

I agree totally. The fact is that there are unsurpassable limits to a certain logic, which I have called a weak logic, but still strong enough to leave you a bit of incompleteness, which you effectively bear out perfectly.

INTERVENTION: *I wonder why this amphitheater is packed full with 800 people. It is true that you are a good clown, famous, and that you have come here to speak. A comrade also spoke for ten minutes to say that groups were unable to get themselves out of the university. And everyone, recognizing that there is nothing to be said, is speaking but saying nothing. So, if there is nothing to say, nothing to understand, nothing to know, nothing to do, why are so many people here? And Lacan, why do you stay?*

INTERVENTION: *We have strayed into a bit of a false problem. All because the comrade said that he was coming to the university in order to leave again with other comrades.*

INTERVENTION: *People speak about a New Society. Will psychoanalysis have a function in that society and what will it be?*

A society is not something that can be defined just like that. What I am trying to spell out, because psychoanalysis gives me the evidence for it, is what dominates it, namely, the practice of language. Aphasia means that there is something that has broken down in this respect. Just think that there are people who happen to have things in their brain and who no longer have any idea how to manage with language. That makes them somewhat crippled.

INTERVENTION: *One could say that Lenin almost became aphasic.*

If you had a bit of patience, and if you really wanted our impromptu to continue, I would tell you that, always, the revolutionary aspiration has only a single possible outcome—of ending up as the master's discourse. This is what experience has proved.

What you aspire to as revolutionaries is a master. You will get one.

INTERVENTION: *We've already got one, we have Pompidou.*

Do you believe that you have got a master in Pompidou? What's all that about?

I, too, would like to ask you some questions. For whom, here, does the word "liberal" have a meaning?

INTERVENTION: *Pompidou is a liberal, so is Lacan.*



240 I am, like everybody is, liberal only to the extent that I am antiprogressive. With the caveat that I am caught up in a movement that deserves to be called progressive, since it is progressive to see the psychoanalytic discourse founded, insofar as the latter completes the circle that could perhaps enable you to locate what it is exactly that you are rebelling against—which doesn't stop that thing from continuing incredibly well.

And the first to collaborate with this, right here at Vincennes, are you, for you fulfill the role of helots of this regime. You don't know what that means either? The regime is putting you on display. It says, "Look at them enjoying!"

Good-bye for today. Bye. It's over.

3 December 1969