

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Colloquium: "Lacan and the Human Sciences"

Nov. 20-22, 1986

Sponsored by the Dept. of French & Italian and The Center for French & Francophone Studies Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, Louisiana

"Lacan and the Human Sciences," a colloquium held at Louisiana State University Nov. 20-22, 1986, was one of the latest in a series of the type "Lacan and . . .": academic gatherings devoted to the work of Jacques Lacan. The Center for French & Francophone Studies and the Department of French & Italian of Louisiana State University invested heavily in the presentation, bringing speakers from territory as diverse as Berkeley and Paris.

For those who have been following the various Lacan conferences in recent years (Ottawa, Milwaukee, Amherst, New York City) the level of address was refreshing and diversified if not entirely devoted to the work of Jacques Lacan proper, in each case.

The structure of the colloquium was perhaps the most evident aspect of a Lacanian discourse. It was framed by two women-Jane Gallop at the beginning and Ellie Ragland-Sullivan at the end. We know that the question of the place of a woman in phallic discourse is central to the Freudian project according to Lacan. Thus, it is always crucial to attend to what a particular woman has to say with regard to her relation to Lacanian theory. In two completely different ways both Gallop and Ragland-Sullivan posed the question of their relation to the discourse of psychoanalysis. If it can be said that Freud introduced the question of the science of the unconscious, Lacan introduced the

56

terms of the science in question: the relation of any subject to the signifier.

Even the form of the discourse of the women bore the mark of their encounter with phallic ambiguity, and in no uncertain terms pushed forward the implicit doubts. Jane Gallop, opening the colloquium, articulated the doubt as such. She spoke from "notes" rather than a formal "text" which seemed to invite one to think about her subject, which she specifically identified as "strange bedfellows." The "strange" of the phrase poses the query into the "bedfellows" of psychoanalysis (especially Lacanian) and feminism. One is tempted to say that this bed-fellowship is a "bad"-fellowship in that one of the "fellows" is female.

Gallop's concern was to show how the discourse of Lacan in the "human sciences" (a term unknown to American academic structure) has depended largely on feminism and literary studies (studies of reading and writing) to disseminate its message to the English-speaking intellectual communities. She related this to the fact that the students of literature have to do with the "human" in the way that psychoanalysis has to do with the "human." In this, she does not follow Lacan, of course, for whom the "human" has nothing to do with the subject, which is only implicated in a discourse of desire, not a discourse of the human. For Lacan, there is no future in which the human sciences will wed psychoanalysis.

Where Jane Gallop brilliantly hesitates at the door of psychoanalytic discourse, Ellie Ragland-Sullivan takes one into the consultation room to experience the mind of the Lacanian analyst musing about the next intervention with the couched subject. Ellie Ragland-Sullivan's paper prepared "text"- was nonetheless fragmented, or rather "split" by the intrusion of time so that the audience was deprived of some of the material pertaining to the subject of her discourse: stealing material. Her primary subject was the materiality of language which is material, in part, because it can be stolen. Theft, rather than measurement, defines what is material. The difference between theft and measurement defines very well the distance between psychoanalysis and the empirical sciences.

This distance is furthermore "measured," as Ellie Ragland-Sullivan develops it, by the materiality of language itself. She states it thus: "the materiality of language is determined on the level of effect." These two female voices operated as elliptical foci of balance for the colloquium. It is not that Denis Hollier's "intervention on the counter-transference"

57

was wrong, though in no way clinically informed. It is not that Dennis Porter said nothing of importance about translation, but just not much about translating (or translations of) Lacan. The elegance of his presentation, however, suggests that his own translations will be more than adequate to a formidable task.

Francois Regnault came very close to the clinical issues of Lacan's theory in his treatment of the nature of "experience" and "experiment." Yet he did not discuss aspects of the unconscious itself which determined his frame of reference. There is a conflict between a scientific treatment of the laws of the unconscious and the particularity of a given clinical case.

While Jean-Claude Milner did not inspire universal applause, he, like the women, spoke to the question of the relation of the subject through history-to the desire of *l'Autre*. The "coupure" of modern science in the seventeenth century radically separated the ancients from the direction of history. It introduced a death into the discourse of Western Civilization. The only exception to this was mathematics which endured, indeed, provoked, the cut. His presentation was a precise and heady rendition of the function of the letter which he said is not a signifier, though inscribed on the Borromean knot.

Joel Fineman's presentation was a close textual reading of the essentially masculine desire of Shakespeare's "Rape of Lucrece"-what might be termed the chiasmic poesis of rape.

Jean-Joseph Goux' presentation was essentially an assault on Lacan's Symbolic order. For Goux, the Symbolic order is itself an assault on the Imaginary and it fails on the question of the feminine. His was the contrapuntal presentation, the effort to de-Lacalize Lacan using Lacan, and in this sense not far from the deconstructive project of Derrida. For Goux, psychoanalysis is a "technology of iconoclasm." In the end, his is a very

familiar charge, namely, that psychoanalysis is phallogocentric since its theory resides on a formalization of the phallogocentricity of contemporary social exchange.

One might express the hope that where there are colloquia whose name is partially determined by the name of Lacan, there is a future for the discourse of psychoanalysis as Lacan taught it. Yet, in Baton Rouge-the red "rod" (cyprus?)-the struggle of the discourse of *l'Autre* in America is still on the level of the discourse of the "Other" that is, something lost in translation. The discourse was preserved-it insisted-in virtue of the elliptical foci around which the arc of the colloquium was inscribed. This may be an apt if not entirely adequate

58

image for the shape of the "effect" of the desire of *l'Autre* during its embryonic beginnings in the "new world."

*James Glogowski State
University of New York at Buffalo
Department of Psychiatry*

Colloquium: "Psychoanalysis and Semiotics"

March 14, 1987

Sponsored by literary and analytic interest groups in Chicago, Illinois

Among the speakers who sought to assess the debt of psychoanalysis to semiotics and vice-versa were members of the Institute of Psychoanalysis in Chicago, invited analysts from outside Illinois, and literature professors and linguists. Bernard Rubin and Arnold Goldberg from the Chicago Institute spoke. Others included Bonnie Litowitz (a semiotic linguist), Françoise Meltzer (professor of comparative literature), Eugen Bar (semiotician) and Barnaby Barrett, a Detroit (Michigan) analyst whose paper was called "Psychoanalytic Method as Semiotics and Anti-Semiotics."

Editor

Symposium: "Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Art: Surrealism, Its Uses and Abuses of Psychoanalysis"

April 4, 1987

Jointly Sponsored by The Department of Art and Art Education, New York University and The Analytic Press

This Symposium is typical of the American tendency to look at Lacan's influence and teaching reductively, while pronouncing on the return to Freud he has catalyzed. Among various speakers Charlotte Stokes spoke about symbols in the work of Max Ernst. Jack Spector spoke on "The Surrealists' Appropriation of Psychoanalysis and Freud's Response." Leonard Shengold, a psychoanalyst, responded to the morning session.

Editor

59

Colloquium: "Jacques Lacan Television"

April 9-10, 1987

Sponsored by *October Television* screened courtesy of Coralie/Zanzibar Films

October 40 (Spring 1987) dedicates that issue to Jacques Lacan. The issue includes a prefatory note by Jacques-Alain Miller; a translation of Lacan's two-part screening on French television, aired under the title "Psychoanalysis" in January of 1973, directed by Benoit Jacquot; an introduction to the dossier on the Institutional Debate written by Joan Copjec; followed by reports, letters and minutes regarding Lacan's career, leading up to his dissolution of the *Ecole freudienne*. The April conference showed the film of Lacan, titled *Television* following the title of the text published in 1974 (Seuil). Annette Michelson introduced the film along with Judith Miller. Jacques-Alain Miller then gave a presentation about the making of the film. On the following day six papers were presented, among which was one by Shoshana Felman entitled "The Figure in the Screen."

Editor

The Lacanian Clinical Forum

Coordinated by John Muller

April 25, 26, 1987-New York City

Analysts Stuart Schneiderman and Pierre Gionnet presented cases which were then discussed by the clinicians present. The overriding questions of the two-day forum concerned the place of the analyst in analysis; and the question of the transmission of psychoanalysis. For further information regarding the meetings of the Clinical Forum, contact John Muller.

James Glogowski

Conference: "Postmodernism"

April 30-May 2, 1987

Sponsored by The International Association for Philosophy and Literature Special session on psychoanalysis was organized by Gregory S.

60

Jay who is known for his work on Derrida and post-structuralism (U. of South Carolina).

On the first day of the conference, presentations focused on Jacques Lacan and Jurgen Habermas. Eugene Holland's paper "The Ideology of Lack in Lacanianism," (Ohio State University) took the "schizoanalysis" position from Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus* to attack the "fundamental Lacanian notion of 'lack', . . . as intrinsic to the structure of subjectivity." Based on what Holland took to be a reified notion of "lack," he argued that Lacan's "projection of the family oedipus onto the whole of society via the Symbolic/ Imaginary dichotomy does not change the profoundly reactionary nature of the oedipal enterprise." Holland's paper argued, finally, for skepticism regarding the ideology permeating Lacan's formulation of "lack." Prof. Ronald Schleifer (University of Oklahoma) then countered Holland's thesis with a discussion of how Lacan's elaboration of the subject, in fact, "eschews the depths of metaphysical constructs [like reified "lack"] for a sense of the palpable surfaces of things and the 'play' on the surfaces." Rather than a reified notion of "lack," Schleifer posited Lacan's "enonce" as the signifying activity of "manquement"-not the reified version of a lack, but the paradoxical case of signification and discourse based on the "failure" of the sign. There was a great deal of discussion about the differences between these two positions.

The last paper, "Psychoanalysis and Modernity in the Thought of Jurgen Habermas," presented by Prof. Jerald Wallulis (University of South Carolina), took a position different from Holland and Schleifer. Wallulis argued that the "depth hermeneutics" of pre-Lacanian psychoanalysis is still viable theoretically and that the work of Habermas is a case in point, a demonstration, as Wallulis offered, "that the utopian ideals of modernity are indeed not exhausted." He then examined the implications of Habermas's thinking about "depth psychology" in relation to social discourse and "modernist" theories of communication within institutional settings.

The second day of the conference continued with considerations of psychoanalytic practice. First, Professor Peter Flaherty (York University in "The Freudian 'Thing': Psychoanalysis and the Culture of Postmodernism" gave an overview of psychoanalysis in postmodern culture where "it is practically impossible to escape [Freud's] presence and the attendant 'anxiety of influence' he and his works exert on us" Professor Mark Roberts (St. Joseph's College) in "Baudrillard According to Freud" sought "to demonstrate that Freud . . . antici

61

pated what Baudrillard, and others, call 'simulation' and had provided a remarkably well-conceived . . . theoretical framework [for it in] *The Interpretation of Dreams*." In "Philosophy After Psychoanalysis: Reading Stephen Melville Reading," Professor Bruce Clarke (Texas Tech University) examined Stephen Melville's treatment of psychoanalysis and philosophy as each enters "into the other's domain by way of their respective blindspots," especially concerning "repression" in the treatment of the notion of "discourse." Professor Gregory S. Jay (University of South Carolina) in "The Subject of Pedagogy: Lessons in Psychoanalysis and Politics" looked at the position of the teacher as the "subject who is supposed to know" and the ideological implications of questioning and displacing, through a whole range of pedagogical considerations regarding the teacher's position (as hegemonic "subject") of mastery and power.

Professor Robert Con Davis (University of Oklahoma) and Professor David L. Miller (University of Alabama), session respondents on the first day, tended to comment on the papers in light of the problematics of Freud's and Lacan's version of the "subject." They both emphasized that the shift in analytical methods between the time of Freud and Lacan corresponded to the century's larger movement from modern to postmodern strategies for conceiving of the "subject," "discourse," and "textuality" in general. The respondents of the second day, Professor Chris Schreiner (Pennsylvania State University) and Professor Andrew Parker (Amherst College), focused more on the difficulty of even conceiving of "strategy," "discourse," or "method" in a postmodern context. They argued that such concepts tend to be deconstructed by the notion of the displaced ("differential" or "semiotic") "subject" that characterizes postmodernism to begin with. The postmodern conception of the "subject," primarily in psychoanalysis, was the issue that clearly emerged over both days to dominate the conference. This development led directly into talk about Lacan, Lyotard, Derrida, Habermas, and others who most directly seek to define or position the "subject" in contemporary theory.

Robert Con Davis
University of Oklahoma

Conference: "An International Conference on Lacanian Theory and Practice of Psychoanalysis"

62

May 30-31, 1987

Sponsored by Central Connecticut State University, Department of Modern Languages

It may be impossible to avoid the charge of discipleship when one praises the work done by serious scholars in whatever discipline they pursue their study of Lacan's work.

Not long ago it was popular to dismiss Lacan as "incomprehensible" or "deliberately opaque" or in the words of Walter Kendrick, that there is "less to Lacan than meets the eye" (Boston Review, 1986). This has proven to be an unconsidered indifference. After all, if incomprehensibility at a glance were the sole criterion, one would have some difficulty justifying much of what meets the eye in literary and cultural studies today.

Furthermore, it has become increasingly difficult to sustain such a criticism of Lacan's texts and prose in the face of a growing number of both young and established scholars whose work embraces some of the most complex aspects of Lacanian theory. However, the criticism that failed on Lacan is now aimed at Lacanians, who, in addition, are labeled "disciples" in the worst sense of the term. The only defense against the "charge" of discipleship may be to speak and write for those who know they are not disciples. This is to speak in the open discourse of analysis, rather than in the closed discourse of criticism.

It was in such an open discourse that the Connecticut conference was structured. Yet, the discourse could have been closed. Officially it was "for clinicians in the field of psychoanalysis and specialists in allied disciplines."

The co-directors of the conference were Claudia Seitelsohn-Douglas and Fred Lougee. Professor Seitelsohn-Douglas established the decidedly clinical nature of the conference in her opening remarks on the desire of the analyst. A striking feature of the CSU conference was its focus on clinical issues as central to any theoretical discussion of Lacanian theory or practice. It is even more remarkable that such a question could be so sensitively posed in an American literary context. While literary departments have opened up to the theoretical aspects of psychoanalysis in the U.S., they have (with some exceptions) avoided the link which psychoanalysis maintains with its clinical roots.

Furthermore, the relation that literature departments maintain to language is not *prima facie* compatible with questions of the unconscious as Lacan posed them, despite his famous maxim that the "unconscious is structured LIKE a language." Indeed, this may account

63

for the relative absence of the clinical/practical dimension of analysis within the confines of literary theory based on Freud's, if not Lacan's, discoveries. That is, the absence of the clinical "sense" of analysis is actually the mode of relation that literary studies maintains to the dimension of the Symbolic, though this is their apparent *metier*. Then too, if it is true, as Lacan maintains, that psychoanalysis is the treatment of the Real through the dimension of the Symbolic, a Lacanian adept may be tempted to diagnose the manifest alienation of American literary discourse from the realities of its social context as a symptom of its repression of the unconscious. For literary studies, this symptom would be structured like a language in ways that differ palpably from the failures to understand symptoms characteristic, for example, of American psychiatry.

Speakers at this Conference sponsored by a Modern Language Department, nonetheless, sought their authority from their positions as practicing clinicians with a Lacanian orientation. They included William Richardson and John Muller from the United States, Philippe Julien from Paris, Donna Lopez from Argentina, and Francois Peraldi from Montreal.

James Glogowski
State University of New York at Buffalo

Conference: "D. W. Winnicott and the Objects of Psychoanalysis"

June 12-14, 1987

Sponsored by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Committee for Psychoanalytic Study and the Center for Studies in Contemporary Culture

The principal organizers, Christopher Bollas and Murray Schwartz, invited several psychoanalysts from London, including Harold Stewart, C. Bollas, Gregorio Kohon, and Adam Phillips. American speakers included psychoanalysts (Ehrenberg, Grolnick, R. Rodman) and literature professors (Norman Holland, D. Hodges, A. Cohen, and others). The only paper to mention a relationship between Winnicott and Lacan was Alain Cohen's. M. Schwartz and F. Rodman led the discussion, focusing on Winnicott's tendency to romanticize a traditionally dark psychoanalytic picture of humankind.

Norman Holland

64

Conference: "Psychoanalysis and Language"

July 18-19, 1987

Sponsored by the Centre for Psychoanalytic Research, Melbourne, Australia, organized by Leonardo Rodriguez and Russell Grigg.

Participation and contributions were forthcoming both from members of the Centre and from other interested clinicians, academics, and students. Speakers included Ben Bradley, Rosemary Grahame, Russell Grigg, Robert King, Sue Long, Don Miller, Leonardo Rodriguez, Paul Valent, and Diane Wieneke. Papers were concerned primarily with exploring theoretical issues, although many drew also upon clinical material.

The Conference opened with two papers concerned with the function of language in the transference. Russell Grigg argued that the intimate link between the unconscious and language gives rise to the position of the analyst as "the supposed subject of knowledge." This view rejects the imaginary position upheld by ego-psychologists who conduct the analysis from the position of the ego and equate cure with an identification of the analysand's ego with the superego of the analyst. Diane Wieneke's paper elaborated Freud's view of the symbolic position of the analyst, arguing that resistance in analysis arises from the desire of the analyst, as exemplified in the case of Dora.

Robert King addressed a question preliminary to the treatment of psychosis, arguing that Freud and Lacan had prematurely closed the question of cure in psychosis by defining it as incurable. He maintained that clinical experience indicates that psychosis is curable, although it is difficult to give an account of the cure.

Don Miller read Freud's study of Leonardo Da Vinci as constituting a number of oppositional dialectics, e.g., masculine/ feminine, art/science, work/inquisitiveness, which he regarded to be unnecessary. He drew upon the philosophy of Hindu texts to illustrate that these rigid boundaries could be overcome.

Sue Long argued that a group is a signifying chain. Its structure is that of the primal horde, and identifications among members are imaginary effects of the signifying chain, anchored by the central signifier of the group, the symbolic Father/leader.

Ben Bradley argued for greater commitment on the part of analysts to social issues.

Paul Valent spoke of conscious and unconscious aspects of the machismo language of war.

Rosemary Grahame explicated Bakhtins' theory of the construction

65

of meaning through dialogue, drawing attention to the emphasis Bakhtin placed on the context of the utterance. There was discussion of Bakhtin's and Saussure's theories of intersubjective communication, in contrast to Lacan's position in which discourse always requires a third term.

Leonardo Rodriguez argued that the voice is an aspect of the *objet a*. Speaking itself is an activity of desire. The voice as libidinal object is material testimony of the presence of the analyst, and is an erotic condition for falling in love. The real of the voice has the effect of a traumatic event at the moment of intervention, producing unexpected, surprising, uncanny effects.

The Conference generated discussion and enthusiasm among those present, (about eighty people), who were varied in their acquaintance with Lacanian texts. For many students in particular, it served as an introduction to Lacanian ideas.

Diane Wieneke
Centre for Psychoanalytic Research
Melbourne, Australia

*For those interested in knowing more about the activities of this Centre, or in obtaining information about the papers presented at this conference, please contact either Russell Grigg or Leonardo Rodriguez at the Centre for Psychoanalytic Research, P.O. Box 509, Carlton South, Victoria 3053, Australia.

Conference: "The Theory of Neurosis in Lacan"

July 18-19, 1987

Sponsored by the 2nd Paris-New York Psychoanalytic Workshop

The second Paris-New York Psychoanalytic Workshop, co-organized by Stuart Schneiderman and Jacques-Alain Miller, was characterized by a seriousness of tone, perhaps owed to the presence of the many analytic practitioners there. Stuart Schneiderman's paper on Lacan's "Theory of Neurosis" made sense of hysteria and obsession in a way quite surprising to those who only know classical psychoanalytic theory or the DSM-III dismissal of these diagnostic categories. Jacques-Alain Miller presented a paper entitled "Twists and Turns in Lacanian The

66

ory and Practice of Neurosis" that took up the crucial role diagnosis plays in the Lacanian clinic. The time spent working with the problem of diagnosis amazed some who believed diagnosis to be a matter of quick deduction (whether psychoanalytic or psychiatric). In the panel on "Clinical Application of the Theory of Neurosis" Lila Kalinich spoke on "On Psychoanalytic Interpretation," pointing to how she as an IPA training analyst has begun to use Lacanian methods in her practice. Donna Lopez spoke on "The Oedipus Complex" in a stirring account of the inseparability of learning gender identity from the experience of the Oedipal structure. James Gorney gave a "transitional paper" on "Transitional Phenomena and the Play of the Signifier." He mixed theory and case study to account for how he uses Winnicott's ideas and Lacan's together in his own clinical practice. The second panel on "The Direction of the Treatment of Neurosis" included a group of Lacanian clinicians, new to New Yorkers, whose clinic for the treatment of psychosis is located in Canada (Quebec City), and directed principally by Danielle Bergeron, Willy Apollon, and Lucie Cantin. Although this clinic has worked only with psychotics for the past several years, the affiliated group also treats neurosis. Fine distinctions were made between neurosis and psychosis in the papers given. Willy Apollon spoke on "Theory of the Direction of the Treatment," while Danielle Bergeron and Lucie Cantin gave examples of the theory in case studies. Cantin spoke on "The Treatment of Neurosis" and Bergeron spoke on "Clinical Work with Neurotic Patients." Both Cantin and Bergeron demonstrated how Lacan's theory of an unconscious signifying chain works in clinical practice.

The proceedings of this Workshop will be published under the auspices of the *Newsletter of the Freudian Field*. Anyone interested in reading any of the papers should contact Ellie Ragland-Sullivan (English Department, 4008 Turlington Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611; or Stuart Schneiderman, 310 East 46th Street, 24H, New York, New York 10017). It should be noted that one need not be in clinical practice to be interested in this particular Workshop. Anyone working with Lacanian theory would find clarification for the theory-in whatever arena of application-in these particular papers. Papers from the 1st Paris-New York Psychoanalytic Workshop were presented by Lacanians from literature departments and psychoanalytic practice. These can be obtained from Stuart Schneiderman.

Editor

67

Conference: Fourth International Conference on Literature and Psychology

August 7-9, 1987 at Kent State University (Kent, Ohio)

Co-sponsored by the Center for the Psychological Study of the Arts, SUNY, Buffalo, New York; Institute for the Psychological Study of the Arts, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida; Center for Literature and Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts; Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Littéraire, Université de Paris 7; Centre d'Etudes freudiennes, Université de Montpellier; Center for Literature and Psychoanalysis, Department of English, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

This conference was characterized by a strong inmixing of literary critics and psychoanalysts, both among the presenters and the audience. The papers were pluralistic in their many approaches to psychoanalytic problems and applications. The conference speakers were carefully selected from among many who submitted papers. Only a few outside guest speakers were invited (Robert Silhol from Paris VII, Nancy Blake from Montpellier, Antal Bokay from Janus Pannonius University in Hungary, and Frederick Wyatt from Freiburg, Germany). The dinnertime keynote address was given by Norman Holland from the University of Florida. What all the papers had in common was an effort to address areas of

interface between psychoanalysis and literature. An interesting sidenote was the number of speakers (many graduate students) who used a Lacanian theoretical base for their presentations. Selected papers from the conference will be published in a special volume by Kent State University Press. For further information, contact Vera Camden, English Department, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242. (The Fifth International Conference on Literature and Psychology will be held in Pecs, Hungary).

Editor

Conference: The Freudian School of Melbourne

September 5-6, 1987

The First Australian Psychoanalytic Congress sponsored by the Freudian School of Melbourne

Oscar and Inez Zentner organized the Freudian School of Melbourne ten years ago when they left Argentina for the Anglophone world. This

68

was the first international conference they have sponsored. Although its fundamental orientation was Freudian and Lacanian, the mixture of speakers was fairly catholic. Many papers were given by nonanalysts. For example, Gary Embelton from Queensland spoke about an attempt at Freudian consciousness-raising in tertiary education. Douglas Kirsner from Victoria spoke on "Culture and Leadership: Mystics and Professionals in American Psychoanalysis." For those who have followed Kirsner's excellent work on Sartre and R. D. Laing, his forthcoming book on American psychoanalytic institutes as institutes of closure and professionalism should be of interest, as was the paper outlining the book (New York University Press). Students and analysts presented papers on analytic problems and therapeutic experiences. The two foreign speakers, Moustapha Safouan (whose paper was read *in absentia*) and Ellie Ragland-Sullivan, symbolized the split within the conference and conference participants insofar as Lacan's teaching is concerned. Safouan's paper works with a pre-*Dissolution* (pre-Paris VIII) Lacan, a direction favored by the Freudian School of Melbourne. Sullivan's paper looked to the *ecole de la cause freudienne* (a Paris VIII orientation) and found common ground with Russell Grigg's paper "Desire and the Division of the Subject in Neurosis." Anyone interested in the publication of some of the conference papers should contact Linda Clifton, Secretary, The Freudian School of Melbourne, P.O. Box 12, Hawthorn, Victoria, 3122, Australia.

Editor

69