by the realisation of the breach in the subject-supposed-to-know (*transfert dans le controle fait lien autrement que ce qui a lieu dans la cure, s'appuie sur la reconnaissance de l'inessentiel du savoir de celui auquel on l'avait supposé*) – this should lead to the extension of the association between analysts, each supervised founds the School with each supervision … with a member of the School (*extension du lien entre les analystes, contrôlant comme fondateur de l'Ecole avec chaque controle*)

[109] Alain Merlet, Variété des contrôles, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, juin 1994, 130, pp. 32-33.
[110] Claude This, Le controle pour fonder l'Ecole, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, juin 1994, 130, pp. 34-37.

Herbert WACHSBERGER[111]

- SPP
  - 1943: supervisors occupy a strategic position in a training in three stages, because they evaluate the training analysis as well as the professional capacities (*contrôleurs occupent une position stratégique dans un cursus à trois dégrés (didactique, enseignement, controle), puisqu'ils peuvent apprécier la validité de l'analyse didactique et évaluer les aptitudes pour la pratique*)
  - 1953: Lacan proposes to 'telescope' training analysis and supervision in one 'gradus'[112] (*contreprojet Lacan télescope en 'un gradus psychanalytique' la didactique et les contrôles*)
- EFP
  - 1964 *"Acte de Fondation"*
    - internal and external 'supervision' (*controle*)
    - the school has to offer supervision to psychotherapists in training analysis (*du controle que l'Ecole doit assurer au practicien en formation*)
    - clinician himself made responsible for his own supervision (his demand) (*practicien responsable du controle qu'il doit prendre à ses risques*)
    - first directory remained rather 'classical', with lists and jury's (*pesanteur du premier directoire: liste, jury d'agrément*)
  - 1967 *"Proposition sur le psychanalyste de l'Ecole"*
    - *gradus* instead of hierarchy and *cursus*
    - diversity in the procedure of supervision
    - analyst member of the School (AME):
      - his formation is guaranteed by the School (*garantie de l'Ecole quant au rapport d'un analyste à la formation qu'elle dispense*)
      - title attributed on the basis of his work and the 'style' of his practice (testimony by his supervisors?)
    - problems remainnog altijd verzet, met analyticuswording niet ogv *passe* maar ogv oordeel controleurs
- ECF (1981)
  - *passe* 'controls' or 'supervises' whether an analyst auto-authorizes himself or not
  - How to articulate the individual responsibility to demand supervision with the responsibility of the School in the training – how can the School guarantee the 'act' of the analyst (*reste à articuler le controle individuel (qui est la responsabilité du practicien) à la responsabilité de l'Ecole dans le controle du practicien en formation – comment l'Ecole dans sa fonction de garantie peut elle connaître le rapport du practicien à l'acte*)

[111] Herbert Wachsberger, Controle et garantie, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, juin 1994, 130, pp. 38-40.
[112] *Gradus ad Parnassum* = step to the Parnassus, dictionary of poetics.

Lilia MAHJOUB-TROBAS[113]

Twee soorten garantie

- Analyst of the School (*AE*)
  - Evaluation of training analysis
  - Double (two) *"commission de la passe"*
- Analyst Member of the School (*AME*)
  - Evaluation of supervision
  - One *"commission de la garantie"*
    - Does not supervise the supervision
    - New task: orientation of the demand for supervision - usually the training analyst indicates a supervisor (*orienter ceux qui le demanderaient pour un controle*)
    - Guarantees the training by judging what can be knwown about the practice of analyst (*garantit la formation à partir de la pratique d'un analyste et de ce que l'Ecole peut en savoir*) - permant title – attributed on the initiative of the School, not sollicited by the candidate (*ne se demande pas*)
    - until now the title *AME* was attributed on the basis of 'rumours' about his supervisions, advice of the supervisor was not asked because the title AME could not be explicitly sollicited by referring to the supervisions one had done – Mahjoub proposes to change this: title *AME* can be asked on the basis of supervisions done with an analyst of the ECF (*AME*?)[114]
  - *AME* as an ironical cipher or figure (*chiffre ironique*), a pun on *âme* or soul according to Lacan
  - *AME* have to indicate the *passeurs* among their own analysants

[113] Lilia Mahjoub-Trobas, Que veut l'Ecole de sa Commission de la Garantie?, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, 1994, 130, pp. 41-43.
[114] Cfr Leguil.

Luis SOLANO[115]

- Where does an analyst speak?
  - As a teacher (*enseignant*), in a country where psychoanalysis is not at home, he explains his 'habits' to the locals
  - As an analyst, in supervision, he talks about an analysant to another analyst
- Ways of verifying the analytical act
  - Passe verifies the inaugural analytical act (the analysant becoming an analyst through his own analysis)
  - Supervision verifies the 'repetition' of the analytical act in each cure (reinvention of psychoanalysis)
- supervision = superaudition = structure of the *Witz*
  - supervised is a go-between, he testifies to what he did hear - resulting in a 'representation' of his analysant
  - importance of the 'audition of the big Other' in the formation of the *Witz*, the *bonne histoire*, the pun: the pun *est homologué par l'audition de l'Autre, au niveau d'une valeur signifiante pure* –the supervisor has to hear the double entendre, the equivocation
  - the fact that the listener will repeat the pun to others (and eventually will make them laugh where they should not) is part of the pleasure of making a pun; the pun is only a pun when it can be transmitted to others – the supervisor has to repeat the signifier in the story of the analysant of the supervised to other analysts, *faire du récit de la cure une bonne histoire à transmettre à d'autres*
  - authentification of the *pas de sens*, the step to sense
- supervision = rectification of the position of the hearer (*entendeur*), small shifts or displacements (déplacements) between analysts
  - calculated disruption of a particular trait of someone's style, which unables him to 'hear'; this obstacle should already been sufficiently clear to the supervised; this rectification in the real, this *tuché*, presupposes the consent of both supervisor and supervised (*provoquer un dérangement calculé sur un trait de style (…) qui empêche l'audition, et qui a été par ailleurs suffisamment repéré car reconnu (…) cela nécessite tuché et consentement de la part des analystes qui jouent cette partie)*
- Lacan's theory of supervision?
  - references in Lacan:
    - 1957: to obtain the common measure of the unconscious with the structure of speech (*obtenir la commune mesure de l'inconscient et de la structure de la parole)*
    - 1967: to verify the analytical act
  - actual paradigms:
    - the work of JAMiller on several notions which today are used by lacanians as concepts
    - cartels of the pass*:* the reports of the *Commission de la garantie* should point out what is new, what is unheard of (*avoir trait (d'esprit) à ce qui n'a pas été encore fait, moins encore raconté*) – this seems to be mainly the way of keeping up the semblance of the objet (a)

[115] Luis Solano, Question de Mutterwitz, Lettre mensuelle de l'ECF, juin 2000, 189, pp. 10-13 – Solano speaks on behalf of the *Commission de la garantie* de l'ECF, on 11 March 2000.