

## DISSOLUTION! Paris, June 10, 1980

### LE MALENTENDU-THE MISUNDERSTANDING/MIS-HEARD\*

\*RGK-*Le Malentendu* sometimes published as 'Cross Purpose', is also a play written in 1943 in occupied France by Albert Camus. It focuses on Camus' idea of The Absurd. The plot: A man who has been living overseas for many years returns home to find his sister and widowed mother are making a living by taking in lodgers and murdering them. Since neither his sister nor his mother recognize him, he becomes a lodger himself without revealing his identity.

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
Je n'ai pas voulu vous quitter sans remettre ça - encore une fois.		I didn't want to leave you without coming back with my own—once again.	I didn't want to leave you without handing you this – once again.
Ce n'est pas seulement que je me suis dit que je vous devais bien un au revoir, pour m'avoir cette année assisté, d'assister à ce séminaire où je ne vous ai pas ménagés.		Not only because I told myself that I owed you a farewell for having assisted me this year, assisting this seminar where I have been very straight forward.	It's not only because I said to myself that I really owed you a good-bye for having helped me this year by attending this seminar where I did not let you off lightly.
Il y a encore une raison autre à cet au revoir : c'est que je m'en va [sic] comme ça, au Venezuela.		There is besides, another reason for the farewell: and it is that I am leaving you, just like that, for Venezuela	There is another reason, different from this good-bye: it's because I'm off without more ado to Venezuela. RGK-Caracas, July 12 <sup>th</sup> , 1980

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Ces latino-américains, comme on dit, qui ne m'ont jamais vu, à la différence de ceux qui sont ici, ni entendu de voix vive, eh bien, ça ne les empêche pas d'être lacano.		Those Latin-Americans, as they are called, unlike those of you who are here, have neither seen me nor heard me live, ---well— that does not prevent them from being <i>Lacanos</i> .	Those Latin-Americans, as one says, who have never seen me, unlike those who are here, nor heard me live, -- well, that doesn't prevent them from being <i>lacanos</i> .
Il semble que ça les y aide plutôt. Je me suis transmis là-bas par l'écrit, et il paraît que j'y ai fait souche. En tout cas, le croient-ils.		Moreover it seems that it helps. I am transmitted over there through writing, and it is said that I have put down roots. In any case, this is what they believe.	It seems rather that that helps them. I have been transmitted there through writing, and it appears that I have started a lineage. In any case, that is what they believe.
Il est sûr que c'est l'avenir. Et c'est en quoi, d'y aller voir, m'intéresse.		For sure, it is the future. And for that reason, going to see interests me.	It is certain that that is the future. And that's why going there to have a look interests me.
Il m'intéresse de voir ce qui se passe quand ma personne n'écrante pas ce que j'enseigne. Peut-être bien que mon mathème y gagne.		I am interested to see what happens when my person does not act as a screen for what I teach. It is quite possible they can make good use of my mathemes.	I am interested to see what happens when my person does not screen what I am teaching. Perhaps my matheme benefits from it.
Rien ne dit que si ça me plaît, je n'y resterai pas, au Venezuela. Vous voyez pourquoi je voulais vous dire au revoir.		Who knows, if I like it I will stay there in Venezuela. Can you see why I wanted to farewell everyone?	Nothing says that, if I like it, I won't stay there in Venezuela. You can see why I wanted to say good-bye to you.

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
Vous n'avez pas idée du nombre de gens que ça embête, que je me pointe là-bas, et que j'y ai convoqué mes lacano-américains. Ça embête ceux qui s'étaient si bien occupés à me représenter qu'il suffit que je me présente pour qu'ils en perdent les pédales.		You cannot imagine the number of people who are discomfited that I will make an appearance over there, and that I have called together my lacano-americans. It disturbs those who have been so busy trying to represent me; so much that my own presence is enough for them to miss the ball.	You cannot imagine the number of people that are annoyed that I am heading over there, and that I have called together my lacano-americans. It annoys those who had been so very busy representing me that I only had to present myself for them to lose the plot.
Je vais donc m'instruire là-bas, mais évidemment je vais revenir.		Then I am going to take instruction over there, but obviously, I'm going to return.	So I'm going over there to find out for myself, but obviously I am coming back.
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Je vais revenir parce que ma pratique est ici - et ce séminaire, qui n'est pas de ma pratique, mais qui la complémente.		I'm going to return because my practice is here—and this seminar which is not my practice but compliments it.	I am coming back because my practice is here – and this seminar, which is not my practice, but which complements it.
Ce séminaire, je le tiens moins qu'il ne me tient.		This seminar, rather than being directed by me, subjects me.	This seminar, I am less the holder than the held.
Est-ce par l'habitude qu'il me tient ? Sûrement pas, puisque [11] c'est par le malentendu. Et il n'est pas prêt de finir, précisément parce que je ne m'y habitue pas, à ce malentendu.		Does it subject me by habit? Surely not, rather by misunderstanding. And it is far from finished precisely because I cannot habituate to that misunderstanding.	Is it force of habit that holds me? Surely not [11] since it is through misunderstanding. And it is not close to finishing, precisely because I can't get used to this misunderstanding.

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
Je suis un traumatisé du malentendu. Comme je ne m'y fais pas, je me fatigue à le dissoudre. Et du coup, je le nourris. C'est ce qui s'appelle le séminaire perpétuel.		I am traumatized by misunderstanding. And because I don't habituate to it, I tire of dissolving it and with this I feed it. That is called the perpetual seminar.	I am traumatized by this misunderstanding. Since I can't get used to it, I wear myself out trying to dissolve it. And at a stroke, I nourish it. It's what is called the perpetual seminar.
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Je ne dis pas que le verbe soit créateur. je dis tout autre chose parce que ma pratique le comporte : je dis que le verbe est inconscient - soit malentendu.	I do not say that the word is creator. I say something altogether different because my practice obliges me to: I say that the word is unconscious—that is misunderstood.	I do not say that the verb creates. I say something very different because my practice implies the following: I say that the verb is un-conscious—therefore misunderstood.	I don't say that the word is creating. I say something quite different, since my practice includes it: I say that the word is unconscious – that is misunderstood.
Si vous croyez que tout puisse s'en révéler, eh bien, vous vous mettez dedans tout ne peut pas. Cela veut dire qu'une part ne s'en révélera jamais.	If you think that all can be revealed about it, well, you are fooling yourselves: not all can be. That means a part of it will never be revealed.	If you believe that from there everything can be revealed, then there you fall down. Everything cannot. That is to say that a part will never be revealed.	If you believe that everything can be revealed from there, well you are fooling yourselves. All cannot. That means that a part of it will never be revealed.
C'est précisément ce dont la religion se targue. Et c'est ce qui donne son rempart à la Révélation dont elle se prévaut pour l'exploiter.	This is precisely where religion goes wrong. And if it also serves as a rampart around Revelation—which religion prides itself on in order to exploit.	It is precisely of this that religion makes ostentation. This gives shelter to Revelation in which its exploitation prevails.	That's precisely what religion shields itself with. And it's what provides a defence for Revelation which religion prides itself on in order to exploit it.

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
Quant à la psychanalyse, son exploit, c'est d'exploiter le malentendu. Avec, au terme, une révélation qui est de fantasme.	As for psychoanalysis. its exploit is to exploit misunderstanding. With, as its end result, a revelation which is phantasy.	With regard to psychoanalysis, its prowess is to exploit misunderstanding by misunderstanding; having at last a revelation which is the phantasy.	As for psychoanalysis, its exploit is to exploit misunderstanding. With, at the end, a revelation which partakes of phantasy.
C'est ce que vous a refilé Freud. Quel filon, il faut le dire. Tous autant que vous êtes, qu'êtes-vous d'autre que des malentendus ?		This is what Freud passed on to you. What a discovery! We should say so. All of you; what are you if not misunderstandings?	That's what Freud slipped you. What a rich vein, you have to say. All of you, as many as you are, what are you other than misunderstandings?
Le nommé Otto Rank en a approché en parlant du traumatisme de la naissance. De traumatisme, il n'y en a pas d'autre : l'homme naît malentendu.	Otto Rank came close to this when he spoke of the trauma of birth. As for the trauma, there is no other trauma: Man is born misunderstood.	That fellow Otto Rank came close to that in speaking of the trauma of birth. The trauma, there is no other: man is born misunderstood.	That chap Otto Rank came close to it in speaking of the traumatism of birth. Concerning traumatism, there is no other: man is born misunderstood.
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Puisqu'on m'interroge sur ce qu'on appelle le statut du corps, j'y viens, pour souligner qu'il ne s'attrape que de là.	Since I've been asked about what's called the state of the body, I reach this point to emphasize the fact that it can only be grasped from this point.	Since I am interrogated on what they call the statute of the body, I am coming to that to emphasize that they only grab that.	Since I have been asked about what's called the status of the body, I'm coming to that, in order to emphasize that it can be grasped only from that.
Le corps ne fait apparition dans le réel que comme malentendu.	The body on makes it apparition in the real as mis-understanding.	The body does not appear in the Real except as misunderstood.	The body appears in the real only as misunderstood.

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
Soyons ici radicaux : votre corps est le fruit d'une lignée dont une bonne part de vos malheurs tient à ce que déjà elle nageait dans le malentendu tant qu'elle pouvait.	Let's be radical about it: your body is the fruit of a lineage [legacy, heritage]—and a large number of your troubles are due to the fact that this lineage had already been swimming in misunderstanding as best it could.	Let us be radicals here: your body is the fruit of a lineage and a good part of your misfortunes are owed to the fact that it was already swimming in misunderstanding as much as it could.	Let's be radical here: your body is the fruit of a lineage of which a large part of your misfortunes are due to the fact that it was already swimming as best it could in misunderstanding.
Elle nageait pour la simple raison qu'elle parlêtrait à qui mieux-mieux.	It was swimming for the simple reason that it would speak-through-being to whomever happened to be around at the time.	It plainly swam for the simple reason of being babbling better.	It was swimming for the simple reason that it was speaking-being to keep up with others.
C'est ce qu'elle vous a transmis en vous "donnant la vie", comme on dit. C'est de ça que vous héritez. Et c'est ce qui explique votre malaise dans votre peau, quand c'est le cas.	That is what it has transmitted to you by "giving you life", as we say. It's from this that you inherit. And this explains your being at odds with yourself, when that's the case.	That is what transmits "giving you life", as they say. That is inherited, and that explains the discomfort in your skin when that is the case.	That is what it has transmitted to you in "giving you life", as they say. That is what you have inherited. And it's what explains your discomfort, when that is the case.
Le malentendu est déjà d'avant. Pour autant que dès avant ce beau legs, vous faites partie, ou plutôt vous faites part du bafouillage de vos ascendants.	The misunderstanding is already present from before. Inasmuch as from before this wonderful legacy you are part of, or rather you have a stake in the babble of your ascendants.	The misunderstanding is there before, in so far as before the beautiful legacy it forms part of, or better say, announces the gibbering of your ascendancy.	Misunderstanding is already there from before. In as much as from before this fine legacy, you are part of, or rather you announce the babbling of your ascendants.
Pas besoin que vous bafouilliez vous-même. Dès avant, ce qui [12] vous soutient au titre de	No need for you to babble yourself. From before, what sustains you in the name of the	There is no need for you to gibber. Since before, what sustained you was the concept of	No need for you to babble yourself. From before, what sustains you under the heading of

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
l'inconscient, soit du malentendu, s'enracine là.	unconscious, i.e. misunderstanding, is rooted there.	unconscious. This is to say that misunderstanding puts its roots there.	the unconscious, i.e. of misunderstanding, takes root there.
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Il n'y a pas d'autre traumatisme de la naissance que de naître comme désiré. Désiré, ou pas - c'est du pareil au même, puisque c'est par le parlêtre.	There is no other trauma of birth than that of being born desired. Desired, or not—it's all the same since it is speaking-through-being.	There is no other trauma of birth than to be born as desired. Desired or not – it is the same, since it is because of the talking- being. ( <i>parlêtre</i> )	There is no other trauma of birth than that of being born desired. Desired or not – it's six of one and half a dozen of the other, since it is through speaking-being.
Le parlêtre en question se répartit en général en deux parlants. Deux parlants qui ne parlent pas la même langue. Deux qui ne s'entendent pas parler. Deux qui ne s'entendent pas tout court. Deux qui se conjurent pour la reproduction, mais d'un malentendu accompli, véhiculera avec la dite reproduction.	The speak-through-being in question is generally divided into two speakers. Two speakers who do not speak the same language. Two who do not understand each other speaking. Two who just don't get on together. Two who conspire for reproduction, but from an accomplished misunderstanding, which your body will carry through the said reproduction.	The talking-being in question is distributed in general in two speakers. Two speakers who do not speak the same language; two who do not hear each other speak, tow who do not understand each other at all. Two who conspire to reproduce a thorough misunderstanding that your body will allow to pass with that so-called reproduction.	The speaking-being in question is in general distributed between two speakers. Two speakers who do not speak the same language. Two who do not hear each other speak. Two who do not understand each the other at all. Two who conspire for reproduction, but who, on the basis of an accomplished misunderstanding, will carry out the aforesaid reproduction.
J'admets que le langage puisse servir à une communication sensée. Je ne dis pas que ce soit le cas de ce séminaire. Pour la bonne raison que la	I admit that language can be useful for sensible communication [ . . . ]	I admit that language can help a sensible communication. I am not saying that this is the case with this seminar for the simple reason that sensible communication is	I allow that language may serve in a meaningful communication. I don't say that this is the case for this seminar. For the good reason that meaningful communication is

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
communication sensée, c'est le dialogue, et que côté dialogue, je ne suis pas gâté.		dialogue and from the margins of dialogue you do not have me with much sense.	a dialogue, and that as far as dialogue is concerned. I have not been spoilt.
J'ajoute que je ne tiens pas la communication scientifique pour un dialogue, puisque non-sensée, ce qui est à son avantage.		I add that I don't regard scientific communication as dialogue, because I is not sensible; a thing from which it takes advantage.	I'll add that I do not consider scientific communication to be a dialogue, since it is non-meaningful, which is an advantage for it.
Le dialogue est rare. Pour ce qui est de la production d'un corps nouveau de parlant, il est si rare qu'il est absent de fait. Il ne l'est pas de principe, mais le principe ne s'inscrit que dans la symbolique.	Dialogue is rare. As for the production of a new body of speaker. It is so rare that it is de facto absent. It is not absent in principle, but the principle is inscribed only in the symbolic.	Dialogue is sparse. In what it contributes to the production of a new talking-body, it is so sparse that it is in fact absent. Not in principle, but the beginning is not inscribed if not in the Symbolic.	Dialogue is rare. As far as the production of a new body of speaker is concerned, it is so rare that it is in fact absent. It isn't absent in principle, but principle is inscribed only in the symbolic.
C'est le cas du principe dit de la famille, par exemple.	This is the case of the so-called family principle, for example	It is the case of the so-called principle of the family, for instance.	That is the case of the so-called family principle, for example.
Sans, doute ceci a-t-il été pressenti de toujours. Assez pour que l'inconscient ait été tenu pour le savoir de Dieu.	. No doubt, there has always been some apprehension of this. Enough for the unconscious to be considered as the knowledge of God.	No doubt, this was pre-sentient from the beginning sufficiently enough to have taken the unconscious as the knowledge of God.	No doubt there has always been some apprehension of it. Enough for the unconscious to have been taken for the knowledge of God.
Ce qui néanmoins distingue le savoir dit inconscient du savoir de	What nevertheless distinguishes the knowledge called unconscious	What notwithstanding distinguishes the knowledge	Nevertheless, what distinguishes so-called unconscious knowledge

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
Dieu, c'est que celui-ci était censé celui de notre bien.	from the knowledge of God is that the latter was supposed to be of our good.	called unconscious from the knowledge of God is that this supposes our well-being.	from the knowledge of God is that the latter was supposed to be that of our good.
C'est ce qui n'est pas soutenable. D'où la question que j'ai posée, Dieu croit-il en Dieu ?	That is what is untenable. Hence the question I have raised: Does God believe in God?	And this cannot be sustained. There is my question. Does God believe in God?	That is what is untenable. Whence the question I have posed: Does God believe in God?
Comme d'habitude quand je pose une question, c'est une question - réponse.		As is usual when I ask a question, it is a question-answer.	As usual when I raise a question, it's a question-response.
* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
Voilà.		That is it.	There you are.
On m'a fait remarquer que le séminaire de cette année n'était pas intitulé. C'est vrai. Vous allez tout de suite voir pourquoi. Le titre est : Dissolution !		I have been told that my seminar this year did not bear a title. It is true. Immediately you will see why. The title is Dissolution!	People have pointed out to me that this year's seminar did not have a title. That's true. You'll be able to see why immediately. The title is: Dissolution!
Evidemment, je ne pouvais pas vous le dire en novembre, parce que mon effet aurait été manqué. On peut dire que c'est un signifiant qui vous a accrochés. J'ai tellement bien réussi à vous y intéresser, qu'il n'y en a plus que pour ça.		Evidently, I could not tell this in November because my effect would have been missed. That is to say that it is a signifier which has trapped you. I was able to keep your interest with such success that it only remains for that.	Obviously, I couldn't tell you that in November, because my effect would have been a flop. You could say that it is a signifier which has hooked you. I have succeeded so well in keeping your interest, that that was the only thing left.

Ornicar Numero 22-23 Printemp 1981, pp. 11-14	Source unknown Joseph Sims/Bracha Lichtenberg-Ettinger; translation	Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne, Volume 19, 1998; pp 13-17 translation	Tony Chadwick Translation
<p>Quelqu'un me fait des remontrances parce que j'en fais pas assez [13] à son gré. Il en a le loisir parce qu'il ne vient pas chez moi. C'est le contraire : il a la bonté de m'accueillir chez lui quand je ne suis pas ailleurs.</p>		<p>Someone admonishes me because I do not make sufficient effort for his taste. I allow him because he does not come to my house. On the contrary; he has the kindness to receive me in his house when I am not in another place.</p>	<p>Someone admonishes me because I do not do enough [to interest people] for his taste. That's fine for him, because he doesn't come to my place. The opposite is the case: he is kind enough to welcome me when I am not elsewhere.</p>
<p>Alors, forcément, je l'écoute. Il souhaite un rythme plus soutenu, et j'en suis bien d'accord. C'est à quoi je veillerai après l'été.</p>		<p>Then by force, I listen to him. He wants a more sustained rhythm and I very much agree. I will take care of that after the summer.</p>	<p>So naturally I listen to him. He wants a more sustained rhythm, and I couldn't agree more. I'll take care of that after the summer.</p>
<p>La Cause freudienne commence à exister toute seule, du fait qu'on s'en réclame, ce qui veut dire qu'on s'en fait déjà une réclame. Il suffit maintenant de quoi ? - d'un courrier, d'un petit bulletin, qui fasse liaison. Éric Laurent voudra bien s'atteler à ce que ça existe, et à ce que les nouveaux cartels, qui foisonnent, se fassent connaître.</p>		<p>The Freudian Cause is starting to exist by itself, for the mere fact that it is invoked. Which says that they are already making propaganda with it. Now it is enough, with what? – with a courier, a small bulletin which establishes links. Eric Laurent will have to dedicate himself to making that exist and the new cartels, which abound, should make themselves known.</p>	<p>The Freudian Cause is beginning to exist by itself, as seen by the fact that people are laying claim to it, which means that people are already using it as publicity. So what do we need now? – a newsletter, a little bulletin which links us. Eric Laurent is willing to harness himself to making that exist, and to letting the new cartels, which are becoming numerous, get to know each other.</p>
<p><i>10 juin 1980</i></p>		<p>June 10 1980</p>	<p><i>10 June 1980.</i></p>