

<p>RADIOPHONIE continued Question V The page numbers in brackets refer to the page numbers at the bottom of the page in the Scilicet 2/3 volume.</p>	<p>Anthony Chadwick Translation</p>	<p>Jack W. Stone Translation</p>
<p>QUESTION V : Quelles en sont les conséquences sur le plan : a) de la science, b) de la philosophie, c) plus particulièrement du marxisme, voire du communisme ?</p>	<p>QUESTION V : What are the consequences of this for : a)science b)philosophy c)more particularly marxism, communism even ?</p>	<p>QUESTION V : What are its consequences on the plane: a) of science, b) of philosophy, c) more particularly, of Marxism, even of Communism?</p>
<p>REPONSE : Votre question, qui suit une liste préconçue, mérite que je marque qu'elle ne va pas de soi après la réponse qui précède.</p>	<p>RESPONSE : Your question, which follows a preconceived list, deserves my marking it as not self-evident after the response which precedes it.</p>	<p>ANSWER : Your question, which follows a preconceived list, merits my marking that it does not go by itself after the preceding answer.</p>
<p>Elle semble supposer que j'aie acquiescé à ce que « l'inconscient... subvertit toute théorie de la connaissance », pour vous citer, aux mots près que j'élide pour les en séparer : (l'inconscient) « est-il une notion-clef qui » etc.</p>	<p>It seems to suppose that I have agreed that « the unconscious...subverts every theory of knowledge », to quote you, except for the words I am eliding to separate them from it : (the unconscious) « is it a key notion which » etc.</p>	<p>It seems to suppose that I have acquiesced to this: "the unconscious . . . subverts every theory of connaissance," to cite you, in almost the same words except that I elide them to separate them: (the unconscious) "is it a key notion that," etc.</p>

<p>Je dis : l'inconscient n'est pas une notion. Qu'il soit une clef ? Ça se juge à l'expérience. Une clef suppose une serrure. Il existe assurément des serrures, et même que l'inconscient fait jouer correctement, pour les fermer ? pour les ouvrir ? ça ne va pas de soi que l'un implique l'autre, <i>a fortiori</i> qu'ils soient équivalents.</p>	<p>I say : the unconscious is not a notion. Is it a key ? That gets judged on experience. A key supposes a lock. There are assuredly locks, and even that the unconscious operates correctly, but to close them ? open them ? It is not obvious that the one implies the other, <i>a fortiori</i> that they are equivalent.</p>	<p>I say: the unconscious is not a notion. Might it be a key? This is judged from experience. A key supposes a lock. Assuredly some locks exist, and even those the unconscious makes work (<i>jouer</i>) correctly, to close them? to open them? it does not go by itself that the one implies the other, that they are a fortiori equivalent.</p>
<p>Il doit nous suffire de poser que l'inconscient est. Ni plus ni moins. C'est bien assez pour nous occuper un moment encore après le temps que ça a duré, sans que jusqu'à moi personne ait fait un pas de plus. Puisque pour Freud, c'était à reprendre de la table rase en chaque cas : de la table rase, même pas sur ce qu'il est, il ne peut le dire, hors sa réserve d'un recours organique de pur rituel : sur <i>ce qu'il en est</i> dans chaque cas, voilà ce qu'il veut dire. En attendant, rien de sûr, sinon qu'il est, et que Freud, à en parler, fait de la linguistique. Encore personne ne le voit-il, et contre lui, chacun s'essaie à</p>	<p>It must be enough for us to posit that the unconscious is. Neither more nor less. It is quite enough to keep us busy a moment longer after the time it has lasted, without anyone before me going one step further. Since for Freud, it was to be taken up again from tabula rasa, and from tabula rasa not about what it is – he can't say, except for his reservation of a purely ritual organic recourse – of <i>what is going on</i> in each case, that's what he means to say. In the meantime, nothing is certain, except that it (the unconscious)</p>	<p>It must suffice for us to pose that the unconscious is. Neither more nor less. This is indeed enough to occupy us for one more moment after all the time this has lasted, without anyone before me making an additional step. Since for Freud this was to be taken from the tabula rasa in each case: from the tabula rasa, not even on this that it is, he cannot say it, outside of his reserve of a purely ritualistic recourse to the organic: on <i>what it is</i> in each case, this is what he means. In waiting, nothing is sure, except that it is, and that Freud, in speaking of it, does linguistics. Again no one sees it,</p>

<p>faire rentrer l'inconscient dans une notion d'avant.</p>	<p>is, and that Freud, by talking about it, is doing linguistics. Still no-one sees it, and against him, each one does their best to make the unconscious fit into a previous notion.</p>	<p>and, against him, each tries to make the unconscious re-enter a notion from before.</p>
<p>D'avant que Freud dise qu'il est, sans que ça soit, ni ça, et notamment pas non plus le Ça.</p>	<p>Before Freud says that it is, without it being neither that, and notably not the Id either.</p>	<p>From before Freud says that it is, without that (<i>ça</i>) being, nor this (<i>ça</i>), and certainly not the Id (<i>notamment pas non plus le Ça</i>).</p>
<p>Ce que j'ai répondu à votre question IV, veut dire que l'inconscient subvertit d'autant moins la théorie de la connaissance qu'il n'a rien à faire avec elle pour la raison que je viens de dire : à savoir, qu'il lui est étranger.</p>	<p>What I answered to your question IV means that the unconscious subverts the theory of knowledge all the less that it has nothing to do with knowledge for the reason I have just stated, namely that the unconscious is a</p>	<p>The answer I gave to your fourth question means that unconscious subverts the theory of connaissance all the less in that it has nothing to do with it for the reason I say: that it is alien to it.</p>

	stranger to it.	
<p>C'est sans qu'il y soit pour rien qu'on peut dire que la théorie de la connaissance n'est pas, pour la raison qu'il n'y a pas de connaissance qui ne soit d'illusion ou de mythe. Ceci, bien sûr, à donner au mot un sens qui vaille la peine d'en maintenir l'emploi au-delà de son sens mondain : à savoir que « je le connais » veut dire : je [84] lui ai été présenté ou je sais ce qu'il fait par cœur (d'un écrivain notamment, d'un prétendu « auteur » en général).</p>	<p>It's without the unconscious having anything to do with it that one can say the the theory of knowledge is not, for the reason that there is no knowledge which is not illusory or mythical. This of course by giving to the word a meaning which is worth the pain of maintaining for it a use beyond its worldly meaning, namely that [84] « I know it » means « I have been introduced to it or I know what he does by heart (concerning a writer notably, or a so-called « author » in general).</p>	<p>This is without it being for nothing that one can say that the theory of connaissance is not, for the reason that there is no connaissance that is not from illusion or from myth. This, of course, in giving the word a sense whose usage is worth the trouble of maintaining beyond its mundane sense: that is, that "I know him" (« <i>je le connais</i> ») means: I [84] have been introduced to him or I know what he does by heart (for a writer notably, for a so-called "author" in general).</p>

<p>À noter, pour ceux à qui le Γνῶθι σεαυτὸν pourrait servir de <i>muleta</i> en l'occasion, puisque ce n'est rien d'autre, que cette visée d'exploit exclut toute théorie depuis que la consigne en a été brandie par le trompeur delphique. Ici, l'inconscient n'apporte ni renfort ni déception : mais seulement que le σεαυτὸν sera forcément coupé en deux, au cas qu'on s'inquiète encore de quelque chose qui y ressemble après avoir dans une psychanalyse mis à l'épreuve « son » inconscient.</p>	<p>Please note, for those to whom the Γνῶθι σεαυτὸν might be used as a <i>muleta</i> at times, since it is nothing but, that this exploit aim excludes all theory since the instructions have been brandished by the delphic deceiver. Here, the unconscious brings neither reinforcements nor deception, but simply that the σεαυτὸν will have to be cut in two, in case one is still worried about something which resembles it after having in a psychoanalysis put « his » unconscious to the test.</p>	<p>It is to be noted, for those to whom Γνῶθι σεαυτὸν¹ could serve as a <i>muleta</i> on the occasion, since it is nothing else, that this extravagant aim (<i>visée d'exploit</i>) excludes all theory because its orders were brandished by the Delphic deceiver. Here, the unconscious brings neither reinforcement nor disappointment: but only that the σεαυτὸν will be necessarily (<i>forcément</i>) cut in two, in the case where one worries again about something that resembles it after having put to the test "his" unconscious in an analysis. 1.TN : <i>Know thyself</i></p>
<p>Brisons donc là : pas de connaissance. Au sens qui vous permettrait l'accolade d'y envelopper les rubriques dont vous croyez maintenant pousser votre question. Pas de connaissance autre que le mythe que je dénonçais tout à l'heure. Mythe dont la théorie dès lors relève de la mythologie (à spécifier d'un trait d'union) nécessitant au plus une extension de l'analyse structurale</p>	<p>Let's break off there ; no knowledge. In the sense that would allow you the accolade of wrapping up in it the headings under which you believe you can now push your question. No knowledge other than the myth that I was just now denouncing. Myth whose theory from then on has to do with myth-ology (to be specified with a hyphen)</p>	<p>Let us therefore break there: no connaissance. In the sense that would allow you the embrace of enveloping there the rubrics with which you now think to advance your question. No connaissance other than the myth I just denounced. A myth whose theory henceforth arises from mytho-logy (to be specified with a hyphen) necessitating in addition an</p>

<p>dont Lévi-Strauss fournit les mythes ethnographiques.</p>	<p>necessitating at the most an extension of the structural analysis for which Lévi-Strauss provides the ethnographic myths.</p>	<p>extension of the structural analysis for which Lévi-Straus furnishes the ethnographic myths.</p>
<p>Pas de connaissance. Mais du savoir, ça oui, à la pelle, à n'en savoir que faire, plein les armoires.</p>	<p>No knowledge. But scientific knowledge, that yes, by the shovel-full, so much you don't know what to do with it, cupboards full.</p>	<p>No connaissance. But savoir, yes, by the shovel-full, just in knowing how to do (<i>à n'en savoir que faire</i>), the armoires are full.</p>
<p>De là, certains (de ces savoirs) vous crochent au passage. Il y suffit que les animent un de ces discours dont cette année j'ai mis en circulation la structure. Être fait sujet d'un discours peut vous rendre sujet au savoir.</p>	<p>From that, certain (of these scientific knowledges) hook on to you as you go by. It is enough that one of those discourses, whose structure I have put into circulation this year, animate them. Being made subject of a discourse may make you subject to scientific knowledge.</p>	<p>From there, certain (of these savoirs) hook you in passing. It suffices there that one of these discourses whose structure I have put in circulation this year animate them. Being made a subject of a discourse can render you a subject to savoir.</p>

<p>Si plus aucun discours n'en veut, il arrive qu'on interroge un savoir sur son usage périmé, qu'on en fasse l'archéologie. C'est plus qu'ouvrage d'antiquaire, si c'est afin d'en mettre en fonction la structure.</p>	<p>If no discourse wants it anymore, it happens that one can interrogate a scientific knowledge on its out-of-date use, that one does the archeology of it. It is more than antiquarian work if it is in order to make its structure function.</p>	<p>If no discourse any longer wants it, it happens that one interrogates a savoir on its outmoded usage, that one does an archeology of it. This is more than the work of an antiquary, this is in order to make its structure function.</p>
<p>La structure, <i>elle</i>, c'est une notion : d'élaborer ce qu'il s'ensuit pour la réalité, de cette présence en elle des formules du savoir, dont je marquais plus haut qu'elle est son avènement notionnel.</p>	<p>Structure is a notion, as a result of elaborating what ensues for reality, from that presence in it of formulae of scientific knowledge, of which I marked earlier that it is its notional advent.</p>	<p>Structure, it, is a notion: from elaborating what follows from it for reality, from this presence in it of formulas of savoir, of which I marked above that it is its notional advent.</p>
<p>Il y a des savoirs dont les suites peuvent rester en souffrance, ou bien tomber en désuétude.</p>	<p>There are knowledges whose outcomes can remain unfulfilled, or even fall out of fashion.</p>	<p>There are savoirs whose consequences can remain in sufference, or else fall into disuse.</p>

<p>Il y en a un dont personne n'avait l'idée avant Freud, dont personne après lui ne l'a encore, sauf à en tenir de moi par quel bout le prendre. Si bien que j'ai pu dire tout à l'heure que c'est au regard des autres savoirs que le terme d'inconscient, pour celui-ci, fait métaphore. À partir de ce qu'il soit structuré comme un langage, on me fait confiance avec fruit : encore faut-il qu'on ne se trompe [85] pas sur ceci que c'est plutôt lui, si tant est que ce ne soit abus de le pronommer, lui, l'inconscient qui par ce bout vous prend.</p>	<p>There is one about which people did not have an idea before Freud, about which no-one after him still has no idea, unless they take from me where to start. So that I was able to say just now that it is in view of other knowledges that the term unconscious, for the latter [Freud], is a metaphor. Starting from the fact that it is structured like a language, people can fruitfully have confidence in me, and still you must not make a mistake [85] on this point that it is rather it, if indeed it is not an abuse to use the pronoun, the unconscious which by this end takes you.</p>	<p>There is one no one had any idea of before Freud, of which no one after him has one yet, except in owing to me what end to take it by. To the extent that I was just now able to say that it is in regard to other savoirs that the term unconscious, for this, makes a metaphor. Beginning with it being structured like a language, one trusts in me fruitfully: yet one must still not be mistaken [85] about its being rather it, insofar as it is not abusive to pronoun it, it, the unconscious that you take by this end.</p>
---	--	---

<p>Si j'insiste à marquer ainsi mon retard sur votre hâte, c'est qu'il vous faut vous souvenir que là où j'ai illustré la fonction de la hâte en logique, je l'ai soulignée de l'effet de leurre dont elle peut se faire complice. Elle n'est correcte qu'à produire ce temps : le moment de conclure. Encore faut-il se garder de la mettre au service de l'imaginaire. Ce qu'elle rassemble est un ensemble : les prisonniers dans mon sophisme, et leur rapport à une sortie structurée d'un arbitraire : non pas une classe.</p>	<p>If I insist in marking in this way my delay on your haste, it's because you have to remember that there where I have illustrated the function of haste in logic, I emphasized it by the lure effect with which it (haste) can make itself compliant. It is correct only to produce this time, the moment to conclude. And one has to prevent oneself from putting it into the service of the imaginary. What it draws together is a set, the prisoners in my sophism, and their relationship to an exit structured by an arbitrary, not a class.</p>	<p>If I insist in this way on marking my slowing down of your haste, it is because you must remember that where I have illustrated the function of haste in logic^{rgk1}, I have underscored it from the effect of the lure with which it can make itself complicitous. It is only correct in producing this time: the moment to conclude. Yet one must take care not to put it to the service of the imaginary. What it pulls together (<i>rassemble</i>) is a set (<i>ensemble</i>): the prisoners in my sophism, and their relation to a departure structured from an arbitrary: not a class. rgk1 : See Le temps logique et l'assertion de certitude anticipée, Un nouveau sophisme in Écrits, pages 197-213.</p>
<p>Il arrive que la hâte à errer dans ce sens, serve à plein cette ambiguïté des résultats, que j'entends résonner du terme : révolution, lui-même.</p>	<p>It happens that the haste to err in this sense serves completely this ambiguity of the results, that I hear resonating in the term « revolution » itself.</p>	<p>It happens that haste, in erring in this sense, fully serves this ambiguity of results I hear resonating from the term: revolution, itself.</p>

<p>Car ce n'est pas d'hier que j'ai ironisé sur le terme de tradition révolutionnaire.</p> <p>Bref, je voudrais marquer l'utilité en cette trace de se démarquer de la séduction.</p> <p>Quand c'est de production que l'affaire prend son tour.</p>	<p>For it was not yesterday that I ironized on the term of revolutionary tradition.</p> <p>In short, I would like to mark the utility of this trace as it distinguishes itself from seduction.</p> <p>When it is of production that the affair takes its turn.</p>	<p>For it is nothing new for me to ironize on the term of revolutionary tradition.</p> <p>In brief, I would like to mark the utility this trace takes on from demarcating itself from seduction.</p> <p>When it is from production that the business takes its turn.</p>
<p>Où je pointe le pas de Marx.</p>	<p>Where I point up Marx's step.</p>	<p>Where I point to Marx's step.</p>
<p>Car il nous met au pied d'un mur dont on s'étonne qu'il n'y ait rien d'autre à reconnaître, pour que quelque chose s'en renverse, pas le mur bien sûr, mais la façon de tourner autour.</p>	<p>For he puts us face to face with an obstacle about which one is surprised that there is nothing else to recognize, in order that something be reversed from it, not the obstacle of course, but the way of turning around it.</p>	<p>For he puts us against a wall from which one is astonished to recognize that there is nothing else to recognize, for something to reverse itself, not the wall of course, but the manner of turning around.</p>
<p>L'efficacité des coups de glotte au siège de Jéricho laisse à penser qu'ici le mur fit exception, à vrai dire n'épargnant rien sur le nombre de tours nécessaire.</p>	<p>The efficacy of the trumpets at the siege of Jericho leaves one to think that here the wall was an exception, truly sparing nothing on the number of circuits needed.</p>	<p>The efficacy of glottal stops at the siege of Jericho lets one think that here the wall makes an exception, to tell the truth sparing nothing on the number of turns necessary.</p>

<p>C'est que le mur ne se trouve pas, dans cette occasion, là où on le croit, de pierre, plutôt fait de l'inflexible d'une vagance extra.</p>	<p>It's that the wall does not find itself, on this occasion, there where one believes it to be, made of stone ; rather it's made of the inflexible matter of an extra-vagance [extra-wandering].</p>	<p>It is that the wall is not found, on this occasion, to be made of stone, but rather of the inflexible of an extra wailing.</p>
<p>Et si c'est le cas, nous retrouvons la structure qui est le mur dont nous parlons.</p>	<p>And if it is the case, we find again the structure which is the wall about which we are speaking.</p>	<p>And if this is the case, we rediscover the structure that is the wall of which we speak.</p>
<p>À le définir de relations articulées de leur ordre, et telles qu'à y prendre part, on ne le fasse qu'à ses dépens.</p>	<p>By defining it on the basis of relations articulated from their order, and such that by taking part in it, one does it only at one's own expense.</p>	<p>In defining it from relations articulated from their order, and such that in taking part there, one only does it at one's own expense.</p>
<p>Dépens de vie ou bien de mort, c'est secondaire. Dépens de jouissance, voilà le primaire.</p>	<p>At the expense of life or even of death, that's secondary. Expense of jouissance, there's the primary.</p>	<p>Expense of life or else of death. Expense of jouissance, that's the main thing (<i>voilà le primaire</i>).</p>
<p>D'où la nécessité du plus-de-jour pour que la machine tourne, la jouissance ne s'indiquant là que pour qu'on l'ait de cette effaçon, comme trou à combler.</p>	<p>Whence the necessity of the surplus-jouissance so that the machine can turn, jouissance indicating itself there only in order that one can have in this effaced way, like a hole to be filled.</p>	<p>Whence the necessity of the surplus enjoyment (<i>plus-de-jour</i>) for the mechanism to turn, jouissance only indicating itself there so that one might have it from this effacing (<i>effaçon</i>), as a hole to fill.</p>

<p>Ne vous étonnez pas qu'ici je ressasse quand d'ordinaire je cours mon chemin. [86]</p>	<p>Don't be surprised that I am going back over old ground when ordinarily I rush forward along my pathway. [86]</p>	<p>Do not be astonished that I pause (<i>ressasse</i>) here when ordinarily I hurry along my path. [86]</p>
<p>C'est qu'ici à refaire une coupure inaugurale, je ne la répète pas, je la montre se redoublant à recueillir ce qui en choit.</p>	<p>It's that here by re-making an inaugural cut, I am not repeating it, I am showing it redoubling itself by receiving what falls out of it.</p>	<p>It is that in remaking here an inaugural cut, I am not repeating it, I am showing it doubling to gather what falls from it.</p>
<p>Car Marx, la plus-value que son ciseau, à le détacher, restitue au discours du capital, c'est le prix qu'il faut mettre à nier comme moi qu'aucun discours puisse s'apaiser d'un métalangage (du formalisme hégélien en l'occasion), mais ce prix, il l'a payé de s'astreindre à suivre le discours naïf du capitaliste à son ascendant, et de la vie d'enfer qu'il s'en est faite.</p>	<p>For Marx, the surplus-value that his scissors, by detaching it (?), restitutes to capital's discourse, it's the price that one has to put on it for denying like me that any discourse can be appeased by a metalanguage (Hegelian formalism in this case), but he paid this price by limiting himself to following the naive discourse of the capitalist then on the rise, and with the life of hell he made for himself from it.</p>	<p>For, the surplus value that Marx's scissors, in detaching it, restores to the discourse of capital, this is the price that must be paid to deny as do I that any discourse can be appeased by a metalanguage (from Hegelian formalism on this occasion), but this price, he paid it in straining to follow the naïve discourse of the capitalist to its ascendant, and with the hellish life he made for himself there.</p>
<p>C'est bien le cas de vérifier ce que je dis du plus-de-jour. La <i>Mehrwert</i>, c'est la <i>Marxlust</i>, le plus-de-jour de Marx.</p>	<p>It is indeed the case to verify what I said about the plus-de-jour. The <i>Mehrwert</i> (surplus-value), is the <i>Marxlust</i>, Marx's <i>plus-de-jour</i>.</p>	<p>This is indeed the case to verify what I say of the <i>plus-de-jour</i>. The <i>Mehrwert</i> is the <i>Marxlust</i>, the <i>plus-de-jour</i> of Marx.</p>

<p>La coquille à entendre à jamais l'écoute de Marx, voilà le cauri dont commercent les Argonautes d'un océan peu pacifique, celui de la production capitaliste.</p>	<p>The shell/slip/typo forever hearing Marx's listening, that's the cauri shell with which the Argonauts traded in a not-very-pacific ocean, that of capitalist production.</p>	<p>The shell to hear forever the listening of Marx, this is the cauri the Argonauts deal in on a not at all pacific ocean, that of capitalist production.</p>
<p>Car ce cauri, la plus-value, c'est la cause du désir dont une économie fait son principe : celui de la production extensive, donc insatiable, du manque-à-jouir. Il s'accumule d'une part pour accroître les moyens de cette production au titre du capital. Il étend la consommation d'autre part sans quoi cette production serait vaine, justement de son ineptie à procurer une jouissance dont elle puisse se ralentir.</p>	<p>For this caurie shell, surplus-value, it's the cause of desire with which an economy makes its principle, that of extensive production, therefore insatiable, of the lack-of-jouissance. It is accumulated on the one hand in order to increase the means of this production under the control of capital. It extends consumption on the other hand without which this production would be vain, precisely because of its ineptness in procuring a jouissance with which this production could be slowed down.</p>	<p>For this cauri, surplus value, is the cause of the desire that an economy makes its principle: that of the extensive production, therefore insatiable, of that lack-in-enjoying (<i>manque-à-jouir</i>). It is accumulated on the one hand to increase the means of this production on the side of capital. It extends consumption, on the other hand, without which this production would be vain, precisely from its ineptitude in procuring a jouissance that would allow it to slow down.</p>

<p>Quelqu'un nommé Karl Marx, voilà calculé le lieu du foyer noir, mais aussi capital (c'est le cas de le dire) que le capitaliste, (que celui-ci occupe l'autre foyer d'un corps à jouir d'un Plus ou d'un plus-de-jouir à faire corps), pour que la production capitaliste soit assurée de la révolution propice à faire durer son dur désir, pour citer là le poète qu'elle méritait.</p>	<p>Someone called Karl Marx, there is calculated the place of the black focal point, but as capital (that's the word for it) as the capitalist (that the latter occupies the other focal point of a Plus or of a plus-de-jouir to make a body), in order that the capitalist production be assured by the revolution which is propitious to make his hard desire last/harden, to quote the poet that it deserved.</p>	<p>Someone named Karl Marx calculated there the place of the dark corridor, but also capital (it is the case to say it) that the capitalist, (that he occupies the other corridor of a body to enjoy from a Plus or from a <i>plus-de-jouir</i> making a body), so that capitalist production might be insured by a revolution propitious for making his hard desire endure (<i>à faire durer son dur désir</i>), to cite there the poet it merited.</p>
<p>Ce qui est instructif, c'est que ces propos courent les rues (à la logique près bien sûr, dont je les fournis). Qu'ils sortent sous la forme d'un malaise que Freud n'a fait que pressentir, allons-nous le mettre au compte de l'inconscient ? Certainement, oui : il s'y désigne que quelque chose travaille. Et ce sera une occasion d'observer que ceci n'infléchit nullement l'implacable discours qui en se complétant de l'idéologie de la lutte des classes, induit seulement les exploités à</p>	<p>What is instructive is that these ideas are available everywhere (except for the logic of course, which I provide for them). That they come out in the form of a discontent that Freud could only sense, are we going to charge that to the unconscious ? Of course : it designates that something is working. And it will be a chance to observe that this does not in any way inflect the implacable discourse which in being completed by the ideology</p>	<p>What is instructive is that these ideas are everywhere (<i>ces propos courent les rues</i>) (with more or less the logic, of course, I provide them). That they emerge in the form of a discontent of which Freud had no more than a premonition, are we going to blame this on the unconscious? Certainly, yes: it is designated there that something labors. And this will be an occasion to observe that this does not at all bend the implacable discourse completed by the ideology of class</p>

<p>rivaliser sur l'exploitation de principe, pour en abriter leur participation patente à la soif du manque-à-jour.</p>	<p>of class struggle, induces the exploited to compete on the exploitation in principle, in order to shelter their open participation in the thirst of the lack-of-enjoyment.</p>	<p>struggle; it only induces the exploited to compete in principle in the exploitation, in order to defend their patent participation in the thirst of the lack-in-enjoyment.</p>
<p>Quoi donc attendre du chant de ce malaise ? Rien, sinon de témoigner de l'inconscient qu'il parle, – d'autant plus volontiers qu'avec le non-sens il est dans son élément.</p>	<p>What can we expect from the song of this discontent ? Nothing, except to witness the unconscious that it speaks – all the more readily that with non-sense it is in its element.</p>	<p>What then is to be expected from this song of discontent? Nothing, except the testimony of the unconscious that it speaks--all the more willingly since with non-sense it is in its element.</p>
<p>Mais quel effet en [87] attendre puisque, vous le voyez, je souligne que c'est quelque chose qui est, et pas une notion-clef ?</p>	<p>But what effect [87] can we expect of it since, as you can see, I emphasize that it is something which is, and not a key-notion.</p>	<p>But what effect is to be expected from it [87] since, as you see, I stress that it is something that is, and not a key notion?</p>

<p>À se rapporter à ce que j'ai instauré cette année d'une articulation radicale du discours du maître comme envers du discours du psychanalyste, deux autres discours se motivant d'un quart de tour à faire passage de l'un à l'autre, nommément le discours de l'hystérique d'une part, le discours universitaire de l'autre, ce qui de là s'apporte, c'est que l'inconscient n'a à faire que dans la dynamique qui précipite la bascule d'un de ces discours dans l'autre. Or, à tort ou à raison, j'ai cru pouvoir risquer de les distinguer du glissement – d'une chaîne articulée de l'effet du signifiant considéré comme vérité –, sur la structure – en tant que fonction du réel dans la dispersion du savoir.</p>	<p>Going back to what I have put into place this year concerning a radical articulation of the master's discourse as the reverse of the psychoanalyst's discourse, two other discourses, being motivated by a quarter of a turn in order to pass from one to the other, namely the hysteric's discourse on one hand, university discourse on the other, what is brought forward from there is that the unconscious has to do only with the dynamic which precipitates the tipping over of one of these discourses into the other. Well, rightly or wrongly, I believe I have been able to risk distinguishing them from the sliding – of a chain articulated by the effect of the signifier considered as truth – onto the structure – as function of the real in the dispersion of scientific knowledge.</p>	<p>To refer to what I have installed this year of a radical articulation of the discourse of the master as reverse side of the discourse of the psychoanalyst, two other discourses are motivated to pass by a quarter turn from one to the other, namely the discourse of the hysteric and the discourse of the university; what is brought in by this is that the unconscious only has to do with the dynamic that precipitates the see-sawing of one of these discourses into the other. Now, wrongly or rightly, I have believed myself able to risk distinguishing them from the slippage--of a chain articulated from the effect of the signifier considered as truth--over structure--as function of the real in the dispersion of savoir.</p>
---	---	---

<p>C'est à partir de là qu'est à juger ce que l'inconscient peut subvertir. Certainement aucun discours, où tout au plus apparaît-il d'une infirmité de parole.</p>	<p>It is starting from there that is to be judged what the unconscious can subvert. Certainly any discourse, where at the most it appears from an infirmity of speech.</p>	<p>It is starting from there that is to be judged what the unconscious can subvert. Certainly no discourse, where it all the more appears as from an infirmity of speech.</p>
<p>Son instance dynamique est de provoquer la bascule dont un discours tourne à un autre, par décalage de la place où l'effet de signifiant se produit.</p>	<p>Its dynamic instance is to provoke the tipping by which one discourse turns to another, by moving away from the place where the signifier effect is produced.</p>	<p>Its dynamic instance is to provoke the seesawing by which one discourse turns into another, by a skewing (<i>décalage</i>) of the place where the effect of the signifier is produced.</p>
<p>À suivre ma topologie faite à la serpe, on y retrouve la première approche freudienne en ceci que l'effet de « progrès » à attendre de l'inconscient, c'est la censure.</p>	<p>By following my rough-hewn topology, one can find again the first Freudian approach in this that the « progress » effect to be expected from the unconscious, is censure.</p>	<p>In following my rough-hewn topology, one rediscovers in it the first Freudian approach in that the effect of "progress" to be expected from the unconscious is censorship.</p>
<p>Autrement dit, que pour la suite de la crise présente, tout indique la procession de ce que je définis comme le discours universitaire, soit, contre toute apparence à tenir pour leurre en l'occasion, la montée de sa régie.</p>	<p>In other words, that for the follow-up of the present crisis, everything indicates the procession of what I define as university discourse, that is, contrary to all appearance to be taken as a lure in this occasion, the rise of its control.</p>	<p>In other words, that for what will follow from the present crisis, everything indicates the procession of what I define as university discourse, that is, contrary to every appearance, to be held for a lure on this occasion, the rise (<i>montée</i>) of its rule.</p>

<p>C'est le discours du maître lui-même, mais renforcé d'obscurantisme.</p>	<p>It's the discourse of the master himself, but reinforced with obscurantism.</p>	<p>It is the discourse of the master itself, but reinforced by obscurantism.</p>
<p>C'est d'un effet de régression par contre que s'opère le passage au discours de l'hystérique.</p>	<p>It is by a regression effect on the contrary that is operated the passage to the hysteric's discourse.</p>	<p>It is from an effect of regression, on the other hand, that the passage to the discourse of the hysteric operates.</p>
<p>Je ne l'indique que pour vous répondre sur ce qu'il en est des conséquences de votre notion prétendue, quant à la science.</p>	<p>I point it out only in order to respond to your question about what are the consequences of your so-called notion, as far as science is concerned.</p>	<p>I only indicate it to answer you on what there are of consequences of your so-called notion, as to science.</p>
<p>Si paradoxale qu'en soit l'assertion, la science prend ses élans du discours de l'hystérique.</p>	<p>As paradoxical as the assertion may be, science takes off from the discourse of the hysteric.</p>	<p>As paradoxical as the assertion may be, science takes its élans from the discourse of the hysteric.</p>
<p>Il faudrait pénétrer de ce biais les corrélats d'une subversion sexuelle à l'échelle sociale, avec les moments incipients dans l'histoire de la science.</p>	<p>One would have to penetrate from this angle the correlates of a sexual subversion on the social scale, with incipient moments in the history of science.</p>	<p>We would have to penetrate from this side the correlates of a sexual subversion of the social ladder, with the incipient moments in the history of science.</p>
<p>Ce serait rude mise à l'épreuve d'une pensée hardie. [88]</p>	<p>It would be a severe testing of bold thinking. [88]</p>	<p>This would be a rude putting to the test of a robust thought. [88]</p>

<p>Elle se conçoit de partir de ceci que l'hystérique, c'est le sujet divisé, autrement dit c'est l'inconscient en exercice, qui met le maître au pied du mur de produire un savoir.</p>	<p>This thought is conceived starting from the point that the hysteric is the divided subject, in other words it's the unconscious at exercise, which puts the master on the spot to produce a knowledge.</p>	<p>It is conceived of starting with this that the hysteric is the divided subject, in other words, the unconscious in exercise, which puts the master against the wall to produce a savoir.</p>
<p>Telle fut l'ambition induite chez le maître grec sous le nom de l'ἐπιστήμη. Là, où la δόξα le guidait pour l'essentiel de sa conduite, il fut sommé, – et nommé par un Socrate hystérique avoué de ce qu'il dit ne s'y connaître qu'en affaire de désir, patent par ses symptômes pathognomoniques – de faire montre de quelque chose qui valût la τέχνη de l'esclave et justifiât de ses pouvoirs de maître.</p>	<p>Such was the ambition induced in the Greek master under the name of the ἐπιστήμη. There where the δόξα guided him for the essential part of his behaviour, he was called upon – and notably by that admitted hysteric Socrates since he said that he knew nothing except matters of desire, patent by his pathognomic symptoms – to display something which might be worthy of the τέχνη of the slave and might justify his powers as master.</p>	<p>Such was the ambition induced in the Greek master under the name of l'ἐπιστήμη¹ There where the δόξα² guided his conduct essentially, he was summoned--and namely by a Socrates avowed an hysteric in that he said he did not know himself except in the business of desire, made patent by his pathognomic symptoms--to show something that gave value to the τέχνη³ of the slave and justified his powers as master. 1.TN : Episteme 2.TN : Doxa 3.TN : Techne</p>

<p>Rien à trancher de son succès, quand un Alcibiade n'y montre que cette lucidité d'avouer, lui, ce qui le captive en Socrate, l'objet a, que j'ai reconnu dans l'ἄγαλμα dont on parle au Banquet, un plus-de-jouir en liberté et de consommation plus courte.</p>	<p>There's nothing to cut off from his success, when an Alcibiades shows only that lucidity to admit what captivates him in Socrates, the object a, that I recognized in the ἄγαλμα about which they are speaking in the Banquet, a plus-de-jouir at liberty and of shorter consumption.</p>	<p>Nothing to detract from his success, when an Alcibiades shows no more than the lucidity of avowing, himself, what captivates him in Socrates, the object a, which I have recognized in the ἄγαλμα¹ spoken of in the Symposium, a plus-de-jouir in freedom and of a quicker consumption. 1.TN: Agalma</p>
<p>Le beau est que ce soit le cheminement du platonisme qui ait rejailli dans notre science avec la révolution copernicienne. Et s'il faut lire Descartes et sa promotion du sujet, son « je pense, je suis donc », il ne faut pas en omettre la note à Beeckman : « Sur le point de monter sur la scène du monde, je m'avance masqué... ».</p>	<p>The beauty of it is that it is platonism's working which has sprung up again in our science with the Copernican revolution. And if you have to read Descartes and his promotion of the subject, his « I am thinking, I am therefore », one must not omit the note to Beeckman : « On the point of stepping onto the world's stage, I move forward masked... »</p>	<p>The beautiful thing is that it would be the progress of Platonism that re-emerged in our science with the Copernican revolution. And if one must read Descartes and his promotion of the subject, his "I think, I am therefore," one must not omit the note to Beeckman^{rgk}: "At the point of mounting the stage of the world, I advance masked . . . ". rgk:Isaac Beeckman (10 December 1588 – 19 May 1637) was a Dutch philosopher and scientist, who, through his studies and contact with leading natural philosophers, may have "virtually given birth to modern atomism. It was Beekman who</p>

		rekindled Descartes' interest in science and opened his eyes to the possibility of applying mathematical techniques to other fields.
Lisons le <i>cogito</i> à le traduire selon la formule que Lacan donne du message dans l'inconscient ; c'est alors : « Ou tu n'es pas, ou tu ne penses pas », adressé au savoir. Qui hésiterait à choisir ?	Let's read the <i>cogito</i> to be translated according to the formula that Lacan gives of the message in the unconscious : it is then : « Either you are not, or you are not thinking », addressed to knowledge. Who would hesitate to choose ?	Let us read the <i>cogito</i> in translating it according to the formula Lacan gives of the message in the unconscious: it is then, "Either you are not, or you do not think, " addressed to savoir. Who would hesitate to choose?
Le résultat est que la science est une idéologie de la suppression du sujet, ce que le gentilhomme de l'Université montante sait fort bien. Et je le sais tout autant que lui.	The result is that science is an ideology of the suppression of the subject, what the gentleman of the rising University knows quite well. And I know it just as well as he.	The result is that science is an ideology of the suppression of the subject, which the gentleman of the rising university knows very well. And I know it as well as he.
Le sujet, à se réduire à la pensée de son doute, fait place au retour en force du signifiant-maître, à le doubler, sous la rubrique de l'étendue, d'une extériorité	The subject, by reducing itself to the thought of its doubting, makes way for the return in force of the master-signifier, by doubling it, under the heading of	The subject, in reducing itself to the thought of its doubt, makes room for the return in force of the master-signifier, to double it, under the rubric of extension, with an entirely

entièrement manipulable.	extension, of an entirely manipulable exteriority.	manipulable exteriority.
<p>Que le plus-de-jour, à donner la vérité du travail qui va suivre, y reçoive un masque de fer (c'est de lui que parle le <i>larvatus prodeo</i>), comment ne pas voir que c'est s'en remettre à la dignité divine (et Descartes s'en acquitte) d'être seule garante d'une vérité qui n'est plus que fait de signifiant ?</p>	<p>That the plus-de-jour, to give the truth of the work which will follow, receives there a mask of iron (it is of him that the <i>larvatus prodeo</i> speaks), how can one not see that it is to hand oneself over to the divine dignity (and Descartes acquits himself here) as being the only guarantor of a truth which is no longer only the doing of a signifier.</p>	<p>That the plus-de-jour, to give the truth of the work that is going to follow, receives there a mask of iron (it is of it that the <i>larvatus prodeo</i>¹ speaks), how can we not see that it is to remit it to divine dignity (and Descartes acquits himself of it) from being the sole guarantee of a truth that is no more than a fact of the signifier? 1.TN: Latin for "I go forward bewitched/masked"</p>
Ainsi se légitime la prévalence de l'appareil mathématique, et l'infatuation (momentanée) de la catégorie quantité.	In this way is legitimated the prevalence of the mathematical apparatus, and the (momentary) infatuation with the category quantity.	Thus is legitimized the prevalence of the mathematical apparatus, and the (momentary) infatuation with the category quantity.

<p>Si la qualité n'était pas aussi encombrée de signifié, elle serait aussi propice au discernement scientifique : qu'il suffise de la voir [89] faire retour sous la forme de signes (+) et (-) dans l'édifice de l'électromagnétisme.</p>	<p>If quality was not so encumbered with signified, it would also be suitable for scientific discernment ; you only need to see it [89] return in the form of the signs (+) and (-) in the structure of electromagnetism.</p>	<p>If quality was not also encumbered by the signified, it would also be propitious to scientific discernment: let it suffice to see it [89] return in the form of the signs (+) and (-) in the edifice of electromagnetism.</p>
<p>Et la logique mathématique (Dieu merci ! car moi, j'appelle Dieu par son nom-de-Dieu de Nom) nous fait revenir à la structure dans le savoir.</p>	<p>And mathematical logic (Thank God ! for I call God by his god-damn name-of-God) brings us back to structure in scientific knowledge.</p>	<p>And mathematical logic (Thank God! for, me, I call God by his name-of-God of Name) makes us return to the structure in savoir.</p>
<p>Mais vous voyez que si « la connaissance » n'a pas encore repris connaissance, c'est que ce n'est pas du fait de l'inconscient qu'elle l'a perdue. Et il y a peu de chance que ce soit lui qui la ranime.</p>	<p>But you can see that if « knowledge » has not yet regained consciousness, it's that it is not because of the unconscious that it lost consciousness. And there is little chance that it is the unconscious which brings it round again.</p>	<p>But you see that if the "<i>la connaissance</i>" has not yet become aware of it again (<i>n'a pas encore repris connaissance</i>), it is not from the fact of the unconscious that it has lost it. And there is little chance that it would be it that would reanimate connaissance (<i>la ranime</i>).</p>

<p>De même qu'on sait que la connaissance a erré en physique, tant qu'elle a voulu s'insérer de quelque départ esthétique, – qu'est restée nouée la théorie du mouvement, tant qu'elle ne s'est pas dépêtrée du sentiment de l'impulsion, – que c'est seulement au retour du refoulé des signifiants, qu'est dû qu'enfin se livre l'équivalence du repos au mouvement uniforme, de même le discours de l'hystérique démontre qu'il n'y a aucune esthésie du sexe opposé (nulle connaissance au sens biblique) à rendre compte du prétendu rapport sexuel.</p>	<p>In the same way that knowledge has erred in physics, as long as it wanted to insert itself from some aesthetic departure – that the theory of movement has remained knotted, as so long as the theory has not been unhobbled from the feeling of impulsion – that it's only with the return of the repressed of the signifiers, that is due that finally is delivered the equivalence of rest with the uniform movement, in the same way the hysteric's discourse demonstrates that there is no aesthetic of the opposite sex (no knowledge in the biblical sense) to give an account of the so-called sexual rapport.</p>	<p>Just as one knows that connaissance has erred in physics, while it has wanted to insert itself in some aesthetic departure--that the theory of movement has stayed knotted, while it has not disentangled itself from the feeling of impulsion--that it is only to the return of the repressed of some signifiers that it is finally owed that the equivalence of repose to uniform movement is revealed, so the discourse of the hysteric demonstrates that there is no aesthesia of the opposite sex (no knowledge [<i>connaissance</i>] in the biblical sense) to account for the so-called sexual rapport.</p>
---	---	---

<p>La jouissance dont il se supporte est, comme toute autre, articulée du plus-de-jouir par quoi dans ce rapport le partenaire ne s'atteint : 1) pour le <i>vir</i> qu'à l'identifier à l'objet <i>a</i>, fait pourtant clairement indiqué dans le mythe de la côte d'Adam, celui qui faisait tant rire, et pour cause, la plus célèbre épistolière de l'homosexualité féminine, 2) pour la <i>virgo</i> qu'à le réduire au phallus, soit au pénis imaginé comme organe de la tumescence, soit à l'inverse de sa réelle fonction.</p>	<p>The jouissance with which it (sexual rapport) supports itself is, like any other, articulated by the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> by which in this rapport the partner attains him/herself 1)for the <i>vir</i> (man) only by identifying it (<i>plus-de-jouir</i>) with the object <i>a</i>, a fact however clearly indicated in the myth of Adam's rib, the one which caused laughter, and for good reason, in the letter-writer of feminine homosexuality, 2) for the <i>virgo</i> (woman) only by reducing it to the phallus, that is to the penis imagined as the organ of tumescence, that is to the inverse of its real function.</p>	<p>The jouissance by which it is supported is, like every other, articulated from the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> by which in this rapport the partner succeeds: 1) for the <i>vir</i>, only in identifying it with the object <i>a</i>, a fact nonetheless clearly indicated in the myth of Adam's rib, which so made laugh, with good reason, the most celebrated epistolary of feminine homosexuality¹, 2) for the <i>virgo</i>, only in reducing it to the phallus, that is, to the penis imagined as organ of tumescence, the inverse of its real function. 1.TN: Madame de Sévigny or Marie de Rabutin-Chantal, marquise de Sévigné (5 February 1626 – 17 April 1696) was a French aristocrat, remembered for her letter-writing. Most of her letters, celebrated for their wit and vividness, were addressed to her daughter.</p>
<p>D'où les deux rocs : 1) de la castration où le signifiant-femme s'inscrit comme privation, 2) de l'envie du pénis où le signifiant-homme est ressenti comme frustration.</p>	<p>Whence the two rocks : 1) of castration where the signifier-woman is inscribed as privation ; 2) of penis envy where the signifier-man is felt as frustration.</p>	<p>Whence the two rocks: 1) of castration where the signifier-woman is inscribed as privation, 2) of penis envy where the signifier-man is felt as frustration.</p>

<p>Ce sont écueils à mettre à la merci de la rencontre l'accès prôné par des psychanalystes à la maturité du génital.</p>	<p>They are reefs to be placed at the mercy of the meeting, the access advanced by some psychoanalysts to the maturity of the genital.</p>	<p>These are the shoals putting the access proffered by some psychoanalysts to genital maturity at the mercy of chance.</p>
<p>Car c'est là l'idéal bâtard dont ceux qui se disent « d'aujourd'hui » masquent qu'ici la cause est d'acte et de l'éthique qu'il anime, avec sa raison politique.</p>	<p>For there is the bastard ideal with which those who say they are « of today » mask that here the cause is the result of an act and of the ethic which it animates, with its political reason.</p>	<p>For there is the bastard ideal by which those who say themselves "of today" mask that here the cause is from an act and from the ethic it animates, with its political reasons.</p>
<p>C'est aussi bien ce dont le discours de l'hystérique questionne le maître : « Fais voir si t'es un homme ! ». Mais la représentation de chose, comme dit Freud, ici n'est plus que représentation de son manque. La toute-puissance n'est pas ; c'est bien pour cela [90] qu'elle se pense. Et qu'il n'y a pas de reproche à lui en faire, comme le psychanalyste s'y obstine imbécilement.</p>	<p>It is also indeed that with which the hysteric's discourse questions the master : « Show that you are a man ! » But the representation of thing, as Freud says, here is nothing more than representation of his lack. All-powerfulness is not ; it is indeed for that [90] that it thinks itself. And that there is no reproach to make against him, as the psychoanalyst obstinately continues to do like a fool.</p>	<p>This is also what the discourse of the hysteric questions the master on: "Let's see if you are a man!" But the representation of the thing, as Freud says, is here no more than a representation of its lack. Omnipotence (<i>toute-puissance</i>) is not; it is indeed for this [90] that it is thought. And it is not to be reproached for it, as the psychoanalyst insists on doing stupidly.</p>

<p>L'intérêt n'est pas là : à faire son deuil de l'essence du mâle, mais à produire le savoir dont se détermine la cause qui fait défi en son étant.</p>	<p>The interest is not in mourning the essence of the male, but in producing the knowledge with which the cause is determined which makes a challenge in his being.</p>	<p>Mourning the essence of the male is not the interesting thing, but producing the <i>savoir</i> by which is determined the cause that makes a challenge in its being (<i>qui fait défi en son étant</i>).</p>
<p>Là-dessus, l'on dira non sans prétexte que les psychanalystes en question ne veulent rien savoir de la politique. L'ennuyeux est qu'ils sont assez endurcis pour en faire profession eux-mêmes, et que le reproche leur en vienne de ceux qui, pour s'être logés au discours du maître Marx, font obligation des insignes de la normalisation conjugale : ce qui devrait les embarrasser sur le point épineux d'à l'instant.</p>	<p>On that point, some people will say, not without justification, that the psychoanalysts in question don't want to know anything about politics. The problem is that they are hardened enough to make a profession out of it themselves, and that the reproach comes to them from those who, by being lodged in the discourse of the master Marx, make an obligation of the insignias of conjugal normalization, which should embarrass them on the thorny question raised just now.</p>	<p>On that, one will say not without pretext that the psychoanalysts in question want to know nothing of politics. The annoying thing is that they are jaded enough to profess it themselves, and that the reproach against them comes from those who, for having lodged themselves in the discourse of master Marx, make an obligation of the insignias of conjugal normalization: which would have to trouble them on the thorny point of the moment.</p>
<p>Détail au regard de ce qui nous intéresse : c'est que l'inconscient ne subvertira pas notre science à lui faire faire amende honorable à aucune forme de connaissance.</p>	<p>A detail with regard to what interests us, is that the unconscious will not subvert our science by making it make amends for any form of (non-scientific) knowledge.</p>	<p>A detail regarding what interests us: the unconscious will not subvert our science in making honorable amends with any form of connaissance.</p>

<p>Qu'il fasse semblant parfois de ce que la nique qu'il y introduit, soit celle des nocturnes habitant l'aile effondrée du château de la tradition, l'inconscient s'il est clef, ce ne le sera qu'à fermer la porte qui béerait dans ce trou de votre chambre à coucher.</p>	<p>That it sometimes pretends that the snook it cocks there is that of the nocturnals inhabiting the ruined wing of the castle of tradition, the unconscious if it is key will only be so by closing the door which would be wide open in this hole of your bedroom.</p>	<p>That it seem to (<i>fasse semblant</i>) at times in that the jibe (<i>nique</i>) it introduces there, that of the nocturnals inhabiting the fallen wing of the castle of tradition, if the unconscious is a key, it will only be so in closing the door that would gape in this hole of your bedchamber.</p>
<p>Les amateurs d'initiation ne sont pas nos invités. Freud là-dessus ne badinait pas. Il proférait l'anathème du dégoût contre ces sortilèges et n'entendait pas que Jung fît que rebruit à nos oreilles des airs de mandalas.</p>	<p>The amateurs of initiation are not our guests. Freud on that point did not beat about the bush. He profered the anathema of disgust against these spells and did not understand that Jung was only repeating in our ears mandala tunes.</p>	<p>The fans of initiation are not our guests. Freud does not trifle with that. He proffered the anathema of disgust against such excursions and did not understand the stink Jung made about mandalas.</p>
<p>Ça n'empêchera pas les offices de se célébrer avec des coussins pour nos genoux, mais l'inconscient n'y apporterait que des rires peu décents.</p>	<p>That won't prevent services being celebrated with cushions for our knees, but the unconscious would bring only indecorous laughter.</p>	<p>This will not prevent celebratory offices from being observed with cushions under your knees, but the unconscious would contribute nothing to them but indecent laughter.</p>

<p>Pour l'usage ménager, il serait à recommander comme tournesol à constituer l'éventail du réactionnaire en matière de connaissance.</p>	<p>For household use it would be recommended as a sunflower to constitute the reactionary's fan in the matter of knowledge.</p>	<p>For sparing usage, it would be recommendable as a sunflower constituting the fan of the reactionary in the material of connaissance.</p>
<p>Il restitue par exemple à Hegel le prix de l'humour qu'il mérite, mais en révèle l'absence totale dans toute la philosophie qui lui succède, mis à part Marx.</p>	<p>It hands back to Hegel for example the prize for humour that he deserves, but reveals the total absence of it in all the philosophy that follows him, Marx excepted.</p>	<p>For example, it restores to Hegel the humorous worth he merits, but reveals its total absence in all the philosophy succeeding him, apart from Marx.</p>
<p>Je n'en dirai que l'échantillon dernier venu à ma « connaissance », ce retour incroyable à la puissance de l'invisible, plus angoissant d'être posthume et pour moi d'un ami, comme si le visible avait encore pour aucun regard apparence d'étant.</p>	<p>I will speak only about the last sample that has come to my « knowledge », this unbelievable return to the power of the invisible, more disturbing by being posthumous and for me that of a friend, as if the visible had still for any gaze the appearance of a being.</p>	<p>I will only say that the final example came to my "connaissance," that incredible return to the potency of the invisible, more anguishing (<i>angoissant</i>) from being posthumous and from a friend of mine¹, as if the visible had again for any gaze an appearance of being (<i>d'étant</i>).</p> <p>1.TN: Maurice Jean Jacques Merleau-Ponty; 14 March 1908 – 3 May 1961) was a French phenomenological philosopher, strongly influenced by Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. His posthumous work was <i>Le Visible et l'invisible, suivi de notes</i></p>

		<p><i>de travail</i>, 1964. Lacan spoke of this book in his Seminar XI, chapters 6-9, between February 19, and March 11, in 1964. Lacan states on Wednesday, February 19, 1964, “It is not mere chance—belonging to the order of the pure tychic—if this very week I have received a copy of the newly published, posthumous work of my friend Maurice Merleau-Ponty, <i>Le Visible et l’invisible</i>.”</p>
<p>Ces simagrées phénoménologiques tournent toutes autour de l’arbre fantôme de la connaissance supra-normale, comme s’il y en avait une de normale.[91]</p>	<p>These phenomenological simperings all turn around the ghostly tree of supra-normal knowledge, as if there was a normal one. [91]</p>	<p>These phenomenological airs (<i>simagrées</i>) all turn around the ghostly tree of supra-normal connaissance, as if there were a normal one. [91]</p>
<p>Nulle clameur d’être ou de néant qui ne s’éteigne de ce que le marxisme a démontré par sa révolution effective : qu’il n’y a nul progrès à attendre de vérité ni de bien-être, mais seulement le virage de l’impuissance imaginaire à l’impossible qui s’avère d’être le réel à ne se fonder qu’en logique : soit là où j’avertis que l’inconscient siège, mais pas pour dire que la logique de ce</p>	<p>No clamor of being or of nothingness which is not extinguished by what marxism has demonstrated by its effective revolution : that there is no progress to be expected from truth or well-being, but only the turning from imaginary impotence to the impossible which claims by being the real to be founded only in logic, that is, there where I</p>	<p>No clamor of being or nothingness not extinguished by what Marxism has demonstrated by its effective revolution: that there is no progress to be expected from either truth or well-being, but only the swerving from imaginary impotence to the impossible that establishes itself as being the real in only founding itself on logic: there where I warned that the unconscious is seated, but not</p>

<p>virage n'ait pas à se hâter de l'acte.</p>	<p>warn that the unconscious has its seat, but not in order to say that the logic of this turning does not have to be hurried by the act.</p>	<p>to say that the logic of this swerving does not have to be hastened by the act.</p>
<p>Car l'inconscient joue aussi bien d'un autre sens : soit à partir de l'impossibilité dont le sexe s'inscrit dans l'inconscient, à maintenir comme désirable la loi dont se connote l'impuissance à jouir.</p>	<p>For the unconscious plays just as well from another sense, that is, starting from the impossibility with which sex is inscribed in the unconscious, to maintain as desirable the law by which is connoted by the impotence to jouir.</p>	<p>For the unconscious comes into play from another direction (<i>sens</i>) as well: starting from impossibility by which sex is inscribed in the unconscious, maintaining as desirable the law connoting the impotence in enjoyment (<i>l'impuissance à jouir</i>).</p>
<p>Il faut le dire : le psychanalyste n'a pas ici à prendre parti, mais à dresser constat.</p>	<p>It has to be said : the psychoanalyst does not have to take sides here, but draw up a statement.</p>	<p>It must be said: the psychoanalyst does not have to take a side here, but to produce a certificate (<i>dresser constat</i>).</p>

<p>C'est en quoi je témoigne que nulle rigueur que j'aie pu mettre à marquer ici les défaillances de la suture, n'a rencontré des communistes à qui j'ai eu affaire qu'une fin de non-recevoir.</p>	<p>It is in that that I witness that despite the rigour that I may have put into marking here the weaknesses of suturing, has met in the communists I have dealt with only a blunt refusal.</p>	<p>This is how I testify that no rigor I might have put into marking here the failings of the suture has not been met with a final non-reception by the communists I have dealt with.</p>
<p>J'en rends compte du fait que les communistes, à se constituer dans l'ordre bourgeois en contre-société, seulement vont à contrefaire tout ce dont le premier se fait honneur : travail, famille, patrie, y font trafic d'influence, et syndicat contre quiconque de leur discours éviderait les paradoxes.</p>	<p>I explain that from the fact that the communists, by constituting themselves in the bourgeois order as a counter-society, are only going to counter everything that the bourgeois make a point of honour : work, family, homeland for the communists are influence-peddling, and a syndicate against whoever would empty the paradoxes from their discourse.</p>	<p>I account for it by the fact that the communists, in constituting themselves in the bourgeois order as against-society, only end up counterfeiting everything the first makes honorable: work, family, and country traffic influence there, and syndicate against whomever would avoid the paradoxes of their discourse.</p>
<p>À démontrer ceux-ci comme facteur de pathologie, soit depuis mes propos sur la causalité psychique, partout où mon effort eût pu desceller le monopole psychiatrique, je n'ai jamais recueilli d'eux, de réponse qui ne s'alignât sur l'hypocrisie universitaire, dont ce serait une autre histoire que de prédire le déploiement.</p>	<p>To demonstrate these as a factor in pathology, that is since my <i>statements on psychic causality</i>, everywhere that my effort might have unsealed the psychiatric monopoly, I have never received from them any response which was not aligned with university hypocrisy, about which it would be another story to</p>	<p>In demonstrating these as a pathological factor, since my <i>propos sur la causalité</i> psychique^{rgk1}, everywhere where my effort might have worked to loosen the psychiatric monopoly, I have never received a response from them not aligned with university hypocrisy, the unfolding of which it would be a whole other story to predict.</p>

	predict the deployment.	rgk1 : See Écrits (fr) , pages151-193
Il est évident que maintenant ils se servent de moi tout autant qu'elle. Moins le cynisme de ne pas me nommer : ce sont gens honorables.	It is obvious that now they use me as much as they do that hypocrisy. Minus the cynicism of not naming me ; they are honourable people.	It is obvious that they now make as much use of me as of it. Minus the cynicism of not naming me: these are honorable men.