

<p>RADIOPHONIE continued Question VII</p> <p>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 VII : Gouverner, éduquer, psychanalyser sont trois gageures impossibles à tenir. Pourtant cette perpétuelle contestation de tout discours, et notamment du sien, il faut bien que le psychanalyste s'y accroche. Il s'accroche à un savoir – le savoir analytique – que par définition il conteste. Comment résolvez-vous – ou pas – cette contradiction ? Statut de l'impossible ? L'impossible, c'est le réel ?</p> <p>REPOSE : Pardon si, de cette question encore, je n'atteins la réponse qu'à la rhabiller de mes mains.</p>	<p>QUESTION VII : Governing, educating, psychoanalysing are three wagers impossible to sustain. However this perpetual contesting of every discourse, and notably of his own, the psychoanalyst has to latch on to it. He latches on to a knowledge – analytical knowledge – that by definition he contests. How do you resolve, or not, this contradiction. Status of the impossible ? The impossible is the real ?</p> <p>RESPONSE : Excuse me if, for this question as well, I don't get to the answer except by dressing it again in my own fashion.</p>	<p>QUESTION VII : To govern, to educate, to psychoanalyse are three wagers impossible to make. However, the psychoanalyst must indeed hook onto this perpetual contestation of every discourse, and notably his own. He hooks onto a savoir--analytic savoir--the one which by definition he contests. How do you resolve--or not--this contradiction? Status of the impossible? The impossible is the real?</p> <p>ANSWER : Pardon me if, for this question again, I only attain the answer in re-clothing it with my own hands.</p>

<p>Gouverner, y éduquer, psychanalyser sont gageures en effet, mais qu'à dire impossibles, on ne tient là que de les assurer prématurément d'être réelles.</p>	<p>Governing, educating (there ?), psychoanalysing are wagers in effect, but by calling them impossible, one holds there only to assure, prematurely, that they are real.</p>	<p>To govern, to educate, to psychoanalyze^{rgk} are in fact wagers, but in calling them impossible, one only holds to prematurely insuring them of being real. rgk: Freud wrote in <i>Analysis Terminable and Interminable</i> "It almost looks as if analysis were the third of those 'impossible' professions in which one can be sure beforehand of achieving unsatisfactory results. The other two which have been known much longer are education and government." S.E. XXIII page 248</p>
<p>Le moins qu'on puisse leur imposer, c'est d'en faire la preuve.</p>	<p>The least one can impose on them is to prove them so.</p>	<p>The least that one might impose on them is to give the proof of it.</p>
<p>Ce n'est pas là contester ce que vous appelez leur discours. Pourquoi le psychanalyste en aurait-il au reste le privilège, s'il ne se trouvait les agencer du pas, le même qu'il reçoit du réel, à pousser le sien ?</p>	<p>That doesn't mean contesting what you call their discourse. Besides, why should the psychoanalyst have that privilege, if he did not find himself with the same move making an agent of them, the same that he receives from the real, by pushing his own discourse ?</p>	<p>This is not to contest there what you call their discourses. Besides, why would the psychoanalyst have this privilege, if he was not found activating them (<i>les agencer</i>) with the step, the same he receives from the real, in pushing forward his own?</p>

<p>Notons que ce pas, il l'établit de l'acte même dont il l'avance ; et que c'est au réel dont ce pas fait fonction, qu'il soumet les discours qu'il met au pas de la synchronie du dit.</p>	<p>Note that he establishes this move with the very act by which he advances it ; and that it is to the real, of which this move makes a function, that he submits the discourses that he puts in step with the synchrony of the said.</p>	<p>Let us note that, this step, he establishes it from the act itself from which he advances it; and it is to the real of which this step makes a function, that he submits the discourses that he puts in step from the synchrony of the said.</p>
<p>S'installant du pas qu'il produit, cette synchronie n'a d'origine que de son émergence. Elle limite le nombre des discours qu'elle assujettit, comme j'ai fait au plus court de les structurer au nombre de quatre d'une révolution non permutative en leur position, de quatre termes, le pas de réel qui s'en soutient étant dès lors univoque dans son progrès comme dans sa régression.</p>	<p>Installing itself with the move that he produces, this synchrony originates only from its emergence. It limits the number of discourses that it subjects, that I have made as small as possible by structuring them to be four in number by a non-permutative revolution in their position by four terms, the move of the real which is sustained by it being henceforth univocal in its progression as in its regression.</p>	<p>Installing itself from the step it produces, this synchrony has no origin except its emergence. It limits the number of discourses it subjects, as I have done in the shortest way possible by structuring them from the number four with a non-permutative revolution in their position, of four terms, the step of the real sustained from it being henceforth univocal in its progress as in its regression.</p>
<p>Le caractère opératoire de ce pas est qu'une disjonction y rompt la synchronie entre des termes chaque fois différents, justement de ce qu'elle soit fixe.</p>	<p>The operational character of this move is that a disjunction breaks the synchrony between the terms that are each time different, precisely because the synchrony is fixed.</p>	<p>The operatory character of this step is that a disjunction breaks in it the synchrony between terms that are different each time, precisely in that this synchrony (<i>elle</i>) is fixed.</p>
<p>À la vérité là n'a lyse à faire de son nom ce qui, dans le proverbe que vous agitez après Freud, s'appelle guérir et qui fait rire trop gaiement.</p>	<p>With truth, there has lysis naught to do with its name, which in the proverb which you are waving about after Freud, is called curing and which provokes gay laughter.</p>	<p>In truth, there is no lysis to make there (<i>là n'a lyse</i>) of its name, which, in the proverb you activate after Freud, is called to cure and makes us laugh too gayly.</p>

<p>Gouverner, éduquer, guérir donc qui sait ? par l'analyse, le quatrième à y rabattre d'y faire figure de Lisette : c'est le discours de l'hystérique.</p>	<p>Governing, educating, curing then, who knows ? by analysis, the fourth to be put down by pretending to be someone else : it's the discourse of the hysteric.</p>	<p>To Govern, to educate, to cure thus who knows? by analysis, the fourth folding back to make there a figure of Lisette : it is the discourse of the hysteric.</p>
<p>Mais quoi ! l'impossibilité des deux derniers s'en proposerait-elle sous le mode d'alibi des premiers ? Ou bien plutôt de les résoudre en impuissance ? [96]</p>	<p>But what ! would the impossibility of the last two propose itself as an alibi for the first ones ? Or rather by resolving them into impotence ? [96]</p>	<p>But, what! would the impossibility of the latter two propose itself in the mode of an alibi for the first two? Or rather resolve them in impotence? [96]</p>
<p>Par l'analyse, là n'a lyse, permettez ce jeu encore, que l'impossibilité de gouverner ce qu'on ne maîtrise pas, à la traduire en impuissance de la synchronie de nos termes : commander au savoir. Pour l'inconscient, c'est coton.</p>	<p>By analysis, , there no lysis is, allow me this pun again, that the impossibility of governing what one cannot master, by translating it into the impotence of the synchrony of our terms : to command knowledge. For the unconscious it's a piece of cake.</p>	<p>By analysis, there is no lysis there (<i>là n'a lyse</i>¹), permit me again this play on words, except the impossibility of governing what one does not master, to translate it as impotence from the synchrony of our terms: commanding savoir. For the unconscious, this is tricky. 1.TN: A pun on <i>l'analyse</i> (analysis)</p>
<p>Pour l'hystérique, c'est l'impuissance du savoir que provoque son discours, à s'animer du désir, – qui livre en quoi éduquer échoue.</p>	<p>For the hysteric it's the impotence of knowing that his discourse provokes, by being animated with desire – which delivers how educating fails.</p>	<p>For the hysteric, it is the impotence of savoir that her discourse provokes, in animating itself from desire--which reveals how educating founders.</p>
<p>Chiasme frappant de n'être pas le bon, sinon à dénoncer d'où les impossibilités se font aise à se préférer en alibis.</p>	<p>A striking chiasmus by not being the right one, except by denouncing where the impossibilities take the easy route by proffering themselves as alibis.</p>	<p>A striking chiasmus from not being the right one, except in denouncing from where the impossibilities take ease in proffering themselves in</p>

		alibis.
Comment les obliger à démontrer leur réel, de la relation même qui, à être là, en fait fonction comme impossible ?	How can you oblige them to demonstrate their real, of the very relation which, by being there, functions as impossible ?	How to oblige them to demonstrate their real, from the relation itself that, in being there, makes a function of it as impossible?
Or la structure de chaque discours y nécessite une impuissance, définie par la barrière de la jouissance, à s'y différencier comme disjonction, toujours la même, de sa production à sa vérité.	Well, the structure of each discourse makes an impotence necessary there, defined by the barrier of jouissance, by differentiating itself as disjunction, always the same, between its production and its truth.	Now the structure of each discourse necessitates there an impotence, defined by the barrier of jouissance, to be differentiated as a disjunction, always the same, of its production from its truth.
Dans le discours du maître, c'est le plus-de-jouir qui ne satisfait le sujet qu'à soutenir la réalité du seul fantasme.	In the discourse of the master, it's the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> which does not satisfy the subject except by sustaining the reality of the sole fantasy.	In the discourse of the master, it is the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> that only satisfies the subject in sustaining reality from the fantasy alone.
Dans le discours universitaire, c'est la béance où s'engouffre le sujet qu'il produit de devoir supposer un auteur au savoir.	In the university discourse, it is the gap in which the subject is engulfed that he produces by having to suppose an author for knowledge.	In university discourse, it is the gap where the subject is engulfed that it produces from having to suppose an author to savoir.
Ce sont là vérités, mais où se lit encore qu'elles sont pièges à vous fixer sur le chemin d'où le réel en vient au fait.	Those are truths, but where one can still read that they are traps to fix you on the road from which the real comes to fact.	These are truths there, but where it is read again that they are traps to fix you on the road from which the real comes in fact.

Car elles ne sont que conséquences du discours qui en provient.	For the truths are only consequences of the discourse which stems from them.	For they are only consequences of the discourse proceeding from it.
Mais ce discours, il a surgi de la bascule où l'inconscient, je l'ai dit, fait dynamique à le faire fonction en « progrès », soit pour le pire, sur le discours qui le précède d'un certain sens rotatoire.	But this discourse has surged up from the balance where the unconscious, I have said, makes a dynamic by making it a function in « progress », that is for the worse, on the discourse which precedes it from a certain rotatory direction.	But this discourse, it has arisen from the see-sawing where the unconscious, as I have said, constitutes a dynamic in making it a function in "progress," for the worst, over the discourse that precedes it from a certain rotational direction (<i>sens</i>).
Ainsi le discours du maître trouve sa raison du discours de l'hystérique à ce qu'à se faire l'agent du tout puissant, il renonce à répondre comme homme à ce qu'à le solliciter d'être, l'hystérique n'obtenait que de savoir. C'est au savoir de l'esclave qu'il s'en remet dès lors de produire le plus-de-jouir dont, à partir du sien (du sien savoir), il n'obtenait pas que la femme fût cause de son désir (je ne dis pas : objet).	Thus the discourse of the master finds its reason from the hysteric's discourse in that by making itself the agent of the all-powerful, it gives up responding as a man in that by soliciting him to be one, the hysteric obtained only knowledge. It is on the slave's knowledge that he relies from then on to produce the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> from which, starting with his own (his own knowledge), he was not getting that the woman was the cause of his desire (I am not saying « object »).	Thus the discourse of the master finds its reason from the discourse of the hysteric in that it making himself the agent of the all powerful, the master (il) renounces responding as a man, since in soliciting him from being, the hysteric only obtains savoir. It is to the savoir of the slave that is henceforth remitted producing the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> from which, starting from his own (his own savoir), he did not obtain that the woman was cause of his desire (I am not saying: object).

<p>D'où s'assure que l'impossibilité de gouverner ne sera serrée dans son réel qu'à travailler régressivement la rigueur d'un développement qui nécessite le manque à jouir à son départ, s'il le maintient à sa fin.</p>	<p>Whence is assured that the impossibility of governing will be squeezed into its real only by working regressively the rigour of development which makes necessary the lack in jouir at its outset, if it maintains it to the end.</p>	<p>Whence it is insured that the impossibility of governing will only be constricted (<i>serré</i>) in its real in regressively working the rigor of a development that necessitates the lack in enjoyment (<i>manque à jouir</i>) from its start, if it maintains it to its end.</p>
<p>C'est au contraire d'être en progrès sur le discours universitaire que le discours de l'analyste lui pourrait permettre de cerner [97] le réel dont fait fonction son impossibilité, soit à ce qu'il veuille bien soumettre à la question du plus-de-jouir qui a déjà dans un savoir sa vérité, le passage du sujet au signifiant du maître.</p>	<p>It is on the contrary by being in progress on the university discourse that the analyst's discourse might allow him to circle [97] the real with which his impossibility functions, that is in that he indeed wants to question the plus-de-jouir which has already its truth in a knowledge, the passage of the subject to the master's signifier.</p>	<p>It is on the contrary from being in progress over university discourse that the discourse of the analyst would permit it to specify (<i>cerner</i>) [97] the real of which its impossibility makes a function, in that it would indeed like to submit to the question of the <i>plus-de-jouir</i> that already has its truth in a savoir, the passage of the subject to the signifier of the Master.</p>
<p>C'est supposer le savoir de la structure qui, dans le discours de l'analyste, a place de vérité.</p>	<p>That is to suppose the knowledge of the structure which, in the discourse of the analyst has the place of truth.</p>	<p>This is to suppose the savoir of structure, which, in the discourse of the analyst, has the place of truth.</p>
<p>C'est dire de quelle suspicion ce discours doit soutenir tout ce qui se présente à cette place.</p>	<p>That is saying with what suspicion this discourse must sustain all that is presented in that place.</p>	<p>This is to say with what suspicion this discourse must sustain all that presents itself at this place.</p>

<p>Car l'impuissance n'est pas la guise dont l'impossible serait la vérité, mais ce n'est pas non plus le contraire : l'impuissance rendrait service à fixer le regard si la vérité ne s'y voyait pas au point de s'envoyer... en l'air.</p>	<p>For impotence is not the guise of which the impossible would be the truth, but neither is it the contrary : impotence would render a service by fixing the gaze if truth did not see itself at the point of blowing it up.</p>	<p>For impotence is not the disguise of which the impossible would be the truth, but it is no more the contrary: impotence would render the service of fixing the gaze if truth were not seen there on the point of vanishing . . . into thin air.</p>
<p>Il faut cesser ces jeux dont la vérité fait les frais dérisoires.</p>	<p>We have to stop these games for which truth pays the derisory costs.</p>	<p>We must cease these games of which truth makes the expense ridiculous.</p>
<p>Ce n'est qu'à pousser l'impossible en ses retranchements que l'impuissance prend le pouvoir de faire tourner le patient à l'agent.</p>	<p>It is only by pushing the impossible into its last defences that impotence takes the power to make the patient turn into the agent.</p>	<p>It is only in pushing the impossible in its deductions (<i>retranchements</i>) that impotence takes on the power of turning the patient into the agent.</p>
<p>C'est ainsi qu'elle vient en acte en chaque révolution dont la structure ait pas à faire, pour que l'impuissance change de mode bien entendu.</p>	<p>It is in this way that it (impotence ?) comes to act in each revolution whose structure has a move to make, in order that impotence change its mode of course.</p>	<p>It is in this way that it comes into act in every revolution in which structure might have a step to make, so that impotence changes its mode, of course.</p>
<p>Ainsi le langage fait novation de ce qu'il révèle de la jouissance et surgir le fantasme qu'il réalise un temps.</p>	<p>Thus language innovates from what it reveals of jouissance and brings out the fantasy that it makes real one time.</p>	<p>In this way language makes a renewal (<i>novation</i>) from what it reveals of jouissance and makes arise that the fantasy realize a time.</p>

Il n'approche le réel qu'à la mesure du discours qui réduit le dit à faire trou dans son calcul.	It approaches the real only to the extent of the discourse which reduces the said to making a hole in its calculation.	It only approaches the real in the measure of the discourse that reduces the said in making a hole in its calculation.
De tels discours, à l'heure actuelle il n'y en a pas des tas. [98]	Of such discourses at the present moment there is not a whole lot. [98]	Of such discourses, at the present hour, there are not a lot. [98]
Note sur la réponse à la VII ^{ème} question.	Note on the answer to the VIIth question.	Note on the answer to question seven.
Pour faciliter la lecture, je reproduis ici les schèmes structuraux des quatre « discours » qui ont fait cette année le sujet de mon séminaire. Pour ceux qui n'en ont pas suivi le développement.	To facilitate reading, I am reproducing here the structural schema of the four « discourses » which this year have been the subject of my seminar. For those who have not been following their development.	To facilitate its reading, I am reproducing here the structural schemas of the four "discourses" which were the subject of my seminar this year. For those who have not followed its development.
Discours de « l'envers de la psychanalyse »	Discourses from "the other side of psychoanalysis"	Discourses from the "reverse side of psychoanalysis."

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discours du Maître</i> impossibilité</p> $\frac{S_1}{\beta} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S_2}{a}$ <p>— s'éclaire par régression du :</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discours de l'Hyfrique</i></p> $\beta \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S_1}{a}$ <p style="text-align: center;">impotence</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discours de l'Université</i></p> $\frac{S_2}{S_1} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{a}{\beta}$ <p>— s'éclaire de son " progrès " d</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discours de l'Analyte</i> impossibilité</p> $\frac{a}{S_1} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{\beta}{S_2}$ <p style="text-align: center;">impotence</p>				
<p>Les places sont celles de :</p> <table border="0" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>l'agent</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>l'autre</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">la vérité</td> <td style="text-align: center;">la production</td> </tr> </table> <p>Les termes sont :</p> <p>S₁ le signifiant maître S₂ le savoir S le sujet a le plus-de-jour</p>		<u>l'agent</u>	<u>l'autre</u>	la vérité	la production
<u>l'agent</u>	<u>l'autre</u>				
la vérité	la production				

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the Master</i> impossibility</p> $\frac{S_1}{S} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S_2}{a}$ <p>— is clarified by regression from the:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the Hysteric</i></p> $\frac{S}{a} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S_1}{S_2}$ <p style="text-align: center;">impotence</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the University</i></p> $\frac{S_2}{S_1} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{a}{S}$ <p>— is clarified by its "progress" in the:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the Analyst</i> impossibility</p> $\frac{a}{S_2} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S}{S_1}$ <p style="text-align: center;">impotence</p>				
<p>The places are those of:</p> <table border="0" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>the agent</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>the other</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">the truth</td> <td style="text-align: center;">production</td> </tr> </table> <p>The terms are:</p> <p>S₁ the master signifier S₂ savoir S the subject a the plus-de-jour (surplus enjoyment)</p>		<u>the agent</u>	<u>the other</u>	the truth	production
<u>the agent</u>	<u>the other</u>				
the truth	production				

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the Master</i> impossibility</p> $\frac{S_1}{S} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S_2}{a}$ <p>— is clarified by regression from the:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the Hysteric</i></p> $\frac{S}{a} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S_1}{S_2}$ <p style="text-align: center;">impotence</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the University</i></p> $\frac{S_2}{S_1} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{a}{S}$ <p>— is clarified by its "progress" in the:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Discourse of the Analyst</i> impossibility</p> $\frac{a}{S_2} \xrightarrow{\quad} \frac{S}{S_1}$ <p style="text-align: center;">impotence</p>				
<p>The places are those of:</p> <table border="0" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>the agent</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>the other</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">the truth</td> <td style="text-align: center;">production</td> </tr> </table> <p>The terms are:</p> <p>S₁ the master signifier S₂ savoir S the subject a the plus-de-jour (surplus enjoyment)</p>		<u>the agent</u>	<u>the other</u>	the truth	production
<u>the agent</u>	<u>the other</u>				
the truth	production				