

Gladys Swain — A Life, a Genealogy, a Reception

For the clinician who rewrote the history of psychiatry after Foucault

Guradisu Suwein — shōgai, keifu, juyō グラディス・スウェイン——生涯・系譜・受容

Takeshi Matsuisbi 松石竹志, M.D., Ph.D.

Editio princeps · Augustus MMXXVI — First edition · August 2026

ABSTRACT

Gladys Swain (1945–1993) is the French psychiatrist whose work reshaped the historiography of psychiatry after Foucault’s *Histoire de la folie*; biographical literature on her is nearly nonexistent in any language, and in English there has been none at all. Drawing chiefly on the two prefaces Marcel Gauchet set before her posthumous works, this paper sketches her life — the unprivileged origins; the political formation of 1965 in the Trotskyist JCR, which gave a medical student her “relatively rare equipment” of social theory; her refusal, amid the climate of Foucault, Lacan and antipsychiatry, of both the couch and the romanticization of madness; her place in the literal first generation of the autonomous psychiatric curriculum opened by the 1968 separation of psychiatry from neurology, for which Henri Ey’s *Livre blanc* movement had fought; and the final years of illness and silence (1987–93). It then documents the genealogy in which her

work stands: Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology and Raymond Aron’s liberalism crossing in Claude Lefort — whose *doctorat d’État* Aron supervised — and descending through Gauchet at Caen to Swain’s article in the first issue of *Libre* (1977): the “other French thought” that contested modernity, power and the subject against the Althusser–Foucault line and concluded for democracy. An account of Gauchet’s later trajectory and the controversy over his interventions on immigration, of Swain’s reception in empirical historiography (Postel’s deep and documented debt) and in the English-speaking world (the abridged *Madness and Democracy* in the series “New French Thought,” Seigel’s foreword, Moyn’s study), an account of the French system of medical qualifications (*thèse d’exercice*, the two doctorates, the signature of rank), and an annotated bibliography complete the portrait — the first biographical introduction to Swain in English.

CONTENTS

Introduction: Why Swain?	2
1. A Life	2
1.1 A sketch	2
1.2 1965: Medical school, and another formation	2
1.3 The intellectual climate: Foucault, Lacan, antipsychiatry	3
1.4 Illness and silence	3
2. A Genealogy: From Aron to Swain	4
2.1 Lefort, the point of junction	4
2.2 From the crossroads at Caen to the first issue of <i>Libre</i>	4
2.3 This genealogy on the map of French thought: Sartre, Althusser, Foucault	4
3. The Co-Author Afterwards: Gauchet’s Trajectory and Its Controversies	5

3.1 From the asylum to religion, and to immigration	5
3.2 The charge of a turn to the right	5
3.3 Reappraisal in English, and the end of <i>Le Débat</i>	5
4. Reception: Empirical History, the English-Speaking World, the Classroom	5
4.1 Empirical history: Postel	5
4.2 An abridged translation and the series “New French Thought”	6
4.3 The present: the classroom, and the remaining absences	6
5. The Writings, with Brief Annotations	6
Conclusion	6
Notes and References	7

Nota in limine — Prefatory note This is the English edition of the author's biographical introduction to Gladys Swain, based on the Japanese original (2026, v1.0). The original was written as a common point of reference — a hub for the person, the genealogy and the bibliography — for this bulletin's studies of Swain's doctrine (on Pinel and the founding of psychiatry; on the criticisms of Foucault; on *La pratique de l'esprit humain*), which for the present remain in Japanese. The doctrine itself is therefore not treated here beyond cross-reference. Passages of the original addressed to the Japanese reader have been lightly recast for the anglophone reader, and the bracketed queries of the original are consolidated in "A note on the state of research" at the end; in substance the two versions coincide. The text was revised in August 2026 in the light of a collegial review: the revisions touch wording, the placement of the account of French medical qualifications (now in section 1.2), and the form of the apparatus of notes and references, not the substance.

How to cite

Matsuishi, T. (2026). Gladys Swain — a life, a genealogy, a reception: For the clinician who rewrote the history of psychiatry after Foucault. *Bulletin of YRIDEI*, 1, Article 17, pp. 1–8. <http://matsuishi-lab.org/bulletin/en/swain-introduction-en.html>

Japanese original: Matsuishi, T. *Guradisu Suwein — shōgai, keifu, juyō* グラディス・スウェイン——生涯・系譜・受容——フーコー以後の精神医学史を書き換えたひとりの臨床医のために [Gladys Swain — a life, a genealogy, a reception: For the clinician who rewrote the history of psychiatry after Foucault]. *Bulletin of YRIDEI*, 1 (2026), Article 17 (in Japanese). <http://matsuishi-lab.org/bulletin/swain-introduction.html>

Introduction: Why Swain?

Gladys Swain (1945–1993) was a French psychiatrist, and the historian who redrew the coordinates of the historiography of psychiatry after Foucault's *Histoire de la folie*. Her working life as a scholar lasted about ten years; she published a single book of her own. Yet on the ground opened by that one book — *Le sujet de la folie : naissance de la psychiatrie* (1977)^[1] — stand today's empirical history of psychiatry, the political philosophy of her co-author Marcel Gauchet (1946–), and this bulletin's own account of the founding of psychiatry by Pinel. Of her life, however, almost nothing has been written: apart from the two prefaces her husband Gauchet set before her posthumous volumes^[2] ^[3], the record — in French no less than in English — is close to silence. Working within this taciturn state of the sources, the present paper puts in order what can now be established, and situates the intellectual climate that surrounded her within the genealogy that runs from Aron through Lefort to Gauchet. It is addressed in the first place to readers in psychiatry, and assumes no prior acquaintance with French political thought.

1. A Life

1.1 A sketch

Swain was born in 1945 at Ablon (the département is not yet established: see the note on the state of research), and died in Paris on 22 September 1993, at forty-eight^[2]. The writings she left are these: the single-author book *Le sujet de la folie* (1977; the actual distribution came in January 1978, in her thirty-third year^[3]); *La pratique de l'esprit humain — l'institution asilaire et la révolution démocratique*, written with Gauchet (1980)^[8]; a dozen or so journal articles; and, published after her death under Gauchet's editorship, the collection *Dialogue avec l'insensé* (1994)^[2] and the co-authored *Le vrai Charcot* (1997)^[20]. The period of writing runs from 1977 to about 1987 — some ten years^[2]. Modest in quantity, this work is still consulted, half a century after publication, as one of the most comprehensive alternative accounts we possess of the birth of psychiatry.

Of her family circumstances the published record says little. But it is worth noting that Gauchet himself, in the preface to the posthumous collection, writes that she was a rebellious head and, being a woman, by no means well born into the bargain (*une tête rebelle ... en tant que femme, de surcroît point bien née*), and that nothing, ever, could make her forget the injustices of the old university and asylum order (*Rien, jamais, ne put le lui faire oublier*)^[2]. From origins that could not be called favoured she made her way into medicine, and cut a path through a medical academy still dominated by men — here is the biographical root of the *esprit de fronde*^[4], the spirit of insubordination that marked her thinking to the end.

1.2 1965: Medical school, and another formation

The key to Swain's intellectual formation is that it did not take place only inside the lecture halls of the faculty of medicine. By Gauchet's testimony she entered political activity in 1965, in step with her entry into university, joining the Trotskyist Jeunesse communiste révolutionnaire (JCR)^[2]. Gauchet calls this background "a relatively rare equipment for a medical student of the period" (*un bagage relativement rare pour une étudiante en médecine de l'époque*), and stresses the theoretical acculturation in matters of society and history that she gained there^[2]. The training of reading and disputation — what is society, how do institutions form human beings — cast the mould of her thought before the medical curriculum could. The shock of May '68 carried her out of Leninist orthodoxy; but no later disenchantment ever took from her the critical eye she turned on the old order^[2].

Only from this fact does the syntax of her doctoral thesis become intelligible: a prose in which main clause and parenthesis fold over one another, moving through concession and reversal toward the conclusion — prose belonging to the tradition of the philosophical essay, of a kind no ordinary medical education produces. Her sentences were not written in

medical school. They were forged in the crucible of political activism and theory, and in that “second university,” the philosophical circle around Lefort and Gauchet described in Chapter 2. The intellectual historian Jerrold Seigel, in his foreword to the English translation, testifies to the difficulty of the Gauchet–Swain prose from the other side: its reason, he finds, lies in the authors’ passionate and deeply humanistic engagement with the people about whom they write^[10].

The institutional sense of that term “doctoral thesis” deserves to be fixed at once, for the full measure of the book’s singularity depends upon it. France has no examination corresponding to the national licensing examinations of Japan or the United States; their place is held by the public defence, at the exit of the medical curriculum, of a doctoral thesis — the *thèse d’exercice*. The successful candidate receives the title *docteur en médecine* — a professional degree, corresponding to the M.D. of anglophone usage — and acquires the right to practise by enrolment in the *Ordre des médecins*; it is, institutionally, a different thing altogether from the academic degree of which the Ph.D. is representative, whose French counterpart, in the humanities of that generation, was the State doctorate (*doctorat d’État*) — the class of Lefort’s Machiavelli thesis (2.1). The *thèse d’exercice* is normally defended during or at the close of the *internat*, the residential hospital training; and its content, in the common run, need not exceed a modest case-study^[25]. When this paper calls *Le sujet de la folie* a “doctoral thesis,” it is in this sense of the *thèse d’exercice* — not in the sense of a Japanese doctoral dissertation, nor of a Ph.D. thesis. Lacan’s thesis of 1932 and Ey’s early papers are, in the same sense, “work of the interne”; and it is only against this institutional background that the anomaly of Swain’s case can be taken at its true size — a professional thesis that need have been no more than a case-study, published as a book by a specialist house, and taking its place at once in the controversy with Foucault.

1.3 The intellectual climate: Foucault, Lacan, antipsychiatry

The France in which she chose psychiatry — the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s — was a France in which the discipline’s very reason for existing stood in question. The governing frame had been set by Foucault’s *Histoire de la folie* (1961); over it lay the protest of antipsychiatry and the promise of a pure psychoanalysis held out by Lacan’s *Écrits* (1966). The dilemma of the age, in Gauchet’s summary, was *L’hôpital ou le divan?* — the hospital or the couch?^[2] Swain’s singularity is that, standing in the middle of this climate, she gave herself to none of its currents. She chose the hospital — that is, psychiatry itself as a discipline —, declined the romanticization of madness (the one that flew Hölderlin and Artaud as its colours), and put the dominant frameworks not to abandonment but to strict historical verification. What Gauchet names as her core is “the irreducible concern to think for herself” (*l’irréductible souci de penser par elle-même*), the union of modesty and tenacity, intransigence and receptivity^[2]. For the terminus of that verification — the dismantling

that descended to the level of Foucault’s own references — the reader is referred to the author’s paper on the criticisms of Foucault^[18] and the paper on Pinel and the founding^[17].

Beneath this intellectual climate lies a climate of institutions. As the sixth chapter of Clervoy’s biography of Henri Ey records, France in 1965 possessed four chairs of psychiatry in all (two in Paris, Strasbourg, Marseille) and six of neuropsychiatry (Lille, Lyon, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Montpellier, Nancy); the real power over training lay with neurology^[24]. Against this state of things the *Livre blanc de la psychiatrie française* movement of Henri Ey and the *Évolution psychiatrique* circle (1965–67) demanded the reform of training and the raising of psychiatry’s standing; and in the torrent of university reform that followed May ’68, psychiatry was separated from neurology and became an autonomous discipline with its own specialty curriculum (the CES de psychiatrie) and its own competitive examination for chairs. It is worth remarking that Ey himself was cautious about the “divorce” — fearing that separation would drain psychiatry out of medicine into psycho-sociology, as he thought had happened in America — and argued instead for an integration with the proportions reversed^[24]; but however that may be, Swain, who entered university in 1965 and chose psychiatry at the beginning of the 1970s, belongs literally to the first generation of the autonomous psychiatric curriculum that this reform opened. No document places Ey and Swain in personal contact (for the crossing of their ideas, see the author’s Foucault paper^[18], chapter 3, section 5). At the level of institutions, however, she became a psychiatrist inside the course that the battle of Ey and his generation had forced open. One may add that Privat of Toulouse, the house that published her book, was also the house to which Ey had entrusted, in December 1965, the publication of his own plan for the reorganization of the psychiatric field — a publisher with deep ties to the discipline^[24].

1.4 Illness and silence

After the ten years of writing, Gauchet records, “illness and suffering” (*la maladie et la souffrance*) drew her away from writing^[2]. About the name of the illness he has disclosed nothing — not in the prefaces, not in any later recollection — and no published source identifies the cause. What can be stated with certainty is the single fact that, after an illness of some six years, she died on 22 September 1993^[26]. After her death Gauchet gathered the dispersed articles into *Dialogue avec l’insensé*, and completed the unfinished joint research as *Le vrai Charcot*. Nearly forty years after the work broke off, it has not aged. Rather, as the age of operational diagnosis goes on evading the question of the subject in madness, its timeliness has grown.

2. A Genealogy: From Aron to Swain

2.1 Lefort, the point of junction

At the centre of the intellectual environment that surrounded Swain stands Claude Lefort (1924–2010). For the reader in psychiatry, the political philosopher's position may be marked briefly. Lefort came to philosophy under Merleau-Ponty, his teacher at the Lycée Carnot; after the war, with Cornelius Castoriadis, he founded the legendary group of the anti-Stalinist left, *Socialisme ou Barbarie*. From about 1952, on the other hand, he was acquainted with Raymond Aron (1905–1983), through whose support he obtained a post in sociology at the University of Caen (1966–71). His State doctorate, *Le travail de l'œuvre Machiavel*, was examined at Paris I in 1971 **under the supervision of none other than Aron**, and published the following year^[11] ^[12]. In the person of Lefort, that is, the lineage of Merleau-Pontian phenomenology and of the anti-totalitarian left crosses the lineage of Aronian liberalism. The critique of totalitarianism, and the theory of democracy as the empty place of power, were born of this crossing.

2.2 From the crossroads at Caen to the first issue of *Libre*

Gauchet was Lefort's direct pupil at Caen. Lefort's tenure there (1966–71) coincides exactly with the years in which Gauchet pursued three parallel courses at the same university — philosophy, history, sociology (1966–71)^[12] — and probably overlaps with Swain's student years as well (see the note on the state of research). Thereafter Gauchet stood at the centre of the review *Textures* (from 1971), with Lefort, and then of *Libre* (1977–80, Payot), with Castoriadis, Clastres and Lefort. Swain's attachment to this circle is a matter of documents, not of conjecture. To the **first issue** of *Libre* (1977) she contributed the article “Deux époques de la folie”^[6] — none other than the first appearance of the piece later collected in the posthumous volume as “De Kant à Hegel.” To share a table of contents with Lefort, Castoriadis and Clastres in the very year her thesis appeared in print is to have belonged to this circle of political philosophy as one of its writers, not as a bystander at its edge. The following year, jointly with Gauchet, she signed the preface to a re-edition of Esquirol's doctoral thesis of 1805, *Des passions*^[7]. In 1980 the co-authored *La pratique de l'esprit humain* was published in Gallimard's Bibliothèque des Sciences humaines; and in *Le Débat*, the review Gauchet founded that same year with Pierre Nora, further joint articles followed (1984, 1986)^[13].

That Swain herself acknowledged owing the inspiration of her method of analysis to Lefort is on record in the anglophone scholarship^[4]. Lefort's problematic — what relation does a society entertain with itself? — prepared the method of *La pratique de l'esprit humain*, which reads a single institution, the asylum, as a crystallization of modern democratic society's relation to itself (the closer examination is left to the author's paper on that book^[19]). And as “De Kant à Hegel”

shows, she could move freely inside German idealism. A psychiatrist re-reading Kant's classification of the maladies of the soul and Hegel's doctrine of *Verrücktheit* as the periodization of the history of psychiatry — such analytical breadth is not the product of a medical curriculum. It is the product of the second university.

2.3 This genealogy on the map of French thought: Sartre, Althusser, Foucault

The received map of postwar French thought is, for most readers, a single line: from Sartre's existentialism to the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss, Althusser and Lacan, and on to the post-structuralism of Foucault, Derrida and Deleuze. In Japan, where the map was drawn by what got translated, “contemporary French thought” has meant almost exclusively this line; in the English-speaking academy the same line has circulated under the name of French Theory. It is, so to speak, the **genealogy of the thought of revolution**: Marxism and its structuralist renewal at the École normale supérieure (Althusser), then the Nietzschean critique of reason itself. The genealogy that surrounded Swain belongs to another line — one poorly visible, from either shore, on that map.

At one of its springs stands Aron. At the ENS, Aron was Sartre's *petit camarade* of the same promotion, and passed the philosophy agrégation of 1928 at the head of the list (Sartre, that year, failed). By way of the Sorbonne chair of sociology he reached the Collège de France in 1970; and for thirty years, all the while, he wrote the political columns of *Le Figaro* — a double activity, academic legitimacy joined to practical commentary, that has few equivalents. At home, however, his position was long that of a minority. Against the Aron of *L'Opium des intellectuels* (1955), which analysed Marxism as the secular religion of the intellectuals, the temper of the Sartrean years is caught in the saying that it was “better to be wrong with Sartre than right with Aron”^[22]. The reversal came in the 1970s. In the anti-totalitarian season opened by the French translation of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* (1974) the valuation turned about, and the *Mémoires* of his final year (1983) became a bestseller^[22].

The other spring is the anti-Stalinist **left**. *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, which Lefort founded with Castoriadis (1948/49–), was the pioneering group that criticized the Soviet bureaucracy from within the left — a criticism begun a quarter of a century before anti-totalitarianism became a fashion. This genealogy, in other words, is not a genealogy of the right. It is the line on which, at the single point of anti-totalitarianism, Aronian liberalism and the non-communist left flowed together. That Aron supervised Lefort's doctorate (2.1) is the most compact symbol of that confluence. In the later 1970s the confluence took institutional form. François Furet, who led the revision of the historiography of the French Revolution and the restoration of Tocqueville, became president of the École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS) (1977–85); Lefort had moved to the EHESS in 1976. In the reviews, *Commentaire* (1978–), around Aron, and the Nora–

Gauchet *Débat* (1980–) opened a new space to succeed the age of the engaged intellectual of *Les Temps modernes*. American scholarship has named this turning-point the “antitotalitarian moment”^[23].

Gauchet is the child of this confluence. He studied under Lefort at Caen; Lefort introduced him to Furet; and with the backing of Furet and Nora he was called in 1989 to the EHESS — to the **Centre de recherches politiques Raymond-Aron**^[12]. That his institutional address literally bore Aron’s name attests the reality of the Aron–Lefort–Gauchet genealogy more eloquently than any argument could. And when Nora made Gauchet editor of *Le Débat* in 1980, the choice was read at the time as, among other things, a declaration of distance from Foucault^[12].

For the reader in psychiatry, the summary is this. The genealogy in question contested the same themes as the Althusser–Foucault line everyone knows — modernity, power, the subject — and moved to the opposite conclusion: the defence of democracy, and the diagnosis of its internal dangers. It is the “other French thought.” Politically it stands neither on the old right nor on the communist left, but between anti-totalitarian liberalism and a non-communist socialism (Gauchet’s self-description, “philosophical socialist,” names this position). And Swain’s *Le sujet de la folie*, with the co-authored *La pratique de l’esprit humain*, is the first work — and still very nearly the only one — to carry the method of this lineage, the Tocquevillian analysis of democracy, into the history of psychiatry. If readers formed on the first map, in Japan or in the English-speaking world, have found this work hard to see, the reason is not its quality. In Japanese, half the map was simply never translated; in English it arrived late, under the counter-label “New French Thought,” and never gained the currency of the other line.

3. The Co-Author Afterwards: Gauchet’s Trajectory and Its Controversies

3.1 From the asylum to religion, and to immigration

Swain’s work is read today, more often than not, together with Gauchet’s name. To know the co-author’s later trajectory, and the controversy that attends it, is therefore indispensable to any reader in psychiatry who would take the measure of her reception as it now stands. Five years after *La pratique de l’esprit humain*, Gauchet stepped into the first rank of French thought with *Le désenchantement du monde — une histoire politique de la religion* (1985), and thereafter unfolded his theory of democracy through *La démocratie contre elle-même* (2002) to the four massive volumes of *L’Avènement de la démocratie* (2007–17)^[14]. Its root theme — after the disappearance of the transcendent instance, society undertakes to include the heterogeneous other within itself rather than expel it to an outside, and the undertaking miscarries — is manifestly the direct extension of the book on the asylum.

3.2 The charge of a turn to the right

From the 2010s onward, Gauchet’s interventions on immigration, laïcité and populism drew strong criticism from the left — the verdicts ran from conservatism to reaction. His own self-description is “philosophical socialist”^[15]. The essentials are these. Already in a *Débat* article of 1990 he had argued that what was needed was not a halt to immigration but a *maîtrise* — a mastery reinserting the process of immigration into the domain of social sovereignty. In an interview of 2017, however, he spoke of a change in the very nature of immigration, and used the vocabulary of a *peuple de souche* — a people of old stock — coexisting with newly arrived peoples differently tied to national unity; the choice of words was criticized as an approach to the language of the far right. In 2014 his nomination as opening lecturer of the *Rendez-vous de l’histoire* at Blois had already provoked a call for boycott^[27].

From the standpoint of this paper, two points matter. First, these interventions read not as topical aberrations but as consistent consequences of a single problematic — the inclusion of the other, and its limits — pursued without interruption from the mad, through religion, to the immigrant. Second, and for that very reason, they suggest that an operation which the author’s study of *La pratique de l’esprit humain*^[19] criticized apropos of that book’s image of the insane — the construction of the included other according to the needs of the theory — may be repeating itself upon a new object. The reader of Swain can thus understand the controversy around Gauchet not as background noise to her reception, but as the later history of a tension her joint book already carried within it.

3.3 Reappraisal in English, and the end of *Le Débat*

In the English-speaking world, meanwhile, the recent movement runs rather toward consolidation. In the reaction against post-structuralism, the “other French thought” has been rediscovered as a theory of democracy with historical and anthropological foundations, and a volume of critical essays has been devoted to Gauchet^[16]. That his anglophone critics re-frame his diagnosis of the present as a problem not of the excess of autonomy but of its blindness shows a range quite different from the verdict of simple conservative reaction. The closing of *Le Débat* in 2020, after the forty years of the Nora–Gauchet editorship^[13], marked the end of an era; that his classicization abroad has proceeded in the same years is the paradox in which the ambiguity of his present position is well caught.

4. Reception: Empirical History, the English-Speaking World, the Classroom

4.1 Empirical history: *Postel*

How Swain’s work was received on the side of empirical history of psychiatry is best shown by the medical historian

Jacques Postel (1927–2022). It was Postel who, in 1968, first pointed out Foucault's defective reference to Pinel's *Traité* — the declared citation of the first edition resting in fact upon the second; Swain inherited the observation and radicalized it into a question about the entire structure of interpretation^[17]. Postel's debt in the other direction runs deeper still. In the essay on the founding myth of French psychiatry in his late collection (2007), he names Swain as one “to whom we owe much for this study” (*à qui nous devons beaucoup pour cette étude*), takes *Le sujet de la folie* as his authority at nearly twenty places, and repeats the formula *comme l'a montré G. Swain*. The philosophical frame of his Pinel studies, moreover — the fault-line from Kant to Hegel, and the discovery of a remainder of reason — he draws from her article in the first issue of *Libre*, writing “as the late Gladys Swain so rightly showed in 1977” (*comme l'a montré si justement la regrettée Gladys Swain*)^[5]. Yet Postel was no unconditional follower: he kept the empirical historian's reservation that the Pinelian rupture “is not so total as Swain would have us believe”^[28]. Precisely this balance of debt and reservation is the proof that her work was received in earnest on the empirical side.

4.2 An abridged translation and the series “New French Thought”

The anglophone reception begins in 1999, with *Madness and Democracy*, the Princeton translation of *La pratique de l'esprit humain*^[9]. It is an abridgement — some chapters are omitted — but one through which the substance carries. What matters is that the translation appeared in the series New French Thought (edited by Thomas Pavel and Mark Lilla), a series conceived expressly as a counter to post-structuralist French Theory: Swain's English debut was thus placed, from the first, in the context of the “other French thought.” The long foreword contributed by the intellectual historian Jerrold Seigel — which values the book as a work whose humanity and analytic power compel re-engagement with the great questions it raises, while directing three lucid criticisms at its Freud–totalitarianism judgment, its thesis of the democratic origin of psychological knowledge, and its state-centrism — remains a document of the first rank for the level of the anglophone reception^[10]. In 2009 there followed, in a journal of intellectual history, a full-scale study placing the Gauchet–Swain theory of the subject in its post-1968 context^[4].

4.3 The present: the classroom, and the remaining absences

In France, Swain remains in the curriculum: “De Kant à Hegel,” from the posthumous collection, serves to this day as a commented text in psychiatric teaching^[21], and the single-author book was reissued in 1997 with Gauchet's new preface “De Pinel à Freud”; the chain of reference has never broken. In Japanese, by contrast, there exists — so far as the author has been able to determine — no translation of Swain and no extended introduction; the Japanese original of the present paper was written, alongside this bulletin's examinations of her doctrine^[17] ^[18] ^[19], as a first step toward filling that

absence. In English the absence is only partly relieved: one abridged translation, one foreword, one article — and, until now, no biographical introduction at all. The present English edition is offered to that gap.

5. The Writings, with Brief Annotations

Swain's writings are listed here in order of publication, with the books as the axis. The greater part of her journal articles was gathered after her death into *Dialogue avec l'insensé*, whose table of contents thus doubles as the effective list of her papers.

Le sujet de la folie : naissance de la psychiatrie, Toulouse, Privat, coll. «Rhadamanthe», 1977 (distributed January 1978). — The single-author book, founded on the thesis. Reissued: Paris, Calmann-Lévy, coll. «Liberté de l'esprit» (the series founded by Raymond Aron in 1947), 1997, with Gauchet's preface “De Pinel à Freud.”

«Deux époques de la folie», *Libre*, n° 1, Paris, Payot, 1977. — The article that introduced the Kant/Hegel fault-line; published in the first issue of the Lefort–Castoriadis *Libre*. Later collected in *Dialogue avec l'insensé* under the title “De Kant à Hegel.”

Preface (jointly with Gauchet) to the re-edition of Esquirol, *Des passions considérées comme causes, symptômes et moyens curatifs de l'aliénation mentale* (1805), Paris, Librairie des Deux Mondes (the year of publication is given as 1978 by one source and 1980 by another: see the note on the state of research).

La pratique de l'esprit humain : l'institution asilaire et la révolution démocratique (with Gauchet), Paris, Gallimard, Bibliothèque des Sciences humaines, 1980. — English translation (abridged): *Madness and Democracy : The Modern Psychiatric Universe*, trans. C. Porter, foreword by J. Seigel, Princeton U.P., coll. «New French Thought», 1999.

Joint articles with Gauchet, *Le Débat*, 1984 and 1986 (titles and issue numbers to be confirmed: see the note on the state of research).

Dialogue avec l'insensé : essais d'histoire de la psychiatrie, préface de M. Gauchet («À la recherche d'une autre histoire de la folie»), Paris, Gallimard, Bibliothèque des Sciences humaines, 1994. — The posthumous collection of the articles.

Le vrai Charcot : les chemins imprévus de l'inconscient (with Gauchet), Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1997. — The unfinished joint research, completed by Gauchet.

Conclusion

A psychiatrist who wrote for ten years, was ill for six, and died at forty-eight prepared the most radical criticism yet made of the enormous construction that is Foucault's, supplied the empirical historians with their framework, and crossed one of the living genealogies of political philosophy. The record of that life is meagre, and this portrait keeps its own list of open

questions (see the note on the state of research). But the meagreness itself seems not unrelated to the character of her work — which does not speak of itself, but makes its object speak. The substance of the doctrine is treated, and will continue to be treated, by the studies of this bulletin^[17] ^[18] ^[19]. The present paper is their small portrait of the author.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- [1] Swain, G. *Le sujet de la folie : naissance de la psychiatrie*. Toulouse: Privat, coll. « Rhadamanthe », 1977. Reissued Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1997.
- [2] Gauchet, M. « À la recherche d'une autre histoire de la folie », préface à G. Swain, *Dialogue avec l'insensé : essais d'histoire de la psychiatrie*. Paris: Gallimard, 1994. (The basic source for the life.)
- [3] Gauchet, M. « De Pinel à Freud », préface à G. Swain, *Le Sujet de la folie*, nouvelle édition. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1997.
- [4] Moyn, S. "The Assumption by Man of His Original Fracturing: Marcel Gauchet, Gladys Swain, and the History of the Self." *Modern Intellectual History*, 6-2, 2009, pp. 315–341.
- [5] Postel, J. *Éléments pour une histoire de la psychiatrie occidentale*. Paris: L'Harmattan, coll. « Psychanalyse et Civilisations, Série Trouvailles et Retrouvailles » (dir. Jacques Chazaud), 2007. ISBN 978-2-296-04371-8. (A facing Japanese translation by the present author is in progress.) Contains « Philippe Pinel et le mythe fondateur de la psychiatrie française », « Philippe Pinel à Bicêtre », « Du traitement moral de Pinel à la "foi qui guérit" de Charcot », « Esquirol : la carrière d'un grand patron ».
- [6] Swain, G. « Deux époques de la folie ». *Libre*, n° 1, Paris: Payot, 1977.
- [7] Esquirol, J.-É. *Des passions considérées comme causes, symptômes et moyens curatifs de l'aliénation mentale* (1805). Re-edition with preface by M. Gauchet and G. Swain. Paris: Librairie des Deux Mondes, 1978 or 1980. (On the year, see the note on the state of research.)
- [8] Gauchet, M. & Swain, G. *La pratique de l'esprit humain : l'institution asilaire et la révolution démocratique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1980.
- [9] Gauchet, M. & Swain, G. *Madness and Democracy : The Modern Psychiatric Universe*. Trans. C. Porter. Princeton: Princeton University Press, coll. « New French Thought », 1999.
- [10] Seigel, J. "Foreword," in *Madness and Democracy* (above), pp. vii–xxvi.
- [11] Lefort, C. *Le travail de l'œuvre Machiavel*. Paris: Gallimard, 1972. (State doctorate, examined at Paris I in 1971 under the supervision of Raymond Aron.)
- [12] For the careers of Lefort (Merleau-Ponty at the Lycée Carnot; Socialisme ou Barbarie; the relation to Aron; Caen 1966–71; EHESS 1976–89) and of Gauchet (the three parallel courses at Caen 1966–71; the introduction to Furet through Lefort; the call to the Centre de recherches politiques Raymond-Aron in 1989; the editorship of *Le Débat* from 1980), this paper relies on the summaries of the English Wikipedia articles "Claude Lefort," "Marcel Gauchet," and related entries. Gauchet's own testimony is in Gauchet, M. *La condition historique. Entretiens avec F. Azouvi et S. Piron*. Paris: Stock, 2003 (not yet obtained: see the note on the state of research).
- [13] *Le Débat* (ed. M. Gauchet & P. Nora, Gallimard, 1980–2020); the joint Gauchet–Swain articles appeared in 1984 and 1986 (titles and issue numbers to be confirmed); final issue n° 210, mai–août 2020.
- [14] Gauchet, M. *Le désenchantement du monde*. Paris: Gallimard, 1985; *La démocratie contre elle-même*. Paris: Gallimard, 2002; *L'Avènement de la démocratie*, I–IV. Paris: Gallimard, 2007–2017.
- [15] Sources for Gauchet's statements on immigration: Gauchet, M. « Les mauvaises surprises d'une oubliée : la lutte des classes ». *Le Débat*, 1990; interview in *Causeur*, 2017; interview in *L'Obs*, 2018; the controversy over the Rendez-vous de l'histoire (Blois), 2014. The precise issue and page references remain a task for future revision.
- [16] Doyle, N. J. & McMorrow, A. (eds.). *Marcel Gauchet and the Crisis of Democratic Politics*. London: Routledge, 2021.
- [17] Matsuishi, T. 「『精神医学の発祥』第六章 ピネル発祥論——スウェイン立場の採用」 [*The Origins of Psychiatry*, chapter 6: Pinel and the founding — adopting Swain's position]. This bulletin, in Japanese: origines-pinel.html.
- [18] Matsuishi, T. 「アンリ・エーとクロード・ケテルによるミシェル・フォーコーの『狂気の歴史』に対する批判」 [*The criticisms of Michel Foucault's Histoire de la folie* by Henri Ey and Claude Quétel]. This bulletin, in Japanese: foucault-critique.html.
- [19] Matsuishi, T. 「狂気における主体と民主主義の権力——ゴージェ＝スウェイン『人間精神の実践』をめぐって」 [*The subject in madness and the power of democracy: on Gauchet and Swain's La pratique de l'esprit humain*]. This bulletin, draft, in Japanese: gauchet-swain-asile.html.
- [20] Gauchet, M. & Swain, G. *Le vrai Charcot : les chemins imprévus de l'inconscient*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1997.
- [21] « Gladys Swain, "De Kant à Hegel : deux époques de la folie" », in *Quarante-six commentaires de textes en clinique psychiatrique*. Paris: Dunod. (An instance of classroom use.)
- [22] Aron, R. *L'Opium des intellectuels*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1955; *Mémoires : 50 ans de réflexion politique*. Paris: Julliard, 1983. English translation: *Memoirs: Fifty Years of Political Reflection*, trans. G. Holoch, New York: Holmes & Meier, 1990 (one-volume, abridged). Japanese translation in two volumes, trans. H. Miho, Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1999.
- [23] Christofferson, M. S. *French Intellectuals Against the Left : The Antitotalitarian Moment of the 1970s*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2004; Furet, F. *Penser la Révolution française*. Paris: Gallimard, 1978. (For the historiographical name of the turning-point, and the context of the Tocqueville revival.)
- [24] Clervoy, P. *Henri Ey, 1900–1977 : cinquante ans de psychiatrie en France*. Le Plessis-Robinson: Les Empêcheurs de penser en rond, 1997 — chapter 6, "Les combats" (a facing Japanese translation by the present author is in progress). For the count of chairs in 1965, the course of the *Livre blanc* movement, the debate over the "divorce" of psychiatry and neurology, and the publication of Ey's reform plan by Privat. The original imprint, Les Empêcheurs de penser en rond, was a label financed by the pharmaceutical company Synthelabo; through the subsequent mergers its list passed, from October 2008, to Éditions La Découverte. The translation rights being unresolved, this bulletin confines itself to limited quotation for purposes of research.
- [25] *Note*. On French medical qualifications: the signature of rank, and the standing of the *interne*. The institutional difference set out at 1.2 shows itself also in the customs of signature. In Japan there is a custom of adding the English letters M.D. to papers whose content requires the medical qualification, as a display of credentials. The French medical book or paper, by contrast, traditionally prints on its title page not degrees but **rank**: *Interne des hôpitaux*, *Ancien interne des hôpitaux de Paris*, *Chef de clinique*, *Médecin des hôpitaux*. The reader who sees the signature reads off exactly in what capacity the author advances his clinical claims. Where the Japanese custom answers the question with a degree, the French answered the same question with rank (that *Ancien interne des hôpitaux de Paris* is a title of honour borne for life shows the standing of the custom). — As to the clinical and scholarly standing of the *interne*: the *interne* is a genuine actor in treatment,

under the delegation and responsibility of the chief of service; on the ward he prescribes and performs procedures; on night duty he in substance carries the hospital; after a certain number of semesters he may even, with the Ordre's permission, stand in for a practitioner (*remplacement*) — legal responsibility resting with the supervising physician and the hospital. On publication there is no restriction of any kind: the French medical journals abound in articles signed by internes, and the thèse itself is meant to be written out of the clinical and scientific work of the internat.

- [26] *Note.* On the illness left unnamed. Gauchet's preface of 1994 records only that from 1987 "illness and suffering drew her away from writing"; in no subsequent recollection or interview has he touched on the cause, and no published source identifies it. This paper follows his reserve, and records no conjecture.
- [27] *Note.* The detail of Gauchet's statements on immigration. In the *Débat* article of 1990 he argued that what was needed was not the stopping (*arrêt*) of immigration but a mastery (*maîtrise*) that would reinsert the process of immigration into the domain of social sovereignty (*souveraineté sociale*): the reactions of rejection would subside together with the dismay of feeling unprotected against pressures that escape control, and what saves us from resentment and violence is not noble sentiments but political intelligence. In the *Causeur* interview of 2017 he spoke of a change in the nature of immigration — the loss of the former horizon of assimilation, and the coexistence in Europe of a people of old stock (*peuple de souche*) with newly arrived peoples whose tie to national unity is of another kind — a choice of vocabulary that was itself criticized as an approach to the language of the far right; in *L'Obs* (2018) he declined the word "crisis," seeing not an acute phase but the continuation of a long-term trend. In 2014 his nomination as opening lecturer of the *Rendez-vous de l'histoire* at Blois provoked a call for boycott by the writer É. Louis and the sociologist G. de Lagasnerie, answered by a defence of Gauchet signed by researchers in *Le Monde*^[15]. That the prescription of 1990 shows the same logical form as the analysis of *La pratique de l'esprit humain* is discussed at 3.2 above and in the author's study^[19].
- [28] *Note.* The detail of Postel's citations. In "Philippe Pinel et le mythe fondateur de la psychiatrie française," the references to *Le sujet de la folie* stand at pp. 23, 43–44, 47, 119–120, 120, 136–137, 141–142, 148–150, 156, 161–164, 168–169, among others. On the ori-

gin of the myth in Esquirol's inaugural thesis of 1805: « comme l'a montré G. Swain, on voit surgir le signifiant clé ... les chaînes qu'on enlève associé au nom du maître »; on the fabrication: « Comme l'a montré G. Swain, tout est fabriqué ». The adoption of the Kant–Hegel frame is documented in "Philippe Pinel à Bicêtre" — « l'espace d'une découverte » (citing Swain, *Libre*, n° 1, 1977, p. 195) — and in the notes 110–114 of the myth essay (citing pp. 181–182 of the same). The reservation stands in "Du traitement moral de Pinel à la 'foi qui guérit' de Charcot": « Il semble que cette rupture ne soit pas aussi totale que le voudrait Swain ». In the Esquirol essay, Gauchet & Swain, *La Pratique de l'esprit humain*, p. 273, is cited as having clearly shown the meaning of the change^[5].

A note on the state of research. This portrait carries, by design, a list of open points, consolidated here from the bracketed queries of the Japanese original. (i) The birthplace: whether the Ablon of the record is Ablon in Calvados (Normandy) or Ablon-sur-Seine (Val-de-Marne) cannot be settled from the sources now to hand (the French Wikipedia; the BnF authority record). (ii) The circumstances and date of her meeting with Gauchet — at Caen, or later — are likewise unestablished. For both points, Gauchet's book of interviews *La condition historique* (Stock, 2003) [12] is the most promising source, and correction will follow upon its acquisition. (iii) The titles and issue numbers of the two joint articles in *Le Débat* (1984, 1986) [13] remain to be confirmed. (iv) The year of the Esquirol re-edition [7]: Postel's bibliography gives 1978, while a contemporary review (*Dix-huitième Siècle*, 14, 1982, reviewing it together with Azouvi's 1980 edition of Pinel's *Traité*) gives 1980; both dates are recorded pending inspection of a copy. (v) The composition of the jury of Swain's thesis is under inquiry. Corrections will be entered in the Japanese original and in this edition together; all translations from the French, unless otherwise noted, are the author's.

* * *