

The French Connection in Criminology

Rediscovering Crime, Law, and Social Change

**Bruce A. Arrigo,
Dragan Milovanovic,
and Robert Carl Schehr**



The French Connection in Criminology

SUNY series in New Directions in Crime and Justice Studies
Austin T. Turk, Editor

The French Connection in Criminology

Rediscovering Crime, Law, and Social Change

BRUCE A. ARRIGO

DRAGAN MILOVANOVIC

ROBERT CARL SCHEHR

State University of New York Press

Published by
State University of New York Press, Albany

© 2005 State University of New York

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission. No part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means including electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission in writing of the publisher.

For information, address State University of New York Press,
State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246

Production by Kelli Williams
Marketing by Michael Campochiaro

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Arrigo, Bruce A.

The French connection in criminology: rediscovering crime, law and social
change/Bruce A. Arrigo. Dragan Milovanovic, Carl Schehr.
p. cm.—(SUNY series in new directions in crime and justice studies)
includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7914-6355-9 (alk. paper) —ISBN 0-7914-6356-7
(pbk.: alk. paper)

1. Crime—Sociological aspects. 2. Criminology. 3. Sociology—France.
I. Schehr, Robert C. II. Milovanovic, Dragan, 1948– III. Title. IV. Series

HV6025.A677 2005
364'.01—dc22

2004045403

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

DEDICATION

For all those students and educators, researchers and activists who theorize the possible in the face of human struggle. You live the challenge of social change deeply, daily, and directly.

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

Introduction		ix
Chapter 1	Establishing the First Wave: The Linguistic Turn in Social Theory	1
Chapter 2	Sustaining the First Wave: More on the Linguistic Turn in Social Theory	19
Chapter 3	The Second Wave: Interpreting the Past, Building the Present, and Looking Toward the Future	35
Chapter 4	Confinement Law and Prison Resistance: Applications in Critical Penology	51
Chapter 5	Critical Race Theory and Postmodern Analysis: Strength in Dialectical Unity	69
Chapter 6	Cinema and Literary Texts, <i>Différance</i> , and Social Justice Studies	83
Chapter 7	Restorative Justice and Victim Offender Mediation: Towards a Transformative Praxis	97
Chapter 8	Social Movements as Nonlinearity: On Innocence Projects and Intentional Communities	115

Conclusion	Back to the Future: Rediscovering Crime, Law, and Social Change	133
Notes		141
References		163
Indexes		187

Introduction

OVERVIEW

Post-Enlightenment thought in the social sciences brought with it a set of core assumptions that too often have remained unexamined. Modernist thought has both advanced and placed limitations on critical inquiry. In its most celebrated form, modernism has contributed profoundly to fundamental insights about the human condition and to potential emancipatory practices. However, the emerging postmodern society has demanded alternative theoretical analyses in understanding its political, economic, and cultural potential, its repressive and liberating tendencies, and its possible directions. Postmodern thought, traced to many of the “first wave” French scholars of the last four decades, has ushered in a new era of scholarly inquiry. This book traces some of the key contributions to the evolving postmodern perspective, especially as they apply to a rediscovery of crime, law, and social change.

In this introduction, we briefly delineate several of the more prominent conceptual and organizational components informing, or otherwise contributing to, this text. Indeed, *The French Connection in Criminology*, and its application to crime, law, and social justice studies, emerges from a number of factors that warrant some general comments. Accordingly, we draw our attention to four concerns. First, we situate this book within its relevant historical context. Along these lines we provide some background material on the emergence of postmodernist thought and its development in the areas of law, crime, and social change, noting especially some of the more virulent criti-

cisms that challenge its place in the academy today. Second, we identify the need for *The French Connection in Criminology*, highlighting what this work endeavors to accomplish. Third, we review our own presuppositions about theory and method, suggesting to readers how they might interpret our analysis. Fourth, we outline the organization of the book, providing a chapter-by-chapter summary.

THE EMERGENCE OF POSTMODERNISM: THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

During the past twenty or so years, much has been made of French postmodern social thought and its capacity to inform cultural theory and contemporary media, art, and society. Academic disciplines as broad ranging as politics, history, literary criticism, philosophy, architecture, gender studies, and anthropology have seized upon the insights of many postmodern concepts, and have articulated new methods and strategies for understanding the social world and people in it. The disciplines of law and criminology are no exception to this trend. Indeed, during the 1980s and 1990s, many “second wave” socio-legal researchers appropriated the tools of the postmodern sciences in order to deepen our regard for crime and justice controversies. Regrettably, however, little attention has been given to the consolidation and coordination of this scholarship in any systematic fashion. Thus, our appreciation for French postmodern social theory, and its impact for socio-legal studies, remains uneven, fragmented, and disorganized at best.

In part, this lack of systematic and integrative thought is traceable to how postmodern sensibilities have been interpreted and appropriated by other scholars. Indeed, we recognize that not all the theoretical or applied research in law and criminology has been supportive of the postmodern enterprise. For example, Martin Schwartz and David O. Friedrichs (1994, 221–222) suggest that not only is this orientation outside the mainstream of legal and criminological thought but that it rests at the fringe of the critical tradition itself. In addition, Joel Handler (1992) argues that discourse analysis, a component of postmodern conceptual inquiry, is not in any way theoretically based. “Rather, it is a method or process for raising questions and criticizing the presumptions of theory” (1992, 723). According to some observers, these and other similar criticisms cast doubt on the efficacy of the postmodern sciences to inform and advance our appreciation for such matters as crime and its control, violence and victims, punishment and correctional practices, deviance and delinquent behavior. However, we note that our task in this book is not to directly challenge these sorts of reservations; rather, we merely wish to draw attention to

where and how the postmodern critique has been and can be significant for advancing our knowledge of law, crime, and social justice.

We do not totally dismiss modernist's claims, assumptions, or theories, nor do we want to reestablish dualisms and clear-cut polarities that become the basis of dogmatic defense; rather, we look forward to ongoing dialogue with modernism's adherents. In this spirit, we do challenge any tendencies toward stasis and closure. In the affirmative postmodern perspective, the search is not for definitive conceptualizations, theories, and solutions, but for approaches to understanding meaning that ensure openness, reflexivity, transparency, and sensitivity to the multifaceted nature of being human in society.¹ It is a search for possible relatively stabilized configurations in which harms of reduction and harms of repression diminish, while personal and social growth expand. It is a call for what chaologists refer to as "dissipative structures" in which institutions and structures remain criticizable, responsive, and transparent. It is a call for "far-from-equilibrium" conditions rather than a privileging of homeostasis, structural functionalism, and linear developments. It is a recognition of nonlinearity, dialectics, irony, spontaneity, flux, flow, the unexpected, and rhizomatic development. It valorizes the notion of Julia Kristeva's "subject-in-process." In this context, we seek to establish transpraxis rather than praxis; a method in which critique is combined with visions of the possible.

Moreover, we regard the above stated cavils and cautions as the anticipated fall out of a more nihilistic, pessimistic, and fatalistic approach to postmodernist thought. It may very well be that the early form of postmodern analysis was merely an adolescent stage of development; a reaction-negation praxis to various repressive activities without an affirmative vision of the possible. As we explain in chapter 3, while a skeptical line of inquiry can be traced to this heterodox intellectual tradition, there also is an affirmative reading located within it. This replacement approach to postmodern thought offers new insights about the human condition and about social life, potentially yielding new vistas of meaning that promote transformative and emancipating social change.

One way to appreciate this more liberating version of postmodernism, especially as developed throughout this book, is to situate it within its appropriate historical context. French postmodernism was fueled by many intersecting events: rapid economic modernization in the wake of World War II; new forms of mass culture, technology, consumerism, and urbanization that concealed psychological alienation and social oppression; the conceptual demise of Marxism, existentialism, and phenomenology and the intellectual birth of structuralism and poststructuralism; and several new theories about

writing and discourse as developed by philosophers, psychoanalysts, and linguists of the infamous *Tel Quel* group. All of these events contributed to the riots of 1968, in which students and workers momentarily brought the political economy of France to a halt. Although short-lived, the uproar of 1968 inaugurated a new historical epoch, a postmodern era, in which an epistemological shift was given life (Best and Kellner 1991, 16–20; Best and Kellner 1997).

Figured prominently in this epistemological transition was the role of language and its capacity to shape our understanding of social phenomena and human behavior.² Central to this exploration of language was the psychoanalytic formulations of Jacques Lacan, particularly his insights on the relationship between discourse and subjectivity. His novel and groundbreaking observations on language and identity were presented in seminar form throughout the 1950s to 1980 in Paris, France. Lacan was to take the early Freud (1900–1920) and integrate and synthesize various theorists: Ferdinand de Saussure provided the theoretical statement for his nonreferential semiotics; Alexandre Kojève offered the interpretations of George W. F. Hegel's notion of desire; Emile Benveniste specified the nature of the personal pronoun and how "I" is a shifter, that is, a stand in for the subject; Roman Jakobson, through his studies on speech disorders, developed the idea that metaphor and metonymy are the two organizing principles of semiotic production; and Claude Levi-Strauss elaborated on the nature of the Symbolic Order.

Lacan, too, was to be inspired by the works of a number of mathematicians, especially topologists (quite early in his career in the 1950s by Georges Guilbaud). In his late works of the 1970s, Lacan turned even more to the works of mathematicians, especially topologists (e.g., Pierre Soury, Michel Thomé), in developing his theory on the use of the Borromean knots and *le sinthome*. Several contemporary mathematically oriented Lacanians such as Jean-Michel Vappeareau were to assist this integration in the 1970s. These syntheses were the basis of Lacan's seminars, most of which have yet to be translated into English; many still await even French publication (for a detailed application of Lacan's contributions in law, crime, and justice see, Milovanovic 1997, 2002).

THE POSTMODERN ENTERPRISE IN CRIME, LAW, AND JUSTICE

Despite its considerable relevance throughout and application to various academic disciplines, the development of French postmodern thought has not been consolidated in the legal and criminological research. *The French*

Connection in Criminology: Rediscovering, Crime, Law, and Social Change aims to remedy this deficiency. Although in a previous article (Arrigo, Milovanovic, and Schehr 2000), we attempted this very exercise, the limits of that scholarship did not permit us to develop more fully many of the important thinkers and themes explored in the pages of this text. Accordingly, this book represents the first comprehensive, accessible, and integrative overview of postmodernism's contribution to the field. More specifically, this text draws attention to where and how the more affirmative and synthetic approach to postmodern inquiry has been and can be significant for advancing our knowledge of and response to law, crime, and justice, particularly in relation to an array of social problems society confronts today.

The French Connection in Criminology also is written principally as a "primer" and a pedagogical tool for the field. As such, it endeavors to reveal the utility of postmodernism's diverse theoretical and methodological underpinnings, especially in relation to more liberating prospects for social change. Moreover, this text represents a rallying cry for future research. Indeed, the taken for granted conceptual prisms and methodological tools through which most criminological and legal investigations unfold must be de-centered and displaced if meaningful, sustainable, and structural change is to occur. With this in mind, *The French Connection in Criminology* seeks to fan the flames of alternative, provocative, and novel lines of socio-legal scholarship; approaches that simultaneously identify the limits of existing research while charting new directions that provisionally, positionally, and relationally advance the interests of citizen well-being, collective humanism, and social accord. Finally, this text stands as a challenge to the modernist tradition in crime, law, and social justice. We invite our colleagues to rethink how such phenomena as identity, social structure, cause and effect logic, time and space configurations, deductive and syllogistic reasoning, role formation, knowledge, truth, and progress, and so forth, are all based on implicit assumptions and concealed values anchored in dominant discourses with their corresponding alienating and marginalizing effects. To this end, *The French Connection in Criminology: Rediscovering Crime, Law, and Social Change* endeavors to establish a vision not of what is but of what could be. Consequently, this book signifies a search for transpraxis (Henry and Milovanovic 1996), particularly in the way we think about, talk about, or otherwise engage in criminological and legal *verstehen*.

A COMMENT ON PRESUPPOSITIONS

No piece of scholarship is without its presuppositions and this book is no exception. In our case, we understand theory and method to be intertwined.

For example, there are multiple theoretical variants to postmodernism (e.g., poststructuralism, discourse analysis, chaos theory, dialogical pedagogy) just as there are different methodological approaches to it (e.g., narrative jurisprudence, semiotics, deconstruction, constitutive). However, in the topography of postmodernism, theory and method converge: language becomes method and method becomes theory; conceptualizing the linguistic turn in crime, law, and social justice becomes a new approach for conceiving, interpreting, and knowing phenomena; “doing” an affirmative and integrative postmodern analysis represents theoretical and methodological reformulation. Our regard for postmodern inquiry unfolds with these presuppositions in mind.

Given our understanding of the relationship between theory and method, the applied investigations that follow (chapters 4–8), signify attempts at crafting novel lines by which to engage in research. This observation should not be underestimated or dismissed. Indeed, what this book attempts to accomplish is to dramatically reframe many of the existing debates in law, crime, and justice studies by drawing from the provocative insights of first and second wave French postmodern social theorists. Thus, we neither presume to offer any definitive truths on the subjects canvassed, nor do we propose that our inquiries represent the final word on the topics investigated. Instead, what we assume is that our observations—incomplete, provisional, and suggestive—signify some of the possible ways in which we can rethink law, criminology, and social justice.

Finally, we assume that readers will be somewhat unfamiliar with several of the ideas, lines of analyses, terms, and algebraic formulations discussed or presented throughout this book. We do not wish this unfamiliarity to harbor resentment or to promote confusion for the uninitiated. Accordingly, several theoretical and methodological themes reemerge, especially in the application chapters. This is deliberate. Our efforts here are designed to encourage novice readers of postmodernist thought to become increasingly comfortable with the alternative conceptualizations proposed. For those readers more informed about postmodern analysis, the book provides an accessible collection of various potential applications and suggestive integrations for further research in these areas and beyond.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

During the past two decades, several noteworthy texts and edited volumes have relied upon selected insights contained within the domain of French postmodern social theory, and have applied these notions to relevant themes in law, criminology, and social justice (e.g., Smart 1989; Manning 1988;

Milovanovic 1992; Henry 1983; Arrigo 1993, 2002a; Butler 1990; Young 1996). Today, this body of scholarship, although far from exhaustive, is voluminous. What each of these works shares is a genuine commitment to the power of postmodern thought to provide different lenses that establish new meanings for complex problems in crime, law, and social justice. However, these texts are neither specifically designed to explain, nor are they intended to unify the strains of thought encompassing French postmodern social theory. More recently, however, a few attempts at theoretical synthesis and/or consolidation have materialized (e.g., Henry and Milovanovic 1996; Milovanovic 2002). Although more mindful of the conceptual and historical origins of postmodern theory, these efforts do not directly address who the key first wave scholars were, nor how their coordinated insights represent a conceptual framework of sorts for social science inquiry, subsequently appropriated by second wave legal and criminological researchers.

The French Connection in Criminology: Rediscovering Crime, Law, and Social Change contributes to the existing body of postmodern work by squarely attending to the limitations identified above. Specifically, the text reviews and consolidates the unique contributions of eleven first wave French postmodern luminaries, mindful of the more affirmative and liberating dimensions of their scholarship. These prominent thinkers include Roland Barthes, Jean Baudrillard, Hélène Cixous, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, and Jean-François Lyotard. Certainly there could be a claim for the inclusion of others in this group; however, we wish to limit our coverage to those who have had the most direct influence in law, criminology, and social justice. To be sure, the scholarly work of some of the less exposed and less translated French scholars will be the basis of important insights in the coming years. Their “discovery” will certainly contribute more momentum to the body of literature supportive of a more postmodern understanding. In addition, the text documents where and how the theorists’ respective insights have been extended into the legal and criminological realm through the application work of second wave scholars. Relatedly, in order to demonstrate the future utility for engaging in an affirmative and integrative postmodern investigation, a number of crime and justice application chapters are presented.

Accordingly, in chapter 1, we present the insights of Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Michel Foucault, and Jean François Lyotard. Each of these first wave luminaries has passed way; however, the vitality of their insights endures. Along these lines, we briefly draw attention to the applied research generated by second wave scholars who

have appropriated and extended the contributions of French postmodern social theorists as linked to law, crime, and justice studies.

In chapter 2, we sustain our presentation of first wave French postmodern thought. In particular, we review the work of Jean Baudrillard, Hélène Cixous, Jacques Derrida, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva. Similar to our exposition in chapter 1, where useful and appropriate, we summarize several of the second wave studies that have applied first wave insights to pressing issues in law and criminology.

In chapter 3, we explore what is meant by “doing” affirmative and integrative postmodern research. In order to accomplish this task, we first review the more nihilistic, skeptical, and antifoundational forms of postmodern inquiry. Next, we explain several theoretical and methodological aspects of our affirmative and integrative enterprise. The comments that follow in this section are not exhaustive; rather, we identify several robust areas where promoting a transformative agenda in socio-legal studies is not only possible but also realizable. Finally, we suggestively propose several areas in which postmodern syntheses are discernible. With this thrust, we conclude the chapter by specifying a number of attempts at affirmative and integrative postmodern research relevant to crime, law, and justice studies (e.g., edgework, constitutive criminology, chaos theory, and psychoanalytic semiotics).

The balance of *The French Connection in Criminology* (chapters 4–8) demonstrates how the insights of the first wave social theorists can be applied to relevant and topical themes in crime, law, and social justice research. Again, our analysis in these chapters is suggestive of what an affirmative and integrative postmodern exposition might encompass.

Accordingly, in chapter 4, we examine confinement law and prison resistance. In this chapter, we first look at persons identified as competent but mentally ill and indicate how an affirmative and integrative postmodern approach to confinement, competency, mental illness, and treatment would offer alternative and more liberating practices. In the second part of this chapter, we focus on four areas of prisons resistance: poststructuralist feminist critiques; agency and resistance in women’s prisons; jailhouse lawyers (primitive rebels or revolutionaries?); and constitutive penology. In each case, we summarize some of the central ideas and then follow with how first and second wave French postmodern insights could further contribute to an even greater understanding of these phenomena.

In chapter 5, we highlight critical race theory and a jurisprudence of color. We first indicate one of the main reservations presented by critical race theorists—that because of compelling, daily, and systematic repressive practices CRT researchers do not have the luxury to engage in highly theoretical,

abstract, and esoteric discourses. Therefore, some critical race theorists contend that they must be more pragmatic in using law as one of the few weapons available to correct wrongs. We describe how postmodern analysis could provide some critical tools for a jurisprudence of color. Indeed, an alliance between the two would enhance both. Accordingly, we engage three areas: storytelling and narrative constructions; the wherewithal of intersectional subjectivity; and an alternative methodology rooted in transpraxis.

In chapter 6, we explore the relationship between media/cultural studies and feminism. We first develop the Lacanian cinema model. In this model the “spoken subject” is developed; a subject who identifies with the discursive subject positions offered and begins to see the world as the director suggests. Underlying this model is a reliance on the oedipalization of the subject; a passive notion of desire as a response to lack; the mirror stage of ego development; and the tendency toward the development of a readerly text. We provide several examples of this application. We then move to revisionist and integrative Lacanian models and explain how women and other disenfranchised persons are denied voices and how they may find expression. Here, the work of Kristeva on the “abject” provides an alternative perspective on how subjectivities and realities are constructed. We provide some applications to filmic and literary texts. A revisionist and integrative perspective is subsequently developed drawing from Norman Denzin’s postmodern ethnography, Minh-Ha Trinh’s critical observations, and the suggestive theoretical work of Deleuze and Guattari on the body without organs. The central notion developed here is the idea of an “intersectional standpoint” which goes beyond mere “standpoint epistemology.”

In chapter 7, we assess restorative justice initiatives and victim offender mediation practices. We first summarize victim offender mediation (VOM) and note that contrary to its main defenders it very much can be likened to legal formalism whereby a dominant discourse in a disciplinary mechanism functions to co-opt discussion in restricted ways. We then offer first and second wave theorizing to not only critique, but also to suggest future directions. We describe a more progressive version of VOM; one that endorses transformation through transpraxis rather than a mere “restoration.” We conclude with a discussion of restrictions concerning the viability of VOM, given the existence of a hierarchical political economy.

In chapter 8, we investigate the phenomenon of social movements, drawing attention to the manifestation of innocence projects and intentional communities. We explain that conventional theorizing about social movements privileges large-scale organization of assumed rational calculators who mobilize resources, build coalition networks, and engage in long-range

planning. However, we demonstrate that challenges to dominant cultural institutions and practices operate at subaltern levels and in nonlinear ways. As such, we delineate a fourth approach to movement potential; a paradigm that relies on the insights of chaos theory. To substantiate our position, we explore the manifestation of innocence projects as a response to wrongful convictions and the presence of intentional communities as a strategy designed to house the homeless. As these illustrations reveal, postmodern social movements argue for the privileging of nonlinear dynamics, framing processes, structural dislocations, sensitivity to the reemergence of the discourse of the *master*, intersectional standpoints, and shifting coalitions. The examples signify a persistent resistance bubbling beneath the surface of dominant culture, and they hold the potential for stimulating nonlinear, but nonetheless manifest, institutional changes. Very central, then, to the new social movements are ideas emerging from chaos theory and first and second wave French scholars.

The French Connection in Criminology: Rediscovering Crime, Law, and Social Change is a timely invitation to the reader. More than critiquing how things are and more than proposing how things could be, this book challenges those who wrestle with its contents to rethink the way in which teachers, researchers, policy analysts, practitioners, and activists can promote, establish, and sustain much needed reform in the every day world of criminal justice. If change is to successfully resist the dust heap of abject idealism, if transpraxis is to avoid the charge of intellectual abstraction, and if humanism is to transcend the confines of false sentimentalism, then the future of socio-legal studies must reconcile itself to the postmodern era. This is the invitation we lay before the reader.

CHAPTER 1

Establishing the First Wave: The Linguistic Turn in Social Theory

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we succinctly describe the contributions of several prominent first wave thinkers whose work has contributed substantially to our understanding of postmodern thought.¹ These authors include Roland Barthes, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, and Jean-François Lyotard. We note that while each of these luminaries has passed away, they individually and collectively helped to establish the first wave's agenda endorsing social and political change. In chapter 2, the insights of those first wave thinkers, who have sustained the postmodern project, are likewise delineated.

Chapter 1 also summarizes where and how the inroads of the identified social theorists have been utilized by various second wave authors, especially those commenting on different facets of law, crime, and social justice. This related and secondary task is important to the text's overall purpose. As the subsequent application chapters make evident, embracing a postmodern attitude need not produce a nihilistic, fatalistic, or pessimistic worldview. Indeed, the linguistic turn in social theory can also lead to affirmative, transformative, and emancipatory praxis. Thus, the aim of the following exposition on postmodernism, the first wave architects of this heterodox perspective, and

the crime and justice scholars who have since then appropriated many of their insights, is to suggest that “doing” affirmative and integrative analysis of the sort proposed here dramatically moves us beyond our conventional understanding of criminological and legal research, to a place in which transpraxis and social justice can thrive.

FIRST WAVE CONTRIBUTIONS

Jacques Lacan

Jacques Lacan (1900–1981) arguably is the key figure in the development of French-inspired postmodern analysis.² Lacan’s (1977) main contribution was that the subject is intimately connected to discourse. This subject, or “speaking” (*parlêtre*) being, is a de-centered rather than centered subject offered by Enlightenment epistemology.

Lacanian thought undermined the concept of the “individual,” captured in the notion of the juridic subject in law or the “rational man” assumption contained in rational choice theory in criminology. Rather, the speaking being was depicted in a more static form in Schema L, and in a more dynamic, topological form in the Graphs of Desire, Schema R, Schema I, the Cross-Cap, and the Borromean Knots (Lacan 1977, 1988). His topological constructions also included the Mobius Band and the Klein bottle. What he showed was that there were two planes to subjectivity: the subject of speech, and the speaking subject (Lacan 1981). The former included the deeper unconscious workings where desire was embodied in signifiers that came to “speak the subject”; the latter was the subject taking a position in various discourses, identifying with an “I” as a stand in for her/his subjectivity, and engaging in communication with the other. He was to show that three intersecting spheres existed in the production of subjectivity: the Symbolic (the sphere of the unconscious, nuanced discourse and the “law-of-the-father”), the Imaginary (the sphere of imaginary constructions including conceptions of self and others), and the Real Order (lived experience beyond accurate symbolization). Since the Symbolic Order is phallogentric, all is tainted with the privileging of the male voice. According to Lacan (1985), women remain left out, *pas-toute*, not-all. However, they have access to an alternative *jouissance*, which remains inexpressible in a male-dominated order (Lacan 1985). Hence, the basis for the call for an *écriture féminine* (i.e., women’s writing) to overcome *pas-toute*.³

Lacan’s attention to discourse and subjectivity includes a dynamic understanding of speech production and its psychic mobilization (Lacan 1991). Interested in both the inter- and intra-subjective plane of human exis-

tence and development, Lacan graphically depicted what he termed the “four discourses.” These included the discourse of the *master*, *university*, *hysteric*, and *analyst*. Each of these organizing schemas, as distinct mechanisms for understanding speech production and its psychic configuration, explained how desire did or did not find expression (and legitimacy) in discourse, and what sort of knowledge was privileged (or dismissed) when one of these specific discourses was in use.

Briefly, each of the four discourses includes four main terms and four corresponding locations. These terms are *S1* or the master signifier; *S2* or knowledge; $\$$ or the desiring subject; and *a* or the *objet petit (a)* understood by Lacan to be *le plus de jouir* or that excess in enjoyment left out (*pas-toute*) in the discursive arrangement of the particular discourse (e.g., *university*, *master*) in operation.

Master signifiers are primordial, originate through our childhood experiences, and form the basis for how speech production typically unfolds. In the United States, the examples of “due process” in law or “just deserts” in criminology are master signifiers. The meanings assigned to these phrases are anchored in ideologically based contents, consistent with a materialistic political economy, established during one’s formative development. For Lacan (1991), the knowledge term, *S2*, is a part of a chain of signifiers where meaning always and already insists. To illustrate, the circumscribed meanings for the master signifier “due process” are linked to other signifiers such as “equity,” “fairness,” “reasonableness,” and these signifiers form the basis of or become the subject for yet other key signifiers in law. The divided or slashed subject is depicted by the $\$$ term. The subject is divided because his or her *jouissance* is not fully embodied in the words or phrases used to convey speech or to invite action. All linguistic coordinate systems are specialized grammars where communicating effectively means that one must insert oneself and/or be positioned within the discursive parameters that give that language system coherence. What is lost in this process, however, is the subject’s being; his or her interiorized self (Lacan’s lack, *pas toute*, or *a*) that slumbers in despair because the subject’s true words cannot find anchorage in prevailing modes of communicating and interacting.

Lacan also identified four structural positions corresponding to the four terms. These four locations can be depicted as follows:

<u>agent</u>	<u>other</u>
truth	production

The left side of the formulation represents the person sending some message. The right side of the formulation symbolizes the receiver of the