

Normality does not exist

By way of introduction

When looking for a title for this conference, I was inspired by a citation of Jacques-Alain Miller, which you can find in his Course of 2003-2004, *Psychoanalysis and Evaluation*. I'll quote him: "Nowadays, the name of God is the normal. Beneath a scientific cover, we are offered a theology of the normal, while the fundament of what psychoanalysis teaches us through Lacan is that the psychical as such is not normal. The *normativisation* of the psychical means its disappearance, its suppression.¹"

"I am not normal," says an analysand who is in her late thirties. She is not married, has no children, she does not even have a partner while all her girlfriends have what she does not have. The Other woman whom she supposes to have access to a jouissance from which she is deprived, and the master discourse which, according to her, indicates what it is normal for a woman of 40, brings her to analysis. But she will discover that what she asks is not what she desires. Her desire is not reducible to common ideals.

In a similar vein, another analysand, a homosexual and an avant-garde artist, is an innovator in his domain. Yet, he realises that when it comes to his sexuality, he is not at all avant-garde. Conversely, he is totally subjugated by a maternal ideal that dictates the heterosexual normality. During his adolescence he tried to connect with girls. Then as a young adult -said he was asexual, finally he adopted a form of homosexuality that his mother could accept. It is only after several years in analysis that he manages to assume something of his desire regarding his sexuated position.

A third analysand, also homosexual, is guilt-ridden by his homosexuality because it is in contrast with what his father had desired for him. He is not the man his father imagined. It is only after undertaking an analysis, that he will manage to separate himself from the paternal ideal and assume his homosexuality.

When I learned of your axis of work for this year - sexualities in the 21st century - the first theoretical reference that came to mind was the last session of Lacan's *Seminar VI, Desire and Its Interpretation*. In this seminar, Lacan stresses the power of protest that is contained in perversion. As Jacques-Alain Miller indicates in the back cover of the seminar, Lacan attributes to perversion the value of "a rebellion against the identifications that assure the maintenance of social routines." Even if this seminar is from 1959 it is very current because it heralds "the revamping of formerly installed conformisms, and even their explosion."

"Lacan is speaking about us" says Miller.

I will start by following the thread of the last session of Lacan's seminar as well as Jacques-Alain Miller's commentaries. Then, I will comment on the exploding of the *normale* – the male norm - by following this thread in Lacan's *Seminar XIX* and *XX*. Finally, I will come to "There

¹ Miller, Jacques-Alain, "Psychoanalysis and Evaluation", (2003-2004), *Lacanian Orientation, Teaching* delivered under the framework of the Department of Psychoanalysis University Paris VIII, Course of the 24th of March 2004. Unpublished.

is no sexual relation," a formula that privileges the One of jouissance while denying the two of the relation.

All desire is perverse

The question that preoccupies Lacan in the lesson of the 1st July 1959 of the Seminar *Desire and Its Interpretation* is the place of desire in the economy of the analytic experience. "It has not been easy to pinpoint the place of desire"² Lacan asserts.

It is his intention to show us the cardinal points in relation to which the function of desire may be situated. For Lacan this is the stake.

So, in this last lesson, he comments on the state of affairs in psychoanalysis in 1959. What dominates here is object relations. In this vein, he remarks that if one is to illustrate a clinical structure, this analysis takes place – at least for a certain amount of time – on a trajectory that he qualifies as a "moralising normalisation."

How then, in 1959, according to Lacan can the analyst find his bearings? How does the analyst articulate the particularity of a subject's position in relation to the object? Lacan answers: "the subject is always situated with respect to a supposedly normal way of approaching other people, and it is in comparison with this normal way that analysts gauge the deficiencies of their patients' apprehension of the object [by the subject who is in analysis]."³

Lacan criticizes the analysts of his day by advancing that reality, the one to which they refer, is in effect nothing but a version of reality, that it is nothing but one reality among others, that it is nothing but their reality. This reality implies "an ideal of normativity, that turns the analyst's ideals into the final standard that the patient, in concluding, in an identificatory conclusion, is encouraged to rally around,"⁴ Lacan emphasises.

Proceeding from here, the question of desire and of subjectivity is left aside. So, for Lacan it is the experience of desire that we should focus on. It is this experience that constitutes the central point of an analysis. Therefore, he ends *Seminar VI* on the place where the analyst must situate himself in relation to desire. He articulates this place in respect to social norms. I quote him: "if there is a practice that can teach us how problematic these social norms are - how much they must be questioned, and how much they are designed to do something other than [adapt people to reality] it is clearly psychoanalysis."⁵

So, if the identification is on the side of social adaptation and norms, then perversion constitutes a protest against this normalisation. In this sense, we are all perverse. Any fantasy is perverse since it distances from that which is supposed normal.

² Lacan, J., *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book VI, Desire and Its Interpretation*, Polity, 2019, p. 471.

³ Ibid, p. 472.

⁴ Ibid, p. 428.

⁵ Ibid, p. 483.

Indeed, Lacan underlines that between conformism and perversion there is an alternating circuit. Perversion “represents protest that, with regard to conforming, arises in the dimension of desire.”⁶

What Lacan brings to the fore in this seminar, is that one can qualify as perversion everything that resists normalisation. Thus he anticipates paternal perversion [*père-version*]. More than 15 years later he will state that “Normality is not the paternal virtue par excellence.”⁷ He will then evoke the paternal perversion [*père-version*]. For Lacan this *père-version* is the only guarantee of the function of the father, a function that is nothing other than the one of the symptom. *Père-version* effectively highlights the unique character of the desire of the father. I quote Lacan: “A father has no right to respect, only to love if love means respect and is [*père-version*] oriented, in other words is created by a women, the object a which causes his desire.”⁸

Père-version is both a reduction and a desublimation of the father; it puts the father back to the level of the symptom. On the other hand, *père-version* means that there are versions of the father. The starting point of the desublimination is the questioning of universality which started with feminine sexuality, but Miller reckons that this desublimination has reached all the categories and most particularly that of the father.

Indeed, Lacan introduced this version of the father just before his inexistent seminar *The Names of the Father*. At the end of Seminar X, he states that the father is not the cause of itself. He is a desiring subject. This unicity of the desire of the father oriented by his fantasy is consonant with the pluralisation of the Name-of-the-Father.

In Seminar *RSI*, Lacan tried to do without the Name-of-the-Father. He invited us to make use of it without believing in it. So, the Name-of-the-Father acquires a functional status of knotting. To do without it on the condition of making use of it, constitutes a devaluation of the Name-of-the-Father. This devaluation is a devaluation of the Name-of-the-Father to the “rank of a pragmatic instrument”⁹ this constitutes the key to our clinic.

On the back cover of *Desire and Its Interpretation*, Jacques-Alain Miller states that by the fact that the object of desire is linked to fantasy, desire is extravagant. This indicates that Oedipus is only a normalised form of desire; all desire is in its essence perverse.

If in the animal kingdom the compass is uni-directional, in the domain of humans the compasses are multi-directional. One cannot reduce the fantasy to common ideals. Let's say that by definition it is irreducible to those ideals. Our compass is no longer the Father. According to Miller equality of conditions, the rise of capitalism and technological domination has contributed to an accelerated decline of patriarchy. Miller suggests in place of tradition, innovation, in place of hierarchy, the network, and in place of immutable order, “transformational flux incessantly pushing back all limits.”

⁶ Ibid, p. 484.

⁷ Lacan, J., Seminar XXII, RSI, Lesson of the 21st of January 1975. Unpublished.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Miller, J.-A., “The Whole World is Mad” (2007-2008), *Lacanian Orientation*, Teaching delivered under the framework of the Department of Psychoanalysis University Paris VIII, Course of the 14th of May 2004. Unpublished in English.

In this vein, Miller comments on the last lesson of *Seminar VI* where Lacan gives a generalised definition of perversion. According to Lacan perversion reveals “a protest against what the subject undergoes at the level of identification, insofar as identification is the relationship that establishes and organises the norms of social stabilisation of the different functions.¹⁰”

For Miller the fundamental structure of *Seminar VI* is the putting into question of the father and the paternal function. He bases his argument on what Lacan - in the same Seminar - called the big secret of psychoanalysis, that there is no Other of the Other. Well, in the *Preliminary Question* ... Lacan had said the contrary. For the general public, Lacan is “the one who promoted the Name-of-the-Father by giving it a decisive, normalising function, and who made it the keystone to everything upholding the world that is common to us.¹¹” In the *Preliminary Question* ... the Other of the law whose signifier is the Name-of-the Father is the Other of the Other.

The first Lacan is under the aegis of the law, whereas in his last teaching he emphasises the without law. Miller enumerates the laws Lacan used in his legalistic passion. These are linguistic laws borrowed from Saussure and Jacobson, Hegel’s dialectical law, mathematical laws, sociological laws taken from Claude Lévi-Strauss and finally the Freudian law where the Name-of-the-Father imposes itself on the desire of the mother. In this law lies the condition for the stabilisation of jouissance and of the subject’s access to a common reality.

These five registers of the law constitute the symbolic order. “What is a world ruled by the symbolic order? “It is a world in which everything is in its place, a world in which the father, the patriarch, locks everything down.¹²”

The Name-of-the-Father is the support of the symbolic order. This is the starting point of Lacan’s teaching. However, later on he will no longer follow this path. Miller indicates: “If Lacan’s teaching has a sense, a direction, it is that of a constant, methodological, relentless dismantling of the pseudo-harmony of the symbolic order.¹³”

According to Miller, Lacan did not follow the path of the Father but that of desire. He emphasises this position in affirming that if Lacan had maintained the Name-of-the-Father as signifier of the Other of the Other, then the determining element for the end of an analysis would be the Name-of-the-Father. Yet, on the top left side of the Graph of Desire, where the ultimate answer expected from an analysis is inscribed, we find S (A) barred and not S (A). For Miller, “the solution is not located at the level of the paternal metaphor. For, at this level, all that the subject encounters is the lack of a signifier, the lack of a signifier that would designate his being by designating the law of this being.¹⁴” The definition of desire as metonymy of lack of being is in line with the inexistence of a terminal or final metaphor that would allow an oedipal signification to be brought to the surface.

The place where the end of the analysis comes into play is not the Name-of-the-Father but the fantasy. In other words, it is the relation of the subject with the object a in unconscious

¹⁰ Lacan, J., *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book VI, Desire and its Interpretation*, op. cit., p. 483.

¹¹ Miller, J.-A., “The Other without Other”, in *Hurly Burly* #10, December 2013, p. 18.

¹² Ibid, p. 22.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 24.

desire. It is the object which was called pregenital; and which was supposed to contain the yoke [*intérfé*] of that jouissance for this object that would be reabsorbed at the phallic stage. This is what the paternal metaphor translated into making the signification of the phallus emerge. In other words, when desire inscribes itself in the signifier of the Name-of-the-Father, when it comes to maturation, all jouissance acquires a phallic signification. However, Miller tells us that there is no maturation or maturity of desire. Thus, he says, and I quote: "What, for Freud were remainders to be absorbed in an infinite task, are permanent elements which unconscious desire remains attached to in the fantasy. It is a question of elements or rather substances that produce jouissance and which are outside the signification of the phallus; let us say as an infringement in relation to castration."¹⁵

What are the consequences of this? It follows that there is no normality in desire and that consequently all desire is perverse. What one takes from *Seminar VI* is that there is no normality of desire. Miller says that "unconscious desire, remains attached in fantasy, to jouissances that, in relation to the norm idealised by psychoanalysts, remains intrinsically perverse. Perversion is not an accident that happens to desire. All desire is perverse in so far as jouissance is never in the place that the so-called symbolic order would like it to be."¹⁶

The father is no longer the guarantee of the symbolic order. Indeed, the symbolic is not an order but a disorder. In Lacan's last teaching, the symbolic loses its supremacy. It is one among the three registers that are all equal.

The sexual relation does not exist but the One exists

The fact that a fourth ring is indispensable to knot the real, the symbolic and the imaginary reveals a fact of structure that is at the same time a trans-structural phenomenon. It is the fact that the sexual relation does not exist. We can give other names to this structural fact: Woman does not exist, the real is without law, not all can be said, all jouissance is not absorbed under the phallus. There is no natural connection between S_1 and S_2 . Each subject is obliged to invent his own response, be it banal or not.

Banal or not, it will always be a "delusional" response. This is the principle of "everyone is mad." Each one invents whatever they can to fill the hole of the absence of the sexual relation. And it is a unique response that cannot be reduced to discourse or common ideals.

Lacan, in the *Preface to the Spring Awakening* teaches us that "if it fails, it's for each one."¹⁷ The sexual makes a hole in the real for all. All jouissance cannot be significantised. Each speaking being will be confronted by this structural fault whether one is on the male or female side, whatever his or her structure or sexual orientation. There is a real at stake, that is to say, something that is without law.

If the sexual relation does not exist, what exists however is the One. In the *Seminar ...or Worse*, we find the jaculation: *There is something of the One [Yad l'Un]*. In the course of this seminar Lacan will ask himself what the One means, where it arises from and why and how there is something of the One. In a first movement, he links the One with the signifier and

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 27.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Cf. Lacan, J., "Spring Awakening.", in *Analysis* #6, 1995, pp. 32-34

master-signifier. Then, in a second moment, he posits that the One has to do with something else. He clarifies that he is speaking of the One as real. For Lacan, the One involves the principle of repetition. Thus, he distinguishes the One of S_1 from the One of repetition.

The One has no relation with Being. When it articulates itself, what stands out, is that that there is not two, that is, that there is no sexual relation. Finally, what Lacan comes to state is: "Only the One exists."¹⁸ In this seminar, Lacan asserts that the signifier is cut from the signified. He says precisely that "what distinguishes the signifier in that, it has no signification."¹⁹ This is the end of determination and the beginning of contingency. The S_1 is cut from the S_2 : $S_1//S_2$.

Indeed, Lacan will evoke the S_1 all alone caught up in repetition – constitutive of the sinthome - and no longer connected to the S_2 . Lacan rejects the two of the signifying chain in favour of the One of jouissance, of the One all alone. Jacques-Alain Miller illustrates this change on the back cover of the *Seminar ...or Worse* in a very pertinent way: "Lacan had taught the primacy of the Other in the order of truth and the order of desire. Here he teaches the primacy of the One in its real dimension. He rejects the Two of sexual relation and that of signifying articulation. He rejects the big Other, the fulcrum of the dialectic of the subject, disputing its existence, which he consigns to fiction. He deprecates desire and promotes jouissance."²⁰

In his last teaching, Lacan shifts from the Other. He is more interested in the sinthome - which he lodges in the One - than in the discourse of the Other. He abandons the category of cause in favour of the category of contingency. Causality and determinacy are both on the side of the symbolic. According to Miller, what regulates the determining effects for the subject is the symbolic, the law of the symbolic chain. However, this symbolic determination is disturbed by contingency.

The very last teaching of Lacan is a subversion of the formula *a signifier is that which represents the subject for another signifier*. One cannot say that the subject is represented by the signifier because in order to be able to say it, we need the two signifiers; and between S_1 and S_2 , there is a gap. There is no arrow between S_1 and S_2 but a disjunction. The signifier is no longer the determining mainspring. Rather, it is chance which pushes us around this way or another

Lacan had already evoked the category of contingency in *Seminar XI*. It was through Aristotle's *tuché* and *automaton* that Lacan had tried to approach the traumatic encounter with the real. While *automaton* constitutes the network of signifiers, *tuché* is nothing but the encounter with the real. Lacan situates the real beyond *automaton*. Thus, he states: "What is repeated, in fact, is always something that occurs [...] as if by chance."²¹

So, he specifies that the function of *tuché*, of the encounter with the real, an encounter that is always missed was first presented in the history of psychoanalysis in the form of traumatism. Traumatism is the absence of meaning, a hole in language, an inassimilable real. The

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 176.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 201.

²⁰ Miller, J-A., "Back Cover", in *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XIX... or Worse*, op. cit.,

²¹ Lacan, J., *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XI, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, Hogarth-Karnac, 2004, p. 54.

encounter with the real is beyond sense, and it is precisely this lack of meaning, this hole in the signifier that constitutes the trauma.

With *tuché* and *automaton* Miller distinguishes two different repetitions: that of *automaton* where what is repeated is the same and that of the *tuché* where there is no law. I quote Miller: "with the *automaton* we are dealing with the repetition that pursues its course as if governed by the same algorithm: it is the same that one sees return and that which Lacan associates with homeostasis, to maintain an equilibrium. And then, we have repetition as *tuché* which has no algorithm and no law. *Tuché* makes an irruption with a value of an encounter with a heterogeneous element; it introduces an alterity, and it disturbs the homeostatic harmony as supported by the automatic algorithm."²²

In the *automaton* the symbolic order is incarnated while *tuché* refers to the real, to a real without law. What we are dealing with *tuché*, is a repetition that perforates the homeostasis of the symbolic order.

As Lacan advances in this teaching, the real becomes more and more prevalent. If the jaculation, *There is something of the One*, prevails in *Seminar XIX*, what prevails in *Seminar XX* is its immediate consequence, namely that *There is no sexual relation*. *There is no sexual relation* signifies that the relation between a man and a woman cannot be written logically. In other words, one cannot write $x R y$. This means that there is no mathematical law that would write the relationship between a man and a woman.

In the unconscious this relation is not written. There is no instinct that would guide the human being how to behave in relation to his or her sexuality. There is nothing natural about the choice of object. Sexuality does not come naturally to the speaking being.

In *Seminar XX* Lacan underlines the impossibility of sexual jouissance to establish the One of the sexual relation. So, he states: "There's no such thing as a sexual relationship because one's jouissance of the Other taken as a body is always inadequate - perverse, on the one hand, insofar as the Other is reduced to object a, and crazy and enigmatic, on the other."²³ The sexual relation is of the order of the impossible; it never ceases not to write itself.

In the same Seminar, Lacan states that the woman is not-all; she is not-all in the phallic function. So, he strikes out the definite article of the woman: the Woman does not exist: "There's no such thing as Woman, Woman with a capital W indicating the universal. There's no such thing as Woman because, in her essence [...] she is not-whole."²⁴

If therefore, as far as the man is concerned, all x is function of Φ of x , concerning the woman, he states that she is not-all in the phallic function. The beings who are situated on the side of the woman have a relationship with another jouissance, not complementary but supplementary. And Lacan explains that this is because if this other jouissance were a complement, one would again fall into the all.

²² Miller, J.-A., "Being and the One", Teaching delivered under the framework of the Department of Psychoanalysis University Paris VIII, Course of the 18th of May 2011. Unpublished.

²³ Lacan, J., *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XX, Encore*, W.W. Norton & Co., 1998, p. 144.

²⁴ Ibid, pp. 72-3.

In the feminine position, there is a jouissance, beyond the phallus. However, this does not mean that the woman is not inscribed in the phallic function. She is in it but she has something more.

Miller reckons that in his very last teaching Lacan explores the beyond of the Oedipal not only to the benefit of the woman but to the benefit of every speaking being: “ Fundamentally, Lacan’s very last teaching is saying that the *not for all x, phi of x* is really the law to which the speaking being as such responds. Lacan discovered this law beginning from the woman and this is what allowed him to see that not everything in jouissance obeys the Freudian-Hegelian schema.²⁵” Lacan was able to unravel the sinthome because he generalised the formula of the *not for all x, phi of x*. For any speaking being, there is a part of jouissance that escapes the phallus, a part that does not enter into the symbolic.

Miller reckons that in his last teaching, Lacan goes beyond himself. What permits him to make this passage is feminine sexuality. Up until his last teaching, the regime of jouissance is conceptualised from the male part while in his last teaching, jouissance is conceptualised from the feminine part.

The study of feminine sexuality has allowed Lacan to lift the veil from this jouissance where the sinthome is situated, a jouissance that Miller calls addiction and which only has a relation with the One all alone, the S_1 without the S_2 . Oedipus is nothing but a regulating myth of analytic practice, a myth that puts the things on the side of the Name of the Father. This solution refers back to the function of Φ . Yet, there is a remainder. Not all responds to this solution.

In his last teaching, castration is disassociated from interdiction. Indeed, jouissance as an event is linked to the body rather than to the side of the dialectic of permission and interdiction. Jouissance is always perceived as an effraction, as a disruption. “It is this disruption that Freud captured in the signification of castration and in the theatre of the oedipal interdiction. This theatre has faded. The symbolic order is not what it used to be.²⁶”

Since 1994 Jacques-Alain Miller has worked on formalising the questioning of the Name-of-the-Father in relation to phallic identification. For Freud the end of an analysis is always linked to the phallus: refusal of castration for the man, penis-envy for the woman. The force of the subject’s phallic identification comes from the Other, from the desire of the Other. To question this identification, it suffices to put the Other in question. If the Name-of-the-Father is a semblant and the Other without guarantee, what becomes the subject’s phallic identification? “*What am I beyond phallic identification?* Here is the response: I am in the place of jouissance. This response institutes an antinomy between the Other and jouissance and it assumes that the Other is inherently inconsistent.²⁷” In this perspective, the \mathbb{A} barred signifies “that there is no Name-of-the-Father that could respond definitively,²⁸” Miller tells us.

²⁵ Miller, J.-A., “Being and the One”, op cit., Course of the 2nd of March 2011.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Miller, J.-A., *Donc* (1993-1994), *Lacanian Orientation*, Teaching delivered under the framework of the Department of Psychoanalysis University Paris VIII, Course of the 22nd June 1994. Unpublished.

²⁸ Ibid.

In 2002,²⁹ he remarks that our classical clinic, that of the Name-of-the-Father, responds to the structure of the all; that is to say to the structure of masculine sexuation. The function of the father is linked to this structure. But the contemporary clinic is a clinic of not-all. It is a clinic that is linked rather to feminine sexuality. In the era of globalisation, the structure of the all has given way to that of the not-all.

Moreover, in *The Other Side of Psychoanalysis*, Lacan specifies that the real father, as the agent of castration, is merely an effect of language. The real traumatic kernel is not Oedipus and castration but the relation to language.

In his very last teaching Lacan accentuates the traumatism of *lalangue*. Insofar as the subject approaches his traumatic kernel, insofar as it evokes something close to his traumatic kernel, what this is about is *lalangue*. And this is exactly where traumatism is situated: at the encounter of the little subject with *lalangue*.

Lacan also evokes *troumatisme* in his seminar *Les Non-dupes Err*. There is nothing to discover in the real. The unconscious invents for the very reason that there is a hole in the real. And each and every one invents what he or she can, to fill the hole. "There, where there is no sexual relation, *troumatisme* is formed,³⁰" as Lacan says.

To Conclude

If in 1959 Lacan spoke of the unicity of desire, in the seventies this unicity relates to jouissance. By definition jouissance is never normalised. Not all jouissance is reabsorbed by the phallus. "Jouissance as such is non-oedipal jouissance, that is to say conceptualised as subtracted, or beyond the oedipal machinery. It is a jouissance reduced to a body event,³¹" as Miller indicates. It is a non-symbolisable, unspeakable jouissance that has affinities with the infinite. And if words are lacking to designate it, it is equally an impossibility of structure: the real does not speak, says Lacan. And one must speak to say anything.

At the end of his teaching, Lacan no longer articulates the pre-existence of the Other. The Other now arises. What there is already, is the One who precisely has no Other, the S₁ all alone. "That there is no sexual relation is the consequence of the primacy of the One insofar as it marks the body by an event of jouissance,³²" as Miller tells us.

The jouissance of the symptom testifies that there was a body event after which "natural jouissance" is found to be troubling and disturbing. "This jouissance is not primary but it is first in relation to the meaning that the subject attributes to it, and that he gives to it by his symptom as such as interpretable,³³" says Miller.

This non-natural but unique jouissance marks a break in relation to a supposed normality, in relation to traditional representations of sexuality, of the couple and of the family. The decline

²⁹ Miller, J.-A., "Milanese Intuitions 1&2." Mental No. 11 2002, 9 16, and Mental No. 12 2003, 5 14, Available online, [https://londonssociety.nls.org.uk/The Laboratory for Lacanian Politics/Some Research Resources/Miller_Milanese Intuitions 1 2.pdf](https://londonssociety.nls.org.uk/The%20Laboratory%20for%20Lacanian%20Politics/Some%20Research%20Resources/Miller_Milanese%20Intuitions%201%202.pdf)

³⁰ Lacan, J., *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XXI, Les Non Dupes Err*, Lesson of the 19th of February 1974, unpublished in English.

³¹ Miller, J.-A., "Being and the One", op. cit., Course of the 2nd of March 2011.

³² Ibid, Course of the 4th of May 2011. Unpublished.

³³ Cf. Miller, J.-A., "Reading a Symptom", in *Hurly Burly* #. 6, 2011, pp. 143 152.

of the patriarchy goes hand in hand with the rise of jouissance. Under these conditions, there is no predetermined protocol that one could apply; no solution valid for all. Each one is called to invent his or her own response; and the analyst, in receiving each subject in his unicity does not have a predetermined response. He, too, must invent.

Lacan created a School that broke with the tradition, the orthodoxy, the orthopraxy and the Name of the Father. It is this rupture with tradition, with the orthodoxy and the orthopraxy that teaches us the guiding principles of the analytic act as Éric Laurent presented them at the General Assembly of the WAP in 2006. I will only mention a few of them, briefly:

“A psychoanalytic session is the place in which the most stable identifications by which a subject is attached can come undone. Psychoanalysis will authorise this distance from one's customs, norms, and rules to which analysands are constrained outside of sessions.

There is no standard cure, no general protocol that would govern the session and the psychoanalytic cure.

Psychoanalysis cannot decide what aims are in terms of an adaptation of a subject's singularity to any norms, rules, determinations, or standards of reality.^{34”}

It is perhaps in this sense that Lacan said that it is up to each one to reinvent psychoanalysis in order to make it last.^{35”} Faced with the inexistence of the sexual relation the analyst would not apply any protocol indicated by the scientific discourse but will invent, not by relying on common ideals but on an unheralded desire, the desire of the analyst.

³⁴ Laurent, É, “The Guiding Principles of any Psychoanalytic Act”, available online at www.iclo-nls.org
<https://bit.ly/3u1VLaX>

³⁵ Lacan, J., “Conclusion of the Study Days in Paris of the EEP”, Address delivered on the 9th of July 1978.
Unpublished