

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Otherwise Than Our Knowledge: Solidarity, Love, Failure and the Left in Argentina and Chile

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0z6484kx>

Author

Harris, Conor

Publication Date

2019

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Otherwise Than Our Knowledge:
Solidarity, Love, Failure and the Left in Argentina and Chile

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Spanish

by

Conor Craig Harris

June 2019

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Alessandro Fornazzari, Chairperson
Dr. Marta Hernández Salván
Dr. Jacques Lezra
Dr. Freya Schiwy

Copyright by
Conor Craig Harris
2019

The Dissertation of Conor Craig Harris is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must acknowledge my constant companion during this process- Faustus. ...*Durchaus studiert, mit heißem Bemühn. / Da steh ich nun, ich armer Tor! / Und bin so klug als wie zuvor....*

And then, my committee. Alessandro, an adviser beyond any other, for being calm and grounding, with a keen eye for which path I ought to be on, whether or not I thought I was going anywhere. Freya, for while at first it was with fear that I approached you, a wiser and warmer presence I could not have asked for throughout, and hopefully to come. Marta, a keen eye and a keener mind, your advice, encouragement, and faith in me has often been what kept me going, come what may. And Jacques, often seemingly bemused, your genuine openness, intelligence and guidance have so often allowed me feel right here when I have doubted. Thank you all so much.

My family knows I love them all dearly and could not have managed without their support- and the free food and drink, of course. A special thanks is due my mother, who beyond everything she does, found it in her to periodically visit California, despite her distaste for the state. My California friends have been ever my sunshine companions, and I'll here restrict myself only to those who have directly impacted this dissertation:

Allison, for venting and inventing; Bret, Alma and Charlie, a new family; Brittany and Sean, for endless engaging conversation; Daisy, for evening wisdom about life and our work; Daniel, ever encouraging, ever open; Emily, David, Luna and all of their smiles; Eric, a better guitar player than he'll admit; Jorge, for all you'd never know it from his face; Mark, although he'd rather be in France; Óscar Alain, steadfast and strong; Óscar,

warm and wittiest of all; Roxana, a sharp eye and a warm welcome, in two countries; Seher, an infinite kindness; and entirely too many others who have had the good fortune to not have to hear overmuch about my work. Out of California, there are too many to name, but I'd like to leave a special thanks for a gaggle of Virginia friends who have been a guiding light: Alex, Athena, Alex, Conor (now somewhere else, of course), Cookie, Dan (VA émigré as he is), Joe, John, Jordan (also much further south, now), Josh, Kyle, Parker, Phillip, Samantha, Sean, Sole, Thom and everyone they gather to themselves. I miss you terribly.

And finally, dearest Annie- for years of friendship, and more of love and light
[slow heavy metal music playing].

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Otherwise Than Our Knowledge:
Solidarity, Love, Failure and the Left in Argentina and Chile

by

Conor Craig Harris

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Spanish
University of California, Riverside, June 2019
Dr. Alessandro Fornazzari, Chairperson

This dissertation proposes to critique and reformulate the terminology used to discuss non-statist subjectivities, particularly regarding neoliberal Argentina and Chile. By putting into dialogue the ethical thought of Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Derrida and the autonomist Marxism of Paolo Virno and Antonio Negri, I articulate an anarchistic thinking of ethico-political subjectivity in the commons and propose a new mode of situated reading/writing opposed to the capitalist State's ordering of language. I argue that a situated thought of solidarity without epistemic capture and friendship as a form of love allows us to think the persistence of radical subjectivities and avoid attributing failure to emergent movements. Further, it allows us to comprehend our own theoretical limitations concerning subjectivities emerging or already extant in modes otherwise than statist politics. I articulate a theory of the neoliberal State's function and continued

relevance through an engagement with Nicos Poulantzas's later works. I then think solidarity and friendship through readings of Nicanor Parra and Juan Gelman's poetry, respectively. Afterwards, I explore radical persistence through a reading of post-*saqueo* independent video in Argentina and the current im-possibility of conceptualizing, within academic language, the relationship between the Mapuche and the Chilean state, through a reading of Elicura Chihuailaf Nahuelpán's poetry and prose. I conclude that by learning to teach from and be taught by these texts, through what I term a paradoxical auto-didact's pedagogy, we may better situate ourselves and our work vis a vis the necessity of a radical, anti-capitalist relationality, beyond the State.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction By Way of a Beginning.....	1
The State During Ouroboros Capital.....	3
<i>Chile</i>	8
<i>Argentina</i>	12
<i>A Return to the Greek</i>	16
<i>The Machinic State</i>	22
Otherwise Than the State.....	24
Learning to Learn, Together.....	29
Chapter 1 Many Parras: Techniques of a (re)Socialized Poetics.....	36
Where(in) we find ourselves.....	37
Double-negation and the Literary.....	47
Humor and the Third Person.....	61
Politics, Somewhere Outside.....	75
Chapter 2 Endless Act(s) of Love: Juan Gelman and Sweetly Writing (for) What's to Come.....	83
<i>So, then, where?</i>	85
Movement, before melancholy.....	94
A Vision, an Act.....	97
There is a time... ..	108
...and a place... ..	114
...to teach and be taught.....	118

Chapter 3	The Violence of Failure, <i>or</i> the Failure of Violence: Documentary, Video and Radical Political Subjectivity in Neoliberal Argentina.....	127
	Dinosaur Cinema.....	132
	The Violence of Failure.....	147
	A Cacophonous Chorus.....	157
	<i>Or</i> the Failure of Violence.....	170
	To see what is to come.....	179
Chapter 4	In the folds of a blue dream: Elicura Chihuailaf and his Impossible Place...	193
	Selecting for the same.....	199
	<i>Colonial encounters</i>	202
	<i>Accumulating independence</i>	204
	<i>Twentieth century ghosts</i>	205
	<i>The unthinkable now</i>	206
	Success, on the face of it.....	211
	A mirror that reflects nothing.....	223
	Our bounds and theirs.....	236
Bibliography	246

By Way of Beginning

“I am an anarchist, a social anarchist.

I am not a communist, because social anarchism is beyond communism.”

-Louis Althusser

“It is from the love of humanity that we are revolutionaries:

it is not our fault if history has forced on us this distressing necessity”

-Errico Malatesta

As I was initially planning this introduction, I intended to open with an apocryphal quote from Emma Goldman, one which I have always liked. The quote in question is always some variation on: “if I can’t dance, it’s not my revolution”. Turning, action, joy and persistence are all bundled up in the little quip, a retort to a young comrade who presumed chide her for dancing, as though her role as agitator forbade such expression. But more than vaguely apocryphal, it cannot be attributed to Goldman at all- it sprung from missed encounters and propagandizing in the seventies, if certain accounts from the 1990s can be believed.¹ The actual sentiment, however, is perhaps a better beginning. As she says of the incident in her autobiography, “I did not believe that a Cause which stood for a beautiful ideal, for anarchism, for release and freedom from conventions and prejudice, *should demand the denial of life and joy*” (Goldman 56, emphasis mine). While this dissertation will not address explicitly anarchist movements- at least, not in the concrete historical sense of that within which Goldman agitated- I felt it appropriate to begin there, in the 1930s but really with the clarification made in the 1990s of a misattribution from the 1970s. In a felicitous way, it lays out the time frame and problematics that guide my work- a work asking after the persistence of certain,

perhaps anarchist but certainly at least horizontal, tendencies in left organizations and works in Argentina and Chile throughout the 20th century and into the 21st, while also thinking the conceptual modulations and approaches we need to do our *own* work *without denying life and joy, nor eliding persistence, failure, love and the imposition(s) of history*.

That said, my aim in this dissertation is to explore concepts and approaches for an explicitly *anarchist* mode of reading, that the dissertation in turn enacts in exploration. A mode of reading that is also, thus, one of learning, writing and teaching, situated in and by the body of whomsoever *enacts* it- one not imposed nor universal, but emergent from the situations in which it is enacted and, thus, always conformed by them. Hence, given my academic role (if not to say, with Henri Lefebvre, *type*), the ethics and politics of reading and writing will here be given primacy and, while far from the only points of departure, will (over)determine my work and its milieu.² For me, then, more than simply *what* texts I choose, the question is always *how is that text a lesson to us?* As a singular product, a text bears traces of a productive act functional to its existence, and so an anarchist mode of reading must learn to bring forward that act's specter, to act again in common, carrying out its lesson(s). While any attempt at dogmatism would for this project be exceedingly contradictory and destabilizing, I do feel that there are a few core concepts that can be addressed as necessary to any anarchist approach, ones that arise time and again and deserve further exploration. I will return to these subjects below, but to mention them in passing, the following are central: solidarity, here as enacted in writing; friendship and love, wherein friendship-as-love teaches us to carry on in and out of solidarity; common action and singular persistence, over and above the strictures of

bourgeois historicity; the spectacularly imposed limits of any situated epistemic mode; and, of course, the State as a central organizing referent for capitalist being, knowledge and politics- all of which must be discarded. But, to begin at the end, I must here clarify what I mean by the State in Argentina and Chile in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, after the dictatorships but not *post*-dictatorship for reasons that will soon become clear. In this effort, I will also lay out my own, more general, understanding of the neoliberal State and its functioning in a system of global capital and atomized social relations, the conjunction of which I will come to refer to as ouroboros capital- capital in the process of consuming itself, coiled as it is around the world.

The State During Ouroboros Capital

Beginning early in the emergence of what we now commonly refer to as neoliberalism, there was a significant shift away from a thought of the State in mainstream academic left discourses, where it had briefly flourished.³ While an exhaustive exploration of its decline would require reviewing the last forty years of social science research, a dizzying proposition, it suffices to note the seemingly common-sense idea that the role of the State has been diminishing. This is explained as symptomatic either of an outright subsumption or subservience to the economic, or of the increasing internationalization and perceived decentralization of politics, economics and culture- and at times, both together. Witness the popularity of the work of authors such as Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, amongst many currents, wherein the role of the state is elided almost to the point of non-existence.⁴ Yet, for as much as this move is justified on the basis of the supposed diminution of the State's role and relevance, the case seems to

me more one of obfuscation and reorientation. Certainly not a measurable lessening of the State, define that as you may- thus, this turn away from it is entirely too hasty and, as is often the case, serves to reinforce, if not reify, its power and functionality. To understand why this is so, and what can be said of the State in recent years, I would like to begin by revisiting one of two thinkers whose interpersonal debate sparked a decade of larger Marxist debates about the State, and who has been recently somewhat revindicated for his prescience- Nicos Poulantzas.⁵

While Poulantzas wrote several texts dealing with this theme, his last work, *State, Power, Socialism*, is of most interest to me and, allowing for historically necessary re-orientations, contributes the most to contemporary scholarship.⁶ While still centering the Marxist understanding of the State's class nature, by dialoguing with (primarily) Foucault's thought of power to elaborate what he called the then emergent Authoritarian Statism, his work gains a flexibility and acuity that assures its continued relevance. While I will spend more time exploring what remains useful and what not after commenting on the Chilean and Argentine states after their respective dictatorships, here I'll review Poulantzas's core insights on the general state form. Against the instrumentalist vision of the State as a *thing* (thus an object) and the social democratic vision of the State as *Subject* (thus *historical* subject), both of which he says reify the State and place it outside of class relations, Poulantzas asserts that the State is "*rather a relationship of forces, or more precisely the material condensation of such a relationship among [dominant] classes and class fractions, such as this is expressed within the State in a necessarily specific form*" (128-9 emphasis in original).⁷ He sees its materiality expressed in the

relations and functions of the various State institutions and their productions; including, to an extent, the oft referred Ideological Apparatuses. But while the inclusion of dominant in the citation was mine, it was to emphasize another key assertion. As Poulantzas says, “the dominated classes exist in the State not by means of apparatuses concentrating a *power of their own*, but essentially in the form of centres of opposition to the powers of the dominant class” and cannot hold power “*without a radical transformation of the State*”, their subordination and exclusion being inscribed in its institutional materiality (142 emphasis in original). While he asserts that the “State is not a monolithic bloc, but a strategic field”, he stridently emphasizes that the contradictions expressed in the shifting powers within the State do not express the dyad dominated/dominant but, rather, the conflicts between fractions of the *dominant* class (130). These fractions are contained by the hegemony of one, specific power bloc (then, Monopoly Capital), whose struggles shape the State’s institutional materiality to organize, in their condensation, these contradictions. For him, this explains why, even should the Left assume power, without said radical transformation the central organizing force can be shifted to other State institutions (and here he uses Salvador Allende and his struggles with the courts as his example).

While that should serve as segue to a discussion of *my* material cases, I would like to underscore another question. That is: what do *I* intend to do with this Marxist’s thought of the State? Or rather, does this text, often interpreted as having an optimistic view of certain reformist efforts, have any use for an actively *anti*-State stance?⁸ A path opens in his most concentrated engagement with the thought of power. For me, the key tension is

contained in the following: “*popular struggles, and power in general, stretch far beyond the State*: but *insofar as* they are genuinely political, they are not really external to the State” due what he calls their “long range” effects within it (141 emphasis in original). He’s walking a fine line: while, rightly, attempting to avoid what Ralph Miliband criticized as “structural superdeterminism”, he also takes explicit issue with the Foucauldian tendency to completely set aside the State’s role in centralizing and ordering power, in favor of an immanent, situational understanding. Within the latter discussion lays the kernel that any anarchistic reading of Poulantzas must address. While his critique of Foucault was left partial after his untimely death, it is nonetheless a fascinating gesture towards what he saw as a tendency to hypostasize power. He reads in Foucault a rhetorical and theoretical dependence on the slippages between a hypostatized idea of Power and the bipolar power/resistance dynamic, such that resistance is vacated of meaning. He insists instead on power’s existence as relational and always emergent from, without exhausting, struggles as inscribed in its materiality.⁹ Unfortunately, this is not the place to take up that debate anew. Of interest to me is his elaboration of popular struggles under the aegis of the idea that, given that power is not exhausted in the State, “it is impossible to remain external to power and escape its characteristic relations: one cannot avoid being trapped by power simply by remaining outside the State” (152). But by viewing the State as *utilizing* all power, whether of its institutions or not, he asserts that the aforementioned “long range” effects of popular and other struggles are amplified and made manifold in the State by virtue of contact with institutions established to distance them (the police, courts, etcetera) and in which they *cannot* be allowed presence.

Yet, following this, he immediately re-affirms the necessity of a certain autonomy of popular struggles from the State. Here is the text's only explicit reference to anarchism (unsurprisingly, while discussing strategy):

...the attainment of such autonomy does not involve the political organizations in leaving the strategic field of the relationship of forces that is the power-State, any more than it involves other organizations [...] in taking up a position outside the corresponding power mechanisms. *To believe that this is even possible is an old illusion of anarchism (in the best sense of the term).* (153 emphasis mine)

While I believe this is a fair description of the strategic positionality often articulated by anarchism with regards the power-State dynamic, it seems to me an unfair transhistorical universalization of its (im)possibility, for a few reasons. First, to clarify, I do not think it accurate to claim anarchists pretend a complete escape from all power relations- in fact, by explicitly *opposing* them in their dominant form, it should be clear that there is no *escape* in their posture. Thus, in the particular case of the power-State relation(s), its immediate elimination (as opposed to its withering away) has other valences. The demand for its elimination is *due to* recognizing our interiority to its strategic field of power and power utilization- this is the negative valence. The positive is rather other, and I believe originates accusations of a utopian desire for exteriority to the State. Anarchism also demands generativity, in a call for *distinct relations from those of the State* to, in practice, *produce in struggle an "outside" to State power, but one no longer "outside", rather otherwise.* To produce the very joy that Goldman writes of, above. For to postulate the impossibility of relations other than the State, as difficult as their generation may be, would be to fall back on a gesture similar to the hypostatization of power Poulantzas

critiques in Foucault, and would further undermine his own dual strategy of radical reformulation within and alternative constituent forces beyond the State.

The question of possibility, though, must be approached historically. While Poulantzas *may* have been accurate saying this in 1978, we are not concerned with 1978. So, returning to Allende and Chile, I will reflect on the state of the State in Chile, and then Argentina, after their dictatorships and into the present day- effectively, allowing for late 80s turbulence in Argentina, beginning circa 1990. While both states differ in their particularities, having been proving grounds for neoliberalism's forceful normalization techniques- both at the point of a gun and a pen- they can reveal to us much about the broader nature and role of the State in late 20th and early 21st century radical politics.

Chile

While I in no way avail myself of the necessary space for an exhaustive exploration of the literature on the dictatorships in either country, nor on the transitions, I will attempt to sketch key points for understanding the State in each country as they moved into the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Beginning with Chile, we need to understand what seem to have been the dictatorships' primary goals vis a vis politics, civil society, and the economy. Socio-politically, the Pinochet dictatorship opposed what it viewed as an "interventionist" state; a welfare state influenced by popular Marxism. Against this it posed an ultra-liberal tendency towards a politics of the free market, wherein was postulated a disarticulation of traditional civil society in favor of increasing social fragmentation and atomization of labor (although these goals moved slowly in popular sectors).¹⁰ This shift from a social defined more homogeneously to one

dominated by a heterogeneity of signifiers also permitted the political order enshrined in the dictatorship's new constitution to re-articulate the left with a chaotic form of socio-political organization. It encouraged, especially amongst younger generations, a self-identification from marginality that destabilized prior left parliamentarism and animated depoliticization and distrust of representative politics, distancing left tendencies from State institutions.¹¹ Accompanying this socio-political distancing, especially after the unrest of 1983-4, the dictatorship used prior economic reforms to stabilize its imposition of global finance-friendly, extractivist neoliberal policies that favored, and perhaps depended on, social fragmentation and depoliticization.¹² Finally, coming out of the dictatorship, there was a shift wherein institutional relations were weakened by a concentration of executive power and a growing decentralization, although not lessening, of state functions- reminiscent of Poulantzas's Authoritarian Statism. *Social* action's efficacy at affecting State institutions was subordinated by a technocratized politics favoring global capital, resulting in a trend towards socio-political normalization and political apathy.¹³

After the dictatorship, properly speaking, this situation provoked a few major critical currents regarding the State. First, there's an explicitly liberal reformist current that conceives of the separation of politics from economics as sufficient to restore the State's political function, which they see as having been almost nullified.¹⁴ Second, there is a broadly Democratic Socialist tendency emphasizing social fragmentation, individualization and, as such, a fragmented Civil Society, as key to the current moment. Broadly Gramscian, their somewhat nostalgic/regressive advocacy for a return to an

instrumentalized, strong interventionist State ignores the complex interplay of forces altering the spatial practice in which the State/Civil Society relationship initially obtained.¹⁵

More than either of these, I find that the heterodox Marxist thought of Tomás Moulian and Gabriel Salazar most effectively comprehends the current State. Moulian centers what he refers to as “transformismo”, in which the dictatorship, principally but not exclusively with the 1980 constitution, legally restricted the Chilean state’s institutional flexibility to ensure the persistence of its economic and social policies. Summarizing this double gesture manifest in the current State, he refers to fusion and fission. Fusion is the centralization of decisional power in the State, and particularly the executive, dependent on a cleavage of the State from society whose root cause is the technification of politics, productive of the oft mentioned technocracy. While often confused for simple subordination of the political to the economic, this process is more an application of an economic-productive logic- specialization- to politics. With this, the dominant ideological tendencies can distinguish political and economic realms and, complementarily, excise the masses from politics for not having sufficient “technical” formation. Fission, then, refers to the decomposition of social forces concomitant with and necessary for the above fusion. Salazar attributes this to the dictatorship’s fragmentation of productive models, which in turn fragmented labor and the social sphere, facilitating post-Fordist forms of capital accumulation.¹⁶ Moulian underscores that, with financial capital’s entrance into Chile, credit became a disciplinary force reinforcing neoliberal isolation and atomization by increasing the risk for the individual

of collective action against capital. Yet, both emphasize that absent credible representative politics, there have been situated, bottom-up political reformulations availing themselves of constituent power otherwise than the traditional pairing State/Civil Society.¹⁷

This moves us beyond the Gramscian binomial State/Civil Society via its comprehension of a certain subsumption of Civil Society to the political, insofar as the capital interests the State serves have necessitated a restructuring of its institutional materiality. Thus, this model allows for alternative political forms exceeding the heavily circumscribed realm of politics as functional to the State, now extended to a Civil Society instrumentalized, or discarded, for and by global capital's collaboration with state apparatuses. Understanding the absence of popular will in state institutions, we understand the exhaustion of a paradigm wherein Civil Society is a balance and complement to the State- concomitant with and productive of a withering functionality of traditional civic institutions in favor of consumerist models that better serve capital (and contribute to the illusion of a withering away *of the State*, insofar as our understanding has not kept pace with institutional shifts).¹⁸ The Chilean state, then, appears in many ways as robust as ever, despite modulations, and so a sense of its diminution can be understood as a misapprehension of its continuity due to the exclusion of the popular from decision making. However, this poses the following questions to Poulantzas's model: when the masses cease to have "long range" effects in the State, what are the dominant class interests and fractional disputes that compose the contradictory unity projected by the State and to which this popular absence is due? How can one account for

the State's utilization of *non-state power* when *its* traditional seat of power has been decentered, although not diminished? We will return to these questions after examining the Argentine situation, which will help focus them.

Argentina

Argentina's dictatorship shared many aspirations with the Pinochet regime, but was also unique to the Argentine situation- enough so that it's worth indicating that direct comparison is not reasonable, although they did have some similarities. I will highlight, initially, though, that the above effects of political technification and the ensuing technocratic governance style do hold for Argentina and will here be presumed. Prior to the dictatorship, popular struggles and social actors had projected their influence into the State by unifying behind *caudillo* figures who controlled, "for" them, sectors of the state apparatus- effectively a form of corporativism, as opposed to representative democracy *per se*.¹⁹ One of the dictatorship's main effects, if not goals, was the working class's fragmentation and heterogenization, facilitating social disciplining by state apparatuses meant to produce individual citizen-subjects amenable to the imposition of new economic models.²⁰ This all formed part of what José Nun has referred to as "atomization by multiplication", principally directed at the Peronist unions, which retained significant political and economic power alongside, but not of, the State. And, though it failed to break the unions, it did succeed in more fully incorporating many elements of traditional Civil Society into the field of power struggles proper to state institutionality, forcing a cleavage between the masses and Civil Society- a situation similar, although not identical, to what I noted above regarding Chile.²¹

Effectively, this fragmentary process of social disciplining produced unstable capital/labor relations and further exacerbated a growing sector of informal, non-unionized labor, while the unions were more fully articulated with the State. This is somewhat ironic, given that Peron had originally encouraged movementist unionization as a way of *quelling* insurrectionary tendencies, although the irony does not become apparent until 2001. At the same time, as most histories of the 1980s implicitly project, there was a significant increase of executive power under Alfonsín during his struggles against a complete imposition of structural adjustment programs, again echoing what we see in Chile.²² This period effectively ends in the 1990s with the election of Carlos Menem, who moved to discreetly but completely advance the neoliberal structural adjustment plans using newly aggregated executive powers, as well as a weakened and coopted Civil Society, more and more removed from popular struggle. He also successfully delegated some of the central government's traditional institutional authority and power to the governors, paradoxically increasing centralized executive power within the State by reinforcing corrupt clientelist networks across the country.²³ Whereas in Chile, we see disillusionment with representative politics, in Argentina this produces a roiling rage around the period's corruption and scandals- although the resultant lack of credibility was effectively the same.²⁴ State politicking during the 1990s is essentially dominated by clientelist networks, elite factionalism and party politics that, collectively, have no immediate relation to popular struggles- again, animating the lack of non-state powers' "long range" effects in the State.²⁵ After the anti-representative, anti-corruption mobilizations of 2001-2 in Argentina there were attempts by Nestor Kirchner to return to

a balanced State/Civil Society dyad by incorporating the moderate elements of *piquetero*, and other, groups to his government. Yet, there was no fundamental change in the depoliticization coetaneous with the overflowing of the social by the political produced as Peronism took refuge in the unions: said another way, the depoliticization produced by state politics' saturation of Civil Society.²⁶ As Laura Tedesco notes of Menem's tenure as president, "the neoliberal state de-politicised the economy, 'de-ideologised' politics and turned social issues into economic ones" (169). But, and Argentina presents in many ways the best case for this, this only holds for the functions and politics delimited in the earlier system, wherein the welfare state was broadly responsive to a robust Civil Society. The social she mentions, referencing as it does older formulations, always implies a delimitation within and by Civil Society and cannot be taken to refer to socialization otherwise than that realm. Thus, with the sharp increase in informal labor and markets under and following the dictatorship, many Argentines fell outside the bounds of the social once articulated with Civil Society's institutions- which, further, no longer function in any substantial way.²⁷ And so, the *desocupados* were, predictably, excluded from Kirchner's attempts at bringing some into the fold insofar as they were more radical than the capitalist State was willing to tolerate. They became an excess signaling an exhaustion, or at least complication, of extant conceptualizations of state power, the State, and power.

So, what can be said, succinctly, of the post-dictatorship Argentine state?

Technocratic tendencies and corruption- manifest as a chauvinistic clientelism effectively isolating state beneficiaries- alongside a withering Civil Society have produced a State

that is responsive to concerns arising everywhere but from popular struggle. And thereby necessitating the same questions I asked above- concerning the State's relationship with power and the efficacy of Civil Society. This is exacerbated in Argentina, historically, by the weakening of Civil Society effected by Peronism's movementist tendencies, particularly after Peron's exile. Moreover, following the Videla dictatorship, horizontally gestated human rights groups ironically strengthened state institutions responsible for atrocities by making claims upon them, further weakening Civil Society and buttressing extant non-traditional, horizontal social networks.²⁸ Argentina is a State willing to use currently available legal and institutional methods to incorporate those it can and excoriate the growing number of those it cannot. This while offering positions to the loyal within institutions rapidly readjusting to global capital's demands- now openly under Macri, but also discreetly under Nestor Kirchner-, veiling the extent of its integration into global capital flows from an already distrustful nation. As Bob Jessop says of neoliberal era state transformations, they tend towards a "denationalization of the state", marked by a "hollowing out of the national state apparatus" and a "continuing movement of state power upward, downward, and sideways as attempts are made by state managers on different territorial scales to enhance their respective operational autonomies and strategic capacities" (206). Which is not, he emphasizes, a sign of a global or withering State, necessary for de-territorialization of the State's centralized political authority. Rather, it signals the need to comprehend the State's shift away from *national* concerns, breaking the long-standing conceptual hyphenation. Again, in the face of a withering and increasingly coopted Civil Society and a State pursuing bureaucratic

centralization while distancing itself from popular struggles- what can we say of the neoliberal State and its hold over us? How can we respond to Poulantzas's assertion that there is no "outside the State" because of the State's utilization of all forms power foreign to its own? As this ouroboros wraps ever more tightly around the world, what possibility is there of any alternative(s)?

A Return to the Greek

Following the above brief sketches, how might I respond to Poulantzas's accusation of anarchism's untenable political positioning? The seed for that response lays in passing comments about State intervention in *social* reality- the problematic exacerbated to the point of near total subsumption that I highlighted above. As he underscores, while the State might increase interventions circumscribing power sectors and class powers, "ideological relations always have roots which go beyond the State apparatuses and which always consist in relations of power" (37). As a corrective to more Althusserian formulations of the State's co-extensiveness with Ideology's operational field, incorporating even non-hegemonic ideologies, this reminds us not so much that all Ideology is of the State, but that the State *utilizes*, to use Poulantzas's terms, all power relations. To say it another way: *power is not exhausted in nor by the State, although the State circumscribes the field of its relational effectivity as it emerges with(in) class divisions and, thereby, struggle.*²⁹ The question becomes- to what degree is that circumscription still functionally all encompassing (if it ever was)? Is there a possibility for alternative relational modes that, while not necessarily escaping the ideological, are emergent so as to be dis-functional to the State? Given the above increasingly structurally

necessitated alternative modes of production *and* living in both Argentina and Chile, now being articulated with the persistent and problematic relationship of indigenous populations with the State, I would say such a possibility exists. The neoliberal State's delimiting circumscription has rigidified in its extension throughout Civil Society, formerly the field of its more flexible delimitations and ideological functioning, and we've begun to see the emergence, extension, and re-affirmation of alternative relationalities otherwise than the State's delimitation of relational effectivity.

Nonetheless, we've seen the exacerbation, during this processual rigidification, of several State features key to Poulantzas's formulation. Relevant to my own work, insofar as we've begun moving into a post-Fordist mode of production that extracts surplus value from even social relations, a key point for the Italian autonomists, the Intellectual/Manual Labor divide has been taken to such an extreme as to at times be moot- this being further evidenced by the decreasing functionality of the Ideological State Apparatus of modernity *par excellence*, the University.³⁰ Interestingly, this corresponds to the masses' exclusion from formal and their relegation to informal labor, an increasingly common condition, without that necessarily excluding them as a source of surplus value.³¹ Further, despite the crevices opening in the State's structures, its emergent discourse as the consecration of a national language still holds, albeit less forcefully; bureaucratization, disperse as it may be, still furthers state power's centralization (particularly as favors the Executive); and individualization as a structural necessity for both the State's and capital's functioning seems even more relevant than before. But how is this happening,

exactly? What institution's materiality has secreted these conditions as it becomes more central to the State's function?

To answer this question, I would highlight the modifications and re-orientations in Andreas Kalyvas's reading of Poulantzas. While I do not necessarily endorse all his points, nor his complete discarding of Authoritarian Statism, I find his idea of "Liberal Authoritarian Legalism" to be an apt descriptor for the current modus operandi of the neoliberal State. Within this framework, the legal institutions- a major battleground in both Chile and Argentina, from Allende's battle with the courts to new constitutions to Alfonsín's late 80's maneuverings- take on a central role in state institutional operativity.³² While this seems to bely increasing executive power, and Kalyvas insists on this somewhat, I think it's important to center how the legal order's re-articulations have *facilitated* executive machinations and reinforced the distancing of representative apparatuses from the masses, advancing bureaucratizing centralization. Kalyvas says the law's new, supplementary functions are such that "the main function of the rule of law and legality is not to conceal state violence as it used to be; it is, rather, to provide the necessary semantic, normative, and institutional framework for its full expression and exercise" (128). While the roots of this are in each country's dictatorship, the fullest expressions are more recent: Kirchner's repression of the more autonomous *piquetero* groups as "illegal" manifestations of organized (non)labor; the later legal maneuvers of Macri to contain dissident socio-cultural expression; the repression of student movements in Chile; and, in particular, the double repression of Mapuche resistance to extractivist international capital in Wallmapu, authorizing (para-)military violence against them to

later try the Mapuche under anti-terrorist laws.³³ The latter also highlights a shift in the neoliberal State from government to governance, noted by Jessop; that is, a unitary government to a *legally* authorized dispersion of State powers between para-, non- and governmental forces (without for that ceasing to be *State* powers). As he says, “the State *in its integral sense* is reproduced in and through continuous changes in the articulation of government and governance” (211). This all points to the ascendancy of State power’s repressive functions. I say this not to discard or diminish others functions, but to highlight how, with Civil Society’s withering and the ideological functions’ dispersal through individualistic consumerist networks, most visible has been the spectacularized repression of destabilizing, dissident and alternative voices and lifestyles.³⁴ But, again, this all corresponds to certain tendencies that Poulantzas noted: wherein “[t]he formal and abstract character of law is inextricably bound up with the real fracturing of the social body in the social division of labour- that is to say, *with the individualization of agents that takes place in the capitalist labour process*” (88 emphasis mine). Extreme atomization, i.e. hyper-individualization, via various socio-economic methods is the hallmark of the emergent neoliberal States’ social policy and the, albeit incomplete, shift toward a post-Fordist mode of production.³⁵ Because it can rely on this modified ideological field, the law now serves primarily, although not exhaustively, to formally enshrine the legitimacy of subjectivities already interpellated within neoliberal sociality- and to refuse authorization of, and thus authorize violence against, those that cannot or will not incorporate to global capitalism’s spectacular auspices. Poulantzas remarks: “[d]espite all the decentralization reforms of a techno-administrative character, real

power is shifting away from the commune or region towards the central state apparatus” (227). But this requires us to ask the final, lingering question of the State: if the contradictory unity presented by and as the State tends to functionality for a hegemonic power bloc, what can we infer of this power bloc based on the distancing from the national masses we have seen in these two States?

Poulantzas says of state policy that “*the establishment of the State’s policy must be seen as the result of the class contradictions inscribed in the very structure of the State*” (132). Recall that these contradictions are always between fractions of the Dominant class(es), and never include direct conflict with the Dominated- and that this shapes the State’s institutional materiality. Given what we’ve seen, and I’ve insinuated, the hegemonic bloc can be broadly referred to as *global capital*- but, to forestall hasty conclusions, this does not in any way strip capital of its necessarily situated base. Rather, *the global capital power bloc is composed of international and, not national, but what Paul Thomas calls domestic capital*. Similar to Jessop’s “de-nationalization”, this form of capital is produced when the contradictions of a national territory’s internal capital are permeated from without by and begin to reproduce interimperialist contradictions; that is, they become increasingly “internationalized”.³⁶ Domestic capital, then, is territorialized capital that reproduces and advances international capital’s imperatives within a geographically delimited legal order dependent upon the State. This further necessitates the State’s institutional materiality as (re)producing global capital’s functioning and existence- and thus is strongly against any withering of the State before global(ized) capital. I would even draw out the implicit conclusion in most revindications of the State

and assert that we cannot even *speak* of a global, supposedly deterritorialized capital without the territorializing functions of the State. While the relevance of capital's national aspect may have withered, the State has not. This was an explicit, as in Chile, or implicit, as in Argentina, goal of the social, political and economic restructuring and disciplining pursued by the dictatorships, along with centralization. Constantine Tsoukalas astutely notes of this tension that "to the extent that national states are not abolished, there can be no deterritorialized imperialism" (227); such that "[t]ogether with exploitation, imperialism is hiding behind the 'neutral' logic of a supposedly uncontrolled transnational market logic" (228). His inversion allows us to understand that any sense of imperial, global capital is dependent on the State's continued territorializing functions, for as long as the State exists. Should it cease to, then imperialism itself as an analytical category would lose all consistency and functioning, necessitating a conceptual reconfiguration to fully invest "global" capital with a new, properly *global* meaning. But this imperialist impasse is effectively aporetic insofar as the State is invested in and articulated by the maintenance of the Domestic/International, i.e. Global, hegemonic bloc's functioning- this because, as Poulantzas observes, "the capitalist State is constituted by a *negative general limit* to its intervention- that is to say, by *specific non-intervention* in the 'hard core' of capitalist relations of production" (191).³⁷ So, to tie up a loose end in passing, I refer to *ouroboros capital* to describe capital in this state of spectacular global saturation that conceals the fantastic, incomplete nature of real subsumption. A snake wrapped around stated global bodies, constricting but not consuming them- instead eating itself alive. But what state does this leave us in?

The Machinic State

We are left, in effect, not with a State that has been ground down to irrelevance; rather, we have a State that grinds down all domestic resistance to international flows of capital. To abuse a somewhat unrelated metaphor, *the State functions as a translation machine*, facilitating the existence of international capital in and as physical intervention within the (newly minted) domestic sphere. And reversing that, this existence modifies the State's institutional materiality to facilitate the emergence of domestic capital, such that international capital's extractive propensities are co-extensive with state institutions, up to and including post-Fordist capitalization of social relations. I say *translation machine* because it establishes the two spheres it translates between in their existence and as interlinked; one as the obverse of the other, both achieving meaning only through the exchange between and of them facilitated by and facilitating the neoliberal State. I say *translation machine* to preserve some of the lingering materialist structural determinism within Poulantzas's work because, as he himself notes and I referenced above, I reject all use for the bourgeois state form *sans* radical change- that is, without its elimination. Machinic, then, because without persistent and significant force from horizontal, constituent power dedicated to generating alternative relational forms of and for power as such, the State will grind down all cogs inserted equally- regardless of their radicality or intentions. But I *do* accept the possibility of alternative relational forms of power, distinct from Poulantzas's rejection of it based in a reading of anarchist thought that, to use an old Marxist saw, may well be dubbed a product of false consciousness.

This possibility, though, must always be situated within a specific historical constellation, responding to the drives and material determinations of that constellation's subjectivation. Today, in at least Argentina and Chile, although perhaps elsewhere as well, the above limitations inherent to the capitalist State, even in its neoliberal manifestation, have generated situations in which the possibility of these alternative relational modes is (perhaps *again*) emergent. Because the 'hard core' of capitalist relations of production has shifted its focus towards global capital as an international/domestic, as opposed to inter-/national, dynamic, the negative limit of non-intervention eschews state action towards remedying the increasing distance from the masses and the growing, alternative forms of labor and sociality within these territories. While there may, periodically, be attempts at reorientation, even those are undercut (at times literally) by the demands of global capital on domestic markets and modes of governance.³⁸ By gesturing to this cleavage in a prior state model, I do not mean to perform some complete separation of all the actors and forces here presented, nor any unification establishing a new conflictive binary. Much as I eschew the assumption of real subsumption, due to differentiated development and situated modes of production, I would refer to none of these processes or situations as totalizing nor finished. Rather, by articulating this understanding of the State, particularly in Argentina and Chile, I mean to allow that we conceive of the ongoing and forthcoming possibility of and potential in alternative emergent spatial, relational and subjective practices.³⁹ Given my institutional situation within an academia equally overdetermined by the State, I must strive to be aware of these possibilities and potentialities, embodied in subjects and practices

otherwise than our knowledge, because they teach us our limitations and how to act within them, without them.

Otherwise Than the State

My dissertation works towards these necessary, high anti-conceptual modulations of thought and practice- that is, towards an anarchist mode of reading- by tracing certain tendencies of leftist politics in historic poetics and intellectual work, later bringing them to bear on situations overdetermined by the neoliberal State. The key points around which I articulate my reading are those mentioned above: a sense of solidarity as practiced in writing; friendship as a form of love that teaches us to carry on, and carry out, rebellious action; the impossibility of ascribing failure, as proper to and dependent upon bourgeois historicity, to emerging commonalities; and the historical and present limitations of leftists' epistemic presumptions, particularly as the contemporary left grows away from the State and becomes forcefully aware of long-standing indigenous opposition to state politics, ontologies and epistemologies. I structure my work, on a theoretical level, as a generative dis/encounter between deconstructive ethics and contemporary horizontal political thought, particularly if not exclusively the works of the Italian autonomists Paolo Virno and Antonio Negri. By highlighting the way that a singularly plural, ethical sense of co-emergence complicates the, at times, subtly totalizing tendencies of autonomist thought of the common, I bring the role of the State back into view and demonstrate the simultaneous utility and limitations of a sense of the common predicated on the necessity of real subsumption. And by insisting on the *co*-emergence necessitated by deconstructive ethics, at the aporetic breaking point that obtains between the common

and the singular, I offer a reinvigorated sense of ethical responsibility's persistence as the necessary kernel for any sense of radical commonality to come. While none of the examples that I explore manage to escape the State's conceptual apparatuses, although some either tried or signaled what does, they are limit cases of political discourse insofar as it is forcefully bound to the State. Each offers us a method for thinking through the conceptual destabilizations that interest me and, thus, thinking through those concepts, such that they might be resituated in our own actions.

Chapters one and two function as something of a theoretical excursus. Given the tendency on the part of anarchist thought toward production elsewhere than traditional, institutionalized channels, it often leaves key concepts underexplored. For instance, solidarity as a situated action, or friendship understood as loving- without a fuller fleshing out of what those entail. The first chapter deals with the solidarity of Nicanor Parra's re-socialized poetics. I examine his works *Artefactos* and *Chistes parra* *desorientar a la policía poesía* to explicate how he enacts a writing of solidarity that signals, without capturing in a name, an emergent spatial practice otherwise than the State's. Initially, by engaging with literary and artistic criticism from and concerning the period covered in the interval between these two books, I assert that his is a body of work re-articulated horizontally within the social sphere, after the collapse of the autonomous sphere of art instigated during the avant-garde. Then, bringing Paolo Virno's work on jokes and the sociality of language together with Jacques Derrida's thought of the signature's recontextualizing iterability, I explore how this writing figuratively marks the limits of the State's spatial practice as articulated within language. Parra's poetics open

for persistent, recontextualized engagement, the emergent social unrest and discontent marking the books' publication- in 1973 and 1983, crisis years for the Chilean socio-political order. He enacts a solidarity without epistemic capture- refusing the *nomos*, his work signals but doesn't fix a sense of emergent multitudinous subjectivities, otherwise than Chilean state spatial practices.

The second chapter takes up Juan Gelman's *Si dulcemente*, reading within the text a model for friendship as a form of love radically other than those traditionally associated with the term- filial, fraternal, romantic, *agape*. This model teaches us to re-situate a way of loving, friendship-as-love, such that we carry on in and out of solidarity with those we love and have loved, despite death or failure. After examining how love shifts within his *oeuvre* from a theme to the act of thematizing driving the poetry, I bring together *Si dulcemente*, the work of Emmanuel Levinas on love in *Totality and Infinity* and Jacques Derrida's study of friendship in *The Politics of Friendship*. In this conjunction, I demonstrate how friendship follows the same active structure of love and socializes it by destabilizing the presumedly singular ipseity of any friend, present or absent. This destabilization opens a futurity for radical practices and becomes the hinge for an ethical sense articulated with the common. Love between friends is an elective affinity, and when born of rebellious action can only be a horizontal force that escapes the State's overdetermined, disciplinary sociality as an excess. Further, by opening itself to the iterability of a love in and of solidarity, the text pro-poses an autodidact's pedagogy, paradoxical as it may sound. Offering a model by en-acting it, the texts allows that readers can themselves re-situate that model in and through their own action. Exploring

the sense of these underworked concepts, and in articulating one with the other, I establish historical antecedents- a tentative genealogy- for horizontal tendencies that emerge again after these dictatorships.

The third chapter is an examination of audiovisual documentary and *video rebelde* produced in Argentina after, and about, the events of the 2001 *saqueo* by international financial capital, articulated with a sustained engagement with Negri's thought of the common. Exploring the explanations and representations of emergent subjectivities in audiovisual and critical work, I trace parallel but rhyming tensions within both fields, using each to describe and explicate the other. Juxtaposing older forms of radical documentary, recent contestatory documentaries and *video rebelde*, I explore the exhaustion of nationalist political categories in the face of global capital and the neoliberal State. This echoes the impossibility of containing a cacophonous subject within an audio-visual production that retains discernible traces of the authorial voice. Parallel, and complementarily, I set alongside one another Negri's thought of the common and what Ana María Fernández describes as *entre-muchos*, to deconstruct Negri's terms and demonstrate how his thought contradictorily forces one to ascribe failure to movements other than constantly generative. By bringing these two modes of analysis together, I strive to show that we must escape capitalist historical teleology, in order to think senses of persistence in common, as carried out by common singularities. This expounds on the necessity of what Jacques Derrida calls, in his text *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, an *anarchivic drive*; as a modality of writing destabilizing to archival consignment within the State's ordering of knowledge. Against this ordering, I

underline the *cacophonous singularity* of hand-held video as a way of situating them within larger aesthetic, and thereby political, moments, without having to fall back on aesthetic categories insufficient to an-aesthetic objects. Or political categories insufficient to impolitical actors. This chapter is, in some ways, the culmination of the previous two, proposing an approach to emergent subjectivities other than *a priori* violent imposition.

My final chapter serves as coda and autocritique, meant to explore the limits of even horizontal political analyses or movements insofar as they are articulated with knowledges, categories and histories developed under the auspices of the capitalist, colonial State. I do this while reading the poetry and prose of Mapuche activist and public figure, Elicura Chihuailaf Nahuelpan. By bringing together his work in *Recado confidencial a los chilenos* and *De sueños azules y contrasueños* with Jacques Derrida's work around languages of arrival in *The Monolingualism of the Other: or, The Prosthesis of Origin*, I explore how Chihuailaf is constantly arriving to either Mapudungun or Castilian, without either the event of arrival nor access to subjective plenitude. In this way, his work teaches us to recognize the categorical limitations on the concepts with which we presume to articulate our solidarity. I emphasize the spectacular virtuality of the figure of the Mapuche as incorporated to the Chilean nation-state's historico-political discourse, which renders the actual, lived being signaled by the name "Mapuche" unspeakable and illegible from within the State's language. I refer to this as a coda because, within my work, it compels us to return to the earlier readings and theorizations to re-evaluate them on the basis of epistemo-conceptual limits imposed by our situated reality. Ending with a reflection on the impossibility of radically liberatory discourses

adequately including certain structurally excluded forms of life and subjectivity renders the work a call in itself, one that demands persistent work towards a politics to come. One perhaps no longer a politics, because politics and its state referent will be exhausted as modes of action and concepts.

Learning to Learn, Together

Ultimately, in the following work, I am attempting to articulate what I am forced time and again to call an anarchist mode of reading. This, however, is not itself meant to be a settled and consistent mode- neither concrete, nor universal, nor even universalizable. Rather, I mean this to be a conceptual exposition and a methodological exploration. Both should be approached with the necessary skepticism with which one approaches the radically other but, at the same time, both should be understood as offering themselves up for an autodidactic pedagogy aimed at the constant re-situation of radical thought by a yet uncountable number of subjects. I referred above, in passing, to certain anti-conceptual tendencies within my work, but that was an intentionally provocative inaccuracy. Rather, what I want the reader to take from this is the need to *first act* in whatever way we might act, wherever we might act, to enable others and ourselves to act more fully. That is, to understand the need to act joyfully, to act in solidarity, in whatever situation we are in- mine being, of course, an academic one- so that those utterly other with whom we are in solidarity might themselves know joy. Let us set aside any conceptual pretensions and strive to understand and act wherever it is we are given to do so, according to whatever terms are the most appropriate, so that we might know joyful forms of being otherwise than and opposed to the violence of the

capitalist State. As for our vaunted concepts- they will follow from our work, and we can read them later, in a mode otherwise than how we might now.

Endnotes

¹ Alix Kates Shulman claims in a short autobiographical piece, “Dances with Feminists”, to have accidentally passed along the idea to a friend in the 1970s, who in turn was responsible for the production of shirts with the (now unrecognizable) quotation.

² Lefebvre references the type, that is a role that we are fully engaged in playing and yet alienated from, in the preface to a reprinting of the first volume of his *Critique of Everyday Life*.

³ This is discussed in Timothy Mitchell’s contribution to *The Anthropology of the State* and in the introduction to the collected volume to which I will soon return, *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*.

⁴ A more recent well-known example would be Sayak Valencia’s *Gore Capitalism* which, while referring to “Marxist state theory”, does no such thing. A hasty reference may be to the post-hegemonic turn, but I feel that’s more symptomatic than causal.

⁵ The two authors in question here are Ralph Miliband and Nicos Poulantzas. The debate ensued shortly following the publication of their books *The State in Capitalist Society* and *Political Power and Social Classes*, respectively, when Poulantzas published a review of Miliband’s work to which the latter responded. The initial rapport is collected in the edited volume *Ideology in Social Science* and Miliband’s review of the English translation of Poulantzas’s book is collected with other essays in *Class Power and State Power*. Clyde W. Barrow’s contribution to the *Paradigm Lost* collection is an excellent history of the debate and its effects.

⁶ In the purely theoretical vein, it’s also worth referring to his sections on the “General Characteristics” and “Relative Autonomy” in *Political Power and Social Classes*.

⁷ By rearticulating his thought of the State in a way that centers its relationality and doesn’t reify it, Poulantzas here (perhaps unwittingly) undermines many of the astute criticisms Phillip Abrams had of his earlier work in “Some Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State”.

⁸ For a discussion of the reformist bent that can be found in his final work, Paul Thomas’s contribution to *Paradigm Lost* is worthwhile.

⁹ It’s worth including here the lengthy quotations I’m referring to in this section. As regards resistance and Foucault, highlighting the different uses of ‘resistance’ in each author: “...no kind of resistance is possible if we follow Foucault’s analyses. For if power

is always already there, if every power situation is immanent in itself, *why should there ever be resistance? From where would resistance come, and how would it even be possible*” (149). To elaborate how he conceives of the limitations on power, and thus sites of ‘resistance’, he clarifies “As regards the State (although this is also true of mechanisms of class power not included in the State), such limits are defined and materially grounded by the reproduction of class places and positions within the State. Power, even in its state form, is never pure immanence. The State and power in general are not an essence or pole standing in counterposition to struggles. If struggle always has primacy over apparatuses, this is because power is a relation between struggles and practices (those of the exploiters and the exploited, the rulers and the ruled) and because the State above all is the condensation of a relationship of forces defined precisely by struggle” such that “struggles are always present in the State (and, more generally, power mechanisms); for even though the State is already there, neither the State nor power is the First Cause of struggle. Struggles are inscribed in the strategic field of the mechanisms and apparatuses of power- that is to say, political struggles which bear upon the State in its peculiar strategic field without necessarily being ‘integrated’ into the power of the dominant classes” (151).

¹⁰ See Lili Letelier and Tomás Moulian’s contribution to *Clases populares, crisis y democracia en América Latina*.

¹¹ Adolfo Gilly refers to the parliamentarian tendency in his *Por todos los caminos/ I: escritos sobre América Latina 1956-1982*, and for an interesting discussion of the effects of this fragmentation in the artistic scene in Chile, see Willy Thayer’s “El golpe como consumación de la vanguardia” in *El fragmento repetido* and the debate he had with Nelly Richard on the subject.

¹² Regarding this process’s dependence on previous agricultural reform and nationalization to stabilize its transitional economic policies, see Javier Martínez and Alvaro Díaz’s *Chile: The Great Transformation*.

¹³ I am referring particular to the discussion of this in *Latin America in the 21st Century: Towards a New Sociopolitical Matrix*, Garretón, et al.

¹⁴ I am thinking specifically of the work of Manuel Antonio Garretón Merino, of whose works I have included three in the bibliography.

¹⁵ This tendency is noticeable in the referenced work of José Joaquín Brunner.

¹⁶ Salazar explores this in *Historia de la acumulación capitalista en Chile (Apuntes de clase)*. Post-Fordist here refers to the subsumption of social relations to a mode of production that generates surplus value through capitalizing on relationality. I will address this more directly below.

¹⁷ Gabriel Salazar, again, explores this in *Dolencias históricas de la memoria ciudadana*. Moulian also, interestingly, suggests the necessity of forging subjects from particularity on p.78 of his *Chile actual* and takes up similar themes in his later *Deseo de otro Chile*.

¹⁸ This is noticeable in Moulian's discussion of malls in *Chile actual*, as well as his discussion of "protected democracy" on pp. 48-9 of that work.

¹⁹ Obviously, the classic referent is Peron. This appears, again, in Garretón, et al. (2003). José Nun also discusses this in "La teoría política y la transición democrática" (1987).

²⁰ See Juan Carlos Portantiero, "La concertación que no fue: de la ley Mussi al plan Austral" (1987).

²¹ In saying this I am basing myself principally on James McGuire's *Peronism with Peron*, Laura Tedesco's *Democracy in Argentina* (which will return often in this section), and José Nun's "Argentina: informe preliminar acerca de la situación de los sectores populares en el proceso de transición democrática" (1989).

²² Tedesco, again, offers an excellent discussion of these years. It might also be productive to return to Gilly's comments on the *montoneros* from *Por todos los caminos*, in order to trace the extreme manifestations of *movimientismo*, but that discussion is better left for the second chapter.

²³ See the contributions by Kent Eaton and Ernesto Calvo & María Victoria Murillo to *Argentine Democracy*.

²⁴ See: Garretón, et al. (2003); Torre in *Argentine Democracy*; and finally, *Broken Promises: The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy* and *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, which I discuss more at length in Chapter 3.

²⁵ See: the contributions by Auyero and Perruzzoti in *Argentine Democracy*. It is also worth referring to the piece by Marcelo Fabián Sain, "Police, Politics, and Society in the Province of Buenos Aires", which I analyze at length in Chapter 3 and which examines a specific case of these networks utilizing the repressive policing apparatus not out of interest in suppressing popular struggle, but as a way of creating bad press for a political opponent.

²⁶ Tedesco discuss this at length in the fourth chapter of her book. When considering this, the praises heaped on Nestor Kirchner by thinkers like Ricardo Forster

(see the referenced volumes) reproduces an interesting division that I map here between the traditional and the emergent centers and foci of left thought in Argentina.

²⁷ Here, as elsewhere, the reference to the non-functionality of traditional institutions of Civil Society is not meant to insinuate that they simply ceased to exist. Rather, it signals the way in which a modified structural relationship with the State re-oriented them towards newer, individualistic consumer models of socialization, as I explore below.

²⁸ Concerning both the movementist tendencies and this paradoxical effect of the human rights groups, see Perruzzoti, *ibid.*

²⁹ See: Poulantzas (2000) pp. 38-9. All citations following this are to *State, Power, Socialism* unless otherwise noted.

³⁰ Concerning the implications of a shift to the post-Fordist MoP, see: Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude*. For a discussion of the crisis of the University in the same time frame, see: Willy Thayer's *La crisis no moderna de la universidad moderna*.

³¹ One might easily append here a discussion on the growing prevalence of the gig economy in Latin America, and globally. Although, it may be more interesting, and relevant to my work, to highlight the way that, for instance, documentaries about the *cartoneros* and academic work produced about these groups (including mine) extract a value from them that will not likely be remitted. And that while being, presumptively, in solidarity with those subjects.

³² This was, in fact, a topic often and explicitly discussed by referencing the struggles of Allende with the courts from elsewhere- see a piece in Miliband's article collection and passing comments by Poulantzas. As regards Alfonsin, see both Tedesco, *ibid.* and McGuire, *ibid.*

³³ This will be discussed more at length in Chapters 3 and 4.

³⁴ See Stanley Aronowitz and Andreas Kalyvas's contributions to *Paradigm Lost*.

³⁵ I say incomplete because both the uneven capital developments that Salazar notes and the rapidly growing informal economies beyond the grasp of the state make Negri's real subsumption a yet untenable assertion.

³⁶ See Paul Thomas's contribution to *Paradigm Lost*, particularly pp. 83-4.

³⁷ Interestingly, in the introduction to *Paradigm Lost*, the editors note a succinct but crucial difference between Poulantzas's thought and that of Hardt and Negri, or for

that matter Deleuze and Guattari. On p. xix they underscore that the core disjunction between the two types of state thought is the absence of an appreciation for spatial practices and divisions in the (inter)national division of labor in both Hardt and Negri and Deleuze and Guattari- something that Poulantzas, I believe rightfully, emphasizes.

³⁸ See, e.g. Miguel Rivera-Quñones piece in *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis*, on Kirchner's relation with transnational corporations. When I say *literally* undercut, I mean *literally*. See <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/apr/01/argentina-new-river-soya-beans>.

³⁹ These currents are already in motion in Latin America. The work of Colectivo Situaciones is an excellent example, as are Hupert 2011 and Benasayag 2000. And the longstanding opposition of indigenous groups, especially the Mapuche in these two territories, cannot but be mentioned- although, as I will explore in Chapter 4, it may be somewhat more complicated.

Chapter 1

Many Parras: Techniques of a (re)Socialized Poetics

It's difficult to begin writing, or write about beginnings, as beginnings only appear after they have ended, and you have begun to write (about them). A trap of retroactivity that will haunt the periodization in the following chapters, and whose failings will become one of their themes. Nevertheless, I have to start somewhere, so I will focus on a specific case, as all instances of this problematic only appear in a given situation. I begin with the poetry of Nicanor Parra, as the problem is compounded when we lack a fixed consensus about whether anything has begun at all, or whether our vocabulary is adequate to the task at hand. The articulation of this difficulty is at least double, and in truth, of course, exceeds that doubling. Criticism on the writing and art of the mid-twentieth century is so often dislocated- no longer the avant-garde moment, not yet the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary fervor of the late sixties and seventies, it tends to be pushed in one direction or the other. The moment is retrospectively articulated so as to conform to more definite critical referents, rather than maintain the ambivalence that allows it to prefigure so much of what was, and is, to come. While the broad strokes of that assertion hold for writers and artists of the fifties and early sixties across the globe, there is a particularly acute lacuna around this period in Chilean criticism. For that reason, we have figures like Parra- apt for exploring alternative politics yet rapidly sidelined by both politics and literary criticism. Exploring the tensions of criticism in and around that moment will allow me to sketch a space for writing in, and out of, solidarity with a mode of being beyond state language. The space of Parra's solidarity has a binding

role throughout my larger work and, so, elaborating its political and critical implications is essential to framing my broader gestures. I will begin this chapter with a conventional reflection on the critical approximations to the various periods of Parra's work, and, later, how those intersect with the political currents of those epochs.

Where(in) we find ourselves

As Pablo Oyarzún notes of Chilean art criticism concerning the fifties and sixties, the reigning sign is that of *no sign*- a lack of consensus writ large behind the always retroactive imposition of contexts and periodization. Which is to say, beginnings and endings show themselves always, yet only, in their critical identification. Further, Oyarzún notes that the social's politicization was beginning to effect a blurring of distinctions between and within institutionalized discourses- a significant point to which I will return, and whose later implications we saw in the Introduction.¹ Parra's entrance to this amorphous milieu, then, is in many ways excessively appropriate: trained in math and physics, which he also taught, he gains renown principally for his poetry; brother to Violeta Parra, uncle to Ángel, father to Catalina, he is integral to a prominent, political family in the Chilean arts yet has a distant, and at times outright conflictive, relationship with institutional left politics; finally, his citational yet disjunctive relationship to literary antecedents dis-locates and re-situates his work as regards the prior and, thus, the present. To wit- Parra is a particularly apt figure for expressing the discursive imbrication constitutive of the period, if only retrospectively.

His citational relationship with the prior suggests another source of seemingly originary difficulty when discussing him- the critical disagreement concerning his

genealogical position vis a vis the preceding (and in Chile, concurrent) literary avant-garde(s). Yet, presuming any historical placement or generational fixity multiplies the difficulties of determining the con-text, as iterability ensures that texts inevitably overflow generational bounds. Always a necessarily singular choice and gesture, retroactively transposing a work into a general literary history always bears some measure of failure. As with all genealogical positionings, “[a]n inheritance is never gathered together, it is never one with itself. Its presumed unity, if there is one, can consist only in the *injunction to reaffirm by choosing*. ‘One must’ means *one must* filter, sift, criticize, one must sort out several different possibles that inhabit the same injunction.” (Derrida *Specters* 18). Specters of various traditions inhabit the works signed Nicanor Parra, such that they cohabit and are conjugated together time and again, most frequently in an ironic mode. Even as Parra cites what may be an influence, the citation itself interrupts the presumption of present, past or future context, undermining and resituating said presumptive influence. However, perhaps appropriately, it is in literary periodization’s elisions and failures that his politics’ traces become more pronounced. To later elaborate on this conceptual juncture, I must reflect on what was immediately prior to and influenced Parra- the early twentieth century artistic avant-garde.

I’ll take one of Parra’s explicit influences as my point of departure- surrealism. Prefacing a 1947 exhibition in Paris, Georges Bataille sees surrealism as marked and circumscribed by the *absence of myth*. “Myth and the possibility of myth become impossible: only an immense void remains, cherished yet wretched” and further, “[t]he *absence of God* is no longer a closure: it is the *opening up to the infinite*” (48 emphasis

mine). Which is to say that the works exhibited were not produced in a social environment over-determined by a totalizing moral system, but rather in that post-Nietzschean moment of a certain (artistic) will to power. At least, on the edge of that moment, pushing towards it by availing themselves of the artistic and critical technics developed during the long romance with bourgeois art. Bataille ends his brief note enigmatically, indicating that “the absence of myth is also a myth: the coldest, the purest, the only *true* myth” (48). Killing God, central to the onto-theological hierarchy long determinant of the social and aesthetic realms, does not, then, simply collapse those structures. Rather, it vacates them, opening space within them to transpose man’s immediate, material concerns to the mythical realm. Deifying the mundane thus reasserts the social’s tenuous limits- concealing anew its structuring principal by negating it, but only according to a structurally facilitated negative methodology. The order of things has not changed- although the sovereign has been replaced, the play of signs continues unabated within sovereignty’s auspices.² Walter Benjamin affirms of them that “they exchange, to a man, the play of human features for the face of an alarm clock that in each minute rings for sixty seconds” (192); yet, despite their screaming discord, they were still bound by the Art against which they struggle, toward its mythic outside.

So, what does this have to do with Parra? The answer is double: it provisionally situates Parra in history and also indicates a route to his work’s politics, heretofore construed as simple negativity for rejecting the terms of politics as such. Historically, Parra himself does not hesitate to mention that antipoetry carries a debt with surrealism- he utilizes a variety of their techniques, although he does not entirely share their goals

and world view(s).³ Antipoetry is a movement doubly *after* surrealism and the rest of the avant-garde- diachronically posterior and taking full advantage of the potential for writing revealed with it. As Enrique Lihn relates of his time with Parra, “[l]a imitación estaba prohibida inter nos, era el indeseable tic de la flojera mental. Nicanor, demócrata del oficio de la palabra, ofició como jefe de taller. De allí salió *El Quebrantahuesos*, diario mural: la perfecta *copia original* del collage surrealista.” (17). But the *after*’s second gesture again recalls Benjamin, when he writes of the surrealists that “to organize *pessimism* means nothing other than to expel *moral metaphor* from politics and to discover in political action a sphere reserved one hundred percent for images” (191 emphasis mine). Might we not also see an apt fit for Parra’s famous coarseness and vulgarity? Further yet, as Parra himself says, “[e]n relación con este mismo tema quisiera repetir una frase que ya es una frase hecha en materia de teoría antipoética: *en la vulgaridad está la vida*” (Lerzundi & Parra 392). Parra writes pessimistically undermining decadent, autonomous art’s a-sociality, in favor of life, while surrealism yet relied on its artistic con-text even while lashing out against it. His work embraces life’s grotesqueries and cannot be subsumed to critical attempts at retroactively prolonging autonomous art’s reign, extending it to include Parra and others. Instead, not even pretending to exult man, negating Bataille’s *true* myth, his work glimpses the social within and alongside which it newly (or perhaps again) formed a part. Following the tension he produces in historicizing literary critique through its articulations, we arrive at a sense of writing in, and as, solidarity without epistemic capture.⁴ But we should further

unpack the avant-garde's goals to ascertain what role they may have in Parra's *oeuvre*, as well as how he diverges from them.

I dwell on what can be said of the avant-garde because Parra is often critically subsumed within it, and I find this gesture untenable.⁵ While seemingly something of a digression, this periodization of art and its relation to capitalist state apparatuses encompasses and prefigures much of the following and situates my thought of art's socialization and social functioning. Parra's epochal *moving past* hints at a shift to another mode of artistic production and critical work of interest to me, wherein function completes a triad with form and content, and whose ambivalent reign is solidified in late capitalism's dyad: culture industry/contestatory art. So again, what can be said of this avant-garde? Peter Bürger, in *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, seeks to answer this and clarify the role of the bourgeois "institution of art" in the social order's maintenance and foundation, after Kant and Schiller. Himself after and indebted to Herbert Marcuse, Bürger signals that bourgeois art's principal role was that of *neutralizing critique*. As he says,

Art allows at least an imagined satisfaction of individual needs that are repressed in daily praxis. Through the enjoyment of art, the atrophied bourgeois individual can experience the self as personality. But because art is detached from daily life, this experience remains without tangible effect, i.e., it cannot be integrated into that life. (12-3)

Integral to the ideological (re)production of bourgeois life's material conditions, art deferred or deflected resistance to and dissent from the bourgeoning capitalist mode of production. By providing a-social catharsis *and* cathexis for popular affects, it helped impede the transposition of aspirational cathexes to the socio-political structure that

would otherwise be placed in crisis by their investiture.⁶ This alienating, subsumptive role characterized art's autonomy and the avant-garde moment signaled that role's implosion. Bürger posits that "with the historical avant-garde movement, the social subsystem which is art enters the stage of self-criticism", which he previously indicated would facilitate its own "objective understanding". It was a protest, then, "whose aim it [was] to reintegrate art into the praxis of life, [revealing] the nexus between autonomy and the absence of any consequences" (22).

He says of their critique that "the demand is not raised at the level of the contents of individual works. Rather, it directs itself to the way art *functions in society*" advocating a sublimation of art to lived praxis (49 emphasis mine). However, we now retroactively understand this demand as a failed, futile gesture, despite its repercussions in subsequent artistic production. Perhaps, then, it is accurate to say that their wishes' realization signaled a radical inversion of the presumptively anti-capitalist values central to their initial artistic impetus. They gravely underestimated the capacity of the bourgeois capitalist State to incorporate principally discursive dissent to its mode of production, particularly dissent dependent on its structures of authorization and remuneration. The stage of the protest was that against which it was directed- the autonomous subsystem of art- and this was the protest's contradiction, if also its strength. Being within and discursively bound to the bourgeois articulatory structures proper to "autonomous" art, their critique existed at that sphere's limitrophe, collapsing back into it without escape. As Bürger says, "for the (relative) freedom of art vis-à-vis the praxis of life is at the same time the condition that must be fulfilled if there is to be a critical cognition of reality. An

art no longer distinct from the praxis of life but wholly absorbed in it will lose the capacity to criticize it” (50). The avant-garde not only unveiled its critique’s absent ground; it set fire to the stage while still on it, dis-covering its absence.

Though, the above also hints at my divergence from Bürger. Art indistinguishable from life hardly *lacks* power for critique; rather, the critique no longer pertains to a *separate* sphere and is dispersed, along with that art, throughout the life with which they are rejoined. Life is not so monochromatic as to be incapable of including the artistic in its repertoire- art as a lived praxis does not demand we live life artistically, but rather that art be lived anew as *a part of* life and not *apart from* it. Bürger insists, however- and I don’t entirely disagree-, that this was what allowed the emergent so-called “culture industry” to coopt the historical avant-garde’s protest, staging an illusory elimination of the art/life distinction to then re-found that distinction in art’s commodity form. Where the surrealists replaced God with Man in a failed protest against the former, the capitalists made Man a Commodity by making us believe being was an aesthetic, sacralizing the profane in the name of God-Capital. At once allowing for art’s broader commodification and reserving for it (the illusion of) a separate sphere, thus begins a new epoch of art’s incorporation to the flow of capital.⁷ And yet, if the avant-garde critical gesture were not completely undermined? If instead what was needed was exactly this “dissolution” of the sphere of art? To explore the ambivalence emergent from between Bürger’s stance and my own, I refer us to Parra.

Unlike critics such as Ivan Carrasco Muñoz and Federico Schopf, I reject the view that Parra *continues* the avant-garde by appropriating their stylistic innovations. The

usage of forms that predate his work, that is, *the application of rules, or structural norms concerning poetry* explored by prior literary movements, does not signal complete historical coextension. Every application of a rule, even the most bizarre, is a singular decision that leaves traces of the possible contained by the decisive injunction. The entrance into language is always into a social structure and so, following Paolo Virno, applying a preexistent rule “is still always public praxis: nothing that can be carried out alone, *privatim*” and furthermore, that “the applicative decision does not *ever* obtain its peculiar juristic force from the rule. *Nor* does it seem to contradict the rule; *nor* does it seem to agree with the rule” (*Multitude...* 109; 112). While Virno is discussing the social articulation and (re)application of juridical norms as laws, this grammar also contains and determines any particular instantiation of the applicative case. While he later presents jokes as a microcosm of innovative praxis, which I will return to regarding Parra’s politics, *here* it signals Parra’s ambivalent, coded mode of breaking with the prior *from within its rules*. His irony and humor allow his writing to perform a poetic exodus in/from even the avant-garde, undermining its forms and goals as he avails himself of them, putting them into crisis. Escaping into the social, his work makes immanent poetry’s critical functioning as a particular linguistic act and a synecdoche for sociopolitical grammar(s).

Reading in “Manifiesto” that “Los poetas bajaron del Olimpo” and “No podemos vivir sin poesía” yet focusing *solely* on the anti-poem’s literary intervention- the incorporation of the common voice, etcetera- would be superficial (*Obra Gruesa* 211-4). In form *and* content, he demystifies the illusory autonomy wherein poetics was kept apart

from sociality and publicly resituates poetry as a form of relational praxis, not a transcendent act of genius. As the name suggests, the poem is a paean to the (re)socialization of poets and poetry, having left behind mythopoetic projects. Poets are amongst *us*: a socialized, collective subject dependent on poetry that we no longer receive from *above*, but rather *beside* us. His poetics is articulated against the proposition of poetics- an exodus from the preexisting representative order, yet also from the avant-garde's (re)incorporation to the concurrently arisen culture industry.⁸

This (re)socialization complicates Bürger's assertions. For Bürger, "when art and the praxis of life are one, when the praxis is aesthetic and art is practical, art's purpose can no longer be discovered, because the existence of two distinct spheres (art and the praxis of life) that is constitutive of the concept of purpose or intended use has come to an end" (50). But that is exactly the gesture of Parra's poetics- the demystification of the older, ideological distinction. And yet, as must constantly be reaffirmed, his antipoetry is *still* poetry- it is *still art*, despite *and because* of its articulation within the social fabric. Instead of art's elimination, we see its *radical re-socialization*, which further includes the critical tools developed under autonomous pretenses. Here I differ marginally, but importantly, from what Chilean critic and philosopher Nelly Richard says of the *Avanzada*'s later realization of the avant-garde de-hierarchizing of the art-life relation. As she says,

[t]o break with the foreclosure of art's interiority (its inner walls) and accomplish the avant-garde goal of art's incorporation into life's exteriority, the divisions that render art *incommunicable*- the walls of a room (= the confinement of art and the institution as closure)- must be abolished. For the horizontal exchange of the signs 'art' and 'life' to occur, the features of superiority and exceptionality that

distinguish (highlight and favor) the private meaning of art must also be eliminated. (*Insubordination* 27)

While I agree with this insistence on collapsing the hierarchical, institutionalized system of (aesthetic) authorization, my disagreement is with the concomitant assertion: that the avant-garde project's realization "[implies] reconciling art and life into a *whole* without divisions or compartmentalization" and "the absence of all limits (discursive boundaries) because each limit was perceived as a *limitation* to be abolished" (*Insubordination* 27; 28). Coinciding with what Bürger described, this explicitly involves a collapse of discursive difference, a revelation of two distinct yet concomitant terms as one accomplished in total fusion, eliminating the possibility of singularities to capacitate productive critique. Positing this collapse, she reinforces the presumptive discontinuity between art and the quotidian produced in bourgeois institutional valorization and authorization, and she thus reifies the retrospective autonomy of both. Without ceasing to insist on the terms' co-implication, the avant-garde anti-hierarchical project is more productively understood not as a totalizing (re)union of art with life, but strictly as the productive destabilization of *the authorizing structures* presuming said disjunction. When we allow that autonomy was always already a deceptive premise allotted only certain "art objects", without weight beyond bourgeois institutionality, the tools of critique are socialized (perhaps for the first time). However, critique implies discursive iterability and, as such, maintaining some difference written art/life- unless one wishes to posit a utopian immediacy for art's capacity for social change. A collapse of differences that flattens art and life's discursive fields onto a plane of superficial identitarian coextension prevents mutual critique through the process of horizontal, reciprocal (re)authorization.

Art is a part of daily social life but does not exhaust it; the social comprehends art but is not only artistic. Eliding fusion assists in positively understanding the relationship between art and the social as reflection and co-implication, in which each one maps the other's gestures and fluctuations without needing the force of a proper name's authorial assignation. The violence of decisions made in and about both is re-distributed between and becomes re-generative of the them. Whereas before there was a dual critical violence to the social- physical State repression and artistic affective diffusion- art's productive re-socialization facilitates the social's defensive re-appropriation of previously misdirected contestatory drives, against the law. Examples from Parra's earlier work will help me to illuminate this point.

Double-negation and the Literary

Briefly commenting *Poemas y antipoemas*, widely agreed upon as his first significant work, will allow me to establish my routes and tone.⁹ Without proposing an exhaustive reading, I would like to focus on the negations, and negations of negations, through which the text participates in language's social functioning. This is an arbitrary place but, being already critically insisted upon, it informs my reading of his later works.

I borrow Virno's elaboration of "so-called evil" and culture's moral ambivalence. Of culture he asserts "that [it] exhibits substantial ambivalence: it smoothes out danger; but in other instances, it multiplies and diversifies the occasions of risk". He then posits negation as one characteristic of the (disoriented) human animal, cultural producer produced in culture, saying "negation is equivalent to a certain degree of 'separation'

from its own vital context” (*Multitude...* 18); a basic function of language, culture’s persistent substance. He continues on to say that

[...]it is precisely to this negation that we owe the eventual *failure of recognition* between members of the same species [...] located at the limit of social interaction, the eventuality of nonrecognition reverberates, even at its center, and permeates the entire web. Language, far from mitigating intra-species aggression [...] radicalizes this aggression beyond measure. (*Multitude...* 19)

This negation occurs at the moment of the face to face encounter(s) formative of the ethico-political subject, underlining the broader ethical undertone of his affirmation; further, by foregrounding language, it is offered up for use regarding any linguistic act. Be it the negation of the Other’s subjectivity, or of bounded literary constructs- for instance, a poem as “not a poem”, or an *anti-poem*. I would like to suggest that this aggression marks the transition from an aloof, autonomous poetics to one embedded anew in the social, vying for its own recognition.

Significantly, Virno indicates that negation can itself be negated. Whence the claim that “the public sphere- interwoven with persuasive discourses, political conflicts, pacts, and collective projects- is *none other than a second negation* by means of which one represses anew the first negation [...] a *negation of the negation*” (*Multitude...* 20-1 emphasis mine). A second negation *constitutive of the social* and one of sociality’s basic functions: negating the negation of the Other’s subjectivity. Narrowing my lens, then, to *Poemas y antipoemas*, its recursive play of negations and irony marks the text’s opening to the world via a poetics (re)submerged within relational sociality, as bound by and reflecting its rules. Beginning with the title, another proper name, it is plainly a double negation: of poems as such and of *that* negation, still being poems, after all, despite

Parra's bluster. Insofar as, *even in name*, the book is bound by the social, there is a synecdochal relation between the two. Already before opening the book, it is arraigned under the sign of the ambivalent social world and announced as double. The text plays out the tensions and encounters that facilitate socio-linguistic innovation, albeit on a smaller scale. By challenging one social form, the ambivalence here resumed as "not *not* a poem" glimpses the regularity of human behavior that underpins rules and, thus, the social. As Virno puts it, "the fact that every rule, standing out against the background of regularity, can be both instrument *and* object of control, is the political, even *constitutional*, equivalent of the ambivalence that distinguishes the linguistic animal" (*Multitude*... 39). While poetry's rules control its production, here Parra assumes control to (re)configure the rules otherwise than as they are without, for that, ceasing to abide by them. As above, Parra's art is then horizontally re-authorized as such within and by the social, partaking of the same processual recognition as all other singular acts. More clearly, it may always be deemed "not art" the same as it may be affirmed as art. Within the text and its dual negations are suggested *possible* ruptures that *might* index multitudinous life beyond state language, without attempting the impossible naming of language's outside. It confronts, synecdochally, the terms determinate of all social functioning, by exposing in one form of sociality the ambivalence of which Virno writes.

A brief note on the text's irony, its dual negativity's primary manifestation, will serve as segue. Federico Schopf asserts its fundamental defensiveness: "la ironía no es en los antipoemas sólo un instrumento de desublimación- que el hablante antipoético maneja con soberanía- sino más radicalmente una actitud de defensa ante una realidad agresiva,

mejor dicho, un modo de defensa, comunicación y, desde luego, conocimiento” (“La antipoesía...” 176). Poetic irony, which interprets the layered negations, defers a decision on the text’s validity or merit by deflecting it into the social field, without sacrificing its particularity as text. Irony finds its limit not only within the text’s already socialized bindings, but also outside of them. Preemptively negating the text’s negation, it is always already distorting critique by allowing the poems the simultaneity of being *and not being* what they seem- a role carried out on several levels. Here I emphasize one poem relevant to *my work’s* thematics, although similar analyses could be performed with many.

Selecting a poem, I follow René de Costa’s schema for the book. The tripartite structure separates it into a sequence of *negations* of prominent poetic styles, performed in said styles- forcing a *stylistic* double negation. His sequence is: “Mistral y el modernismo; en la segunda, Neruda y la poesía de mensaje; y en la tercera, él mismo, el ‘autor’ contra el ‘poeta’” (23). Each section is and is not faithful to the style with which it is paired- which will become clearer shortly, as I turn to a “modernist” piece. More than repeat these observations, I wish to center the work’s dually negative irony as highlighting the collapse of the autonomous position previously afforded poetry and poet, and as fundamental to Parra’s general style. Thus, this brief stop with his earlier work indicates a functioning that will be of importance later.

I will focus on his poem “Defensa del árbol”, which, with its tongue-in-cheek didactic tone, prefigures his later ironic political gestures by adopting a modernist, nationalistic stance to subvert it and render it excessive. Although nominally recriminating a young boy’s destructiveness, slippages in meaning realized through

subtle personification suggest a more pointed allegorical reading. A constant duality, being both what it seems to be and its negation, points toward the sutured projects of culture and nation-state, and the pedagogical import of the one for the other. The work performs the tone and tropes of modernism, especially Mistral's familial and arboreal themes, whilst their subtly imperfect appropriation humorously undermines their excesses and presumption. All while maintaining itself comfortably within the prescribed form: playing by the rules, if you will, to laugh them off.

In reference to any and no tree in particular, both schooling and scolding the boy that throws stones, the speaker intones: "Debe ser siempre por el hombre / Bien distinguido y respetado / Niño perverso que lo hiera / Hiere a su padre y a su hermano" (ll. 9-12, 53).¹⁰ By moralistically prioritizing the phallic tree's well-being via analogous relation to the father and brother, it realizes a primary slippage: here and throughout, the speaker invokes the oedipal structure to call into question the boy's behavior. Moreover, the syntactical inversion of the phrase split between the first two lines insinuates both an ethical obligation towards and a necessary being of this tree. Certainly, the psychoanalytic reading is apparent, but I would like to suggest a slightly different, if not unrelated, direction. Louis Althusser proposes of individuals that they "*are always already subjects*" and as such, "are 'abstract' with respect to the subjects they always-already are" (192). To support this, he invokes the same Freudian familial structure implied in this principal slippage- the father, the tree, the one that ought not be harmed, occupies within the familial ideology a nominal role that guarantees the child's subjectivity. The name of the father anticipates the child's first breath, fitting it into the

larger, multipartite system of state ideological apparatuses that determine state language. Throwing stones at the tree that is not the father and yet stands for him, as symptomatic of oedipal rebelliousness, *might* be read as a coded reference to a rejection of the name, the familial ideological technic *par excellence*. Further, the final verse's conjunction of father *and* brother to the signifying chain begun with tree folds in potential political overtones. *Or* it could be the guilt driven, over-the-top didactic gesture that it plays at—perhaps Parra's experience as a teacher coming through. This reading is always held in suspense by the *might*, the straightforward and ironic readings constantly at odds with each other, both deferring interpretation and thus a decision on which rules.

This ideological complex reasserts itself in the poem's re-presentation of the mother— as innocent, unknowing, purity that raises the child. “Seguramente que tu madre / No sabe el cuervo que ha criado / Te cree un hombre verdadero” (ll. 17-9, 53). Invoking the mother that assuredly “no sabe”, the always uninformed maternal figure that was and was not an object of affection, is excessive. She becomes the silent ground guilt relies upon to make a “true man” out of this childish crow. She is not virginal, per force, but nor does she lack of the virginal; never speaking, never granted the word, only spoken for and on behalf of, the mythical grounding of the family structure who is nonetheless excluded from any exercise of authority.¹¹ From this one may again, not incorrectly, erect a simple oedipal reading. A bad subject that would kill the father and usurp the mother to reclaim ideologically “virginal” territory and assume the word within the family, even if this is only achieved through metaphorically displacing the affection of and for the mother. This reading might hinge on the crow, a scavenger not opposed to violence, and

the use of “verdadero” to modify “hombre” in the last line. Yet, a second slippage directs us towards Althusser’s Absolute Other, the Sovereign, the Father of the (secular) State.

These lines follow in short order: “La gran persona que es el árbol! / Él da fruta deleitosa / Más que la leche, más que el nardo; / Leña de oro en el invierno, / Sombra de plata en el verano / Y, lo que es más que todo junto, / Crea los vientos y los pájaros” (ll.26-32, 53). Tree, father, provider of sustenance and means of life- the Great Man emerges from the palpitating, archaic syntax of the first line’s proclamation. Not merely sustaining the family, he also provides gold and silver- that is, money, value-, joy and the very environment in which the subject thrives. These are the bounds of subjective reality, wherein the subject is subjected; and these lines’ slippage is crucial. The poem is elevated to a defense of the State as embodied by the Sovereign, threatened by youthful disorder- in a way reminiscent of León Rozitchner’s work on the externalization of the internalized structure of familial authority and its projection onto the State.¹² These lines subtly potentiate a critique of modernist poetry’s pedagogical role in national propaganda, ostensibly from within its own rules. They go so far as to use its florid, colorful, and at times contradictory imagery: “leña de *oro*”; “sombra de *plata*”; “fruta *deleitosa*”, which sonically suggests that it is delicious while also a crime to eat, calling to mind the Edenic apple and *another* Sovereign. Didactic poetry, like school and family as an apparatus that interpellates bourgeois subjects, does not go unscathed. All are bound together in verse and confused under the gaze of the Great Man, calling on one another for justification, just as they are called upon in turn. This gesture *might* teach a tongue in cheek lesson, or it *might* destabilize autonomous art’s pedagogical pretense. Both readings are held in

suspense by the interpretive ambivalence and the double negation reinforced by, and necessary to, the ironic interpretation.¹³ This tree is not the Sovereign while, at the same time, it cannot escape being him.

The poem's coded ambivalence, while *suggestive* of this critique, gives over to the deferred addressee the task of constructing meaning from its ironic twists and turns via their supplementary interpretation. On its own, it's not a poem about a tree, and yet it is; it's not a poem about the family, but still very familiar; it's not a poem defending the State, but still beneath its shadow. Publicly and proficiently performing, it signals the style's un-fixity and possible discursive polyvocality. The poem is socialized beginning with its name- not unlike the subject granted the name of the father before its first breath- and it insists on the tensions to be resolved anew with each reading. By playing with the modernist project's effaced alternatives it signals the potential for an alternative reading, without forcing it to emerge within the poem. Possibility indicated and yet suspended, deferred; there is no Olympian nomological gesture that would force what might be understood otherwise to exist within the State's language. An obligation to the form is lacking in this poem that is and is not a modernist piece, and yet it is masterfully well formed. Reading in a certain manner, one may run their hand along the law's immanent edge, made coarse by irony, and feel there the possibility of a poetics excessive to it. Parra suggests a route that may be otherwise by forcing readers to recognize modernism's stakes, without presuming to demonstrate an escape from language, which constantly expands as we attempt to contain within it previously unforeseen forms of sociality.

As I mentioned above, one may seek out these negations throughout the text, concerning multiple state ideological constructs- for me, this “defense” was most appropriate. But, by way of demonstration, let us pause at the poem where the book folds back over itself- a citation of the entire text, embedded within it. To approach “Los vicios del mundo moderno”, I refer to one line: “El mundo moderno es una gran cloaca” (l.63, 108). This isn’t because there’s nothing else of note; rather, its importance derives from what it conjoins interpretively. It agglomerates various terrors plaguing the world, listed throughout the poem, to code a straightforward message- the world and the culture through which we approach it are as ambivalent as... an egg we’ve yet to crack. By emphasizing the polysemic discourse(s) on a reality in which “[l]a policía atemorizada huye de estos monstruos / En dirección del centro de la ciudad”, the poem presents the terrors and complexities of the crisis in poetic meaning and, perhaps, the law (ll.9-10, 106). Yet, crucially, it contrasts the terrors plaguing the law to the unadulterated reality beyond them- “el mundo ha sido siempre así. / La verdad, como la belleza, no se crea ni se pierde / Y la poesía reside en las cosas o es simplemente un [espejismo del espíritu” (ll.73-5, 109). A book of poetry asserting only that Parra is not a poet in as much as he is, it sets itself beyond art’s former haughty autonomy. Here poetry is no longer a pedagogical apparatus but a singular voice in a multitudinous cacophony, the latter presented by the poem only in its absence. Parra pretends no authoritative naming and gestures towards the tenuous, simultaneous beauty and suffering of being otherwise.

The poetic, here, is not what it inhabits- the world beyond the word of man. And yet, it does not cease to reside within the world, a part of things apart from them. Poetry

is not the world, but not *not* the world, as it forms one part of it- one that may be drawn out into the order of language without diminishing always excessive reality. Its non-prescriptive critiques are contingently authorized and granted force horizontally, as teasing out language's ambivalence and reminding us of the world that escapes our words. The only available action at the edge of the law is *to constantly decide to act however you can*, knowing that your actions have a responsibility to not expand that edge while clinging to its flickering appearance. From there, the territory where one might, in the future, become many, the poet-as-singularity speaks to suggest that "Tratemos de ser felices, recomiendo yo, chupando [la miserable costilla humana. / Extraigamos de ella el líquido renovador, / Cada cual de acuerdo con sus inclinaciones personales. / ¡Aferrémonos a esta piltrafa divina!" (ll.84-7, 109). Humans are and are not miserable creatures; it depends on how we cling to what little scraps of the world our words catch.

This text affronts poetic norms, recognizing poetry's ambivalent role as a synecdoche for the law that determines being as *being subject* to the State. Refusing to decide its poetic status, the text takes up arms against itself in crisis, when the rules of poetics are confused with common social behavior and senselessly precipitate an interpretive decision. Senseless, because the decision's sense could only be found by resolving the tension between the bourgeois individualism of the first poem's recriminations and the multitude otherwise than the State, towards which the poem's irony gestures. Predetermining that decision's nature would eliminate any power it might have, confining it to the terms of extant bourgeois social structures. Accounting for this, I sense emerging a path otherwise than poetry's rules, modelling a politics otherwise than

the State's. Something that is not yet language or, at least, something unspeakable in the *State's* language. This path will characterize Parra's socialized poetics and begins to appear in the anti-poetry, to persist in finding a-new its sense of a politics to come.

So, returning to the above discussion of art's re-socialization, if art seems purposeless post-avant-garde, it is only in so much as said purpose was articulated in service of the bourgeois State, whose institutionality construed, and whose capital facilitated, its illusory autonomy. However, highlighting the (new) socialization determining the space of Parra's poetics, we have also come to the second aspect of Parra criticism: his potential politics, or his political potential.

Critics of his politics, or lack thereof, are various. There are those more interested in literary history, such as Muñoz, that view Parra's as a purely negative critique. There is also the more doctrinaire left that deemed poetry's role to be in the service of hegemonic revolutionary aspirations and censured Parra's ambiguous public behavior, viewing his work and life as lacking a solid political project.¹⁴ Nonetheless, there are those that seek to rescue, or uncover, a serviceable politics from within his work. Amalia Rodríguez, while recognizing that Parra's work has a destructive bent, remarks that it does not lack a positive sense behind, beneath and beyond its negative critique. For her, "puede interpretarse, entonces, el artefacto como un intento de reducir el poema a su unidad original, la célula, que podría multiplicarse y dar origen a nuevas estructuras poéticas. *Parra destruye el mundo, pero es para reconstruirlo de nuevo*" (63 emphasis mine).

Following the subversive nature of his works, she asserts that:

Para un hombre como Parra, la terrible enfermedad de nuestra sociedad es el poder. Todo poder es represivo, es la negación de toda espontaneidad y de toda

creatividad. Y aún más grave, el deseo de poder en los individuos está en conflicto con el espíritu de solidaridad propio de la naturaleza social del hombre. Es un error, por lo tanto, pensar que la postura anti-autoritaria del anarquista es individualista y asocial, al contrario, nace de la convicción de que sólo en la total ausencia de poder puede darse en la sociedad un estado de unidad auténticamente solidario. (66-7)

Taking up the anarchistic discussion, Patricio Lerzundi notes of the *artefactos* that “es una confirmación más de que el poeta no es un demiurgo sino simplemente un obrero de la palabra” (74). This echoes a nineteenth century poem by Patricio Miranda Venegas which asserts that “Todo poeta popular / es trabajador primero, / defiende, en sus proporciones, / la causa del pueblo obrero” (*Tipos y cuadros... 26*)- nodding to another important influence on Parra. While these observations may pinpoint Parra’s sympathies and somewhat explicate the *artefactos* and *chistes*, Marlene Gottlieb succinctly (re)situates his political praxis in an article on his later work: “Nicanor Parra es el anarquista *de la poesía*” (77 emphasis mine). That is, his praxis is manifest as and in a *specific mode* and didn’t go further afield, despite a synecdochal relation between spheres of socialization. Enthusiasm aside, Parra was not participating in direct actions along the lines of torching police facilities when he directs his humor and irony at institutions with a policing effect on society.¹⁵ His work belongs principally, although not exclusively, to the re-socialized poetic-critical discourse. We must confront it therein, as articulated with and in relation to other overlapping, mutually constructive social discourses. Given this, when Lerzundi asserts that credit is due Parra for a “renovación total de la expresión cultural”, it is minding culture’s horizontal (re)socialization that I must assess the assertion, without effacing the distinction between discursive modes (76). And so, I must object.

Here I might re-iterate my hesitance to identify in Parra a *beginning*. Were we to see in Parra's work a total renewal of cultural expression, we would be assigning to it the beginning of something that had, in a sense, *not been before*; renewal as naming anew, opposed to a citational dialogue with the past highlighting iterability's disjuncture. But the first stance does not pertain to Parra's broader poetics, nor is assigning a proper name poetry's task.¹⁶ Poetic iterability breaks with the prior, "engender[ing] infinitely new contexts in an absolutely nonsaturable fashion" for poetry, facilitating its resocialization by deconstructing its previously assumed (and deeply ideological) autonomy (Derrida "Signature..." 320). He neither avails himself of anything newly created nor *creates something new*; rather, his work *takes place* anew in language's oscillating sociality, exposed in the avant-garde crisis and the concomitant demystification of art institutions and art's institutionality.

In as much as (some) art is no longer functional to the State's subjectivizing apparatuses, its critique exposes human behavior's regularity as the substratum underpinning the application of rules and yet exceeding them- as the limit of the social that folds back with(in) sociality. Parra manipulates the faculty of language- which Virno associates with the general intellect- to carve out exodic paths through language's *habitual* use; that is, use which does not *yet* conform to bourgeois literary rules as granting the artist an autonomous position within, and supplementary to, their system.¹⁷ We read amongst the "Guatipiques", "Dice abajo los de arriba / debe decir arriba los de abajo" (*Chistes...* 164). Taking advantage of macrostructural play (here within the "social") to belie the high/low distinction, Parra's poetry indexes, without naming, voices

apart from bourgeois art and society. Before, art was meant to subsume affective tensions that threatened disruption of the burgeoning capitalist (representational) system- an indirect politicization of the aesthetic. Now we comprehend art's explicit re-socialization as the obverse of its ambivalent post-avant-garde duality; the other face being incorporation to the culture industry. It has become possible that it assumes a plainly critical role *within* the social, because of the ambivalence inherent to the contestatory/incorporative split.

Parra's poetry indexes an excessive social relationality that escapes recognition's manifestation as representation within hegemonic politico-cultural struggle, even in its most populist forms. It (re)textures a fluctuating social topography at state language's frontiers, which alternative relationality cannot puncture without being subsumed.¹⁸ This seems most effectively realized through literature as particularizing the universalizing faculty of language, whose functioning subtends multitudinous sociality. As the poet's name cannot be entirely effaced, Parra's negations, irony and humor allow his unicity with(in) non-hegemonic sociality while fully embracing and manipulating the iterability that characterizes both common subjectivity as a generalizing *one* and the singular human beings within it. This without ignoring that his poetry functions necessarily from *within* state structures, as institutionally authorized works of art. Moreover, poetry is writing as an artefact of and amongst other artefacts- we constantly reengage these works as we reread them and, with each reading, determine their significance anew. This is aided by the multitude to which they refer, and to which they are indirectly functional, that persists in its ambivalent nature beyond sovereign structures and thus beyond the scope of any

single interpretation. Re-iterating the assertion that opens this paragraph- his poetry indexes a mass exodic persistence. As Virno puts it,

Neither A, nor not-A, neither resigned acquiescence nor struggle to seize power in a predetermined territory, but an eccentric B, achievable only as long as other premises are surreptitiously introduced into the given syllogism. The separation from the ‘house of slavery and of unjust toil’ takes place in the precise moment in which *a side road*, uncharted on sociopolitical maps, is identified. (*Multitude...* 148)

I will now turn to others of Parra’s works, allowing that they have no “purpose” as art and, thus, can indicate paths newly glimpsed, further illuminating fragmented and fragmenting horizontal social space.

Humor and the Third Person

Keeping the prior in mind, I’ll address the works least bound to the poetic and most to the social, and thus Parra’s politics: *Artefactos* and *Chistes parra disorientar a la política poesía*.

Written just before and during the dictatorship, they index a social whose exodus from statist spatial practices was exacerbated by the progressive dissociation of the multitudes from authoritarian state apparatuses. These works are marked by a heavily effaced authorial presence and an almost complete dissolution of the narrative first person, still predominant in his early anti-poems. Of his work, they offer the most telling instance of the paradoxically empty fullness of his resocialized poetics. This is perhaps so salient due the timing of their publication: *Artefactos* was published in 1973 and *Chistes...* in 1983, both years that mark profound crises in the Chilean state and economic order. Following Javier Martínez and Alvaro Díaz, those years signaled a strengthening of State institutionality in service of a neo-liberal transition that, despite

being politically and economically untenable without the strengthened State, would come to demand its complete reformulation.¹⁹ As the *artefactos* bear witness to the multifaceted socio-cultural crisis that was the violent destabilization of and coup against the Allende regime, they sense a distress on the outskirts of high political drama and a cynicism as regards the Allende government's eventual nature for the present and future of Chilean politics. While this was due to political tensions instigated by the conservatives and foreign capitalist interests they were, nonetheless, at times aggravated by the *Unidad Popular's* attempts at dialogue with its entrenched opponents. A decade afterwards, *Chistes...* weaves itself neatly into the decentralized discontent of massive popular protests against the dictatorship's social, political and economic policies. A step removed from lived experience by virtue of being writing, they articulate a pointed critique of bourgeois conciliation and the traditional left's inefficacy in the face of a violent dictatorial regime. These texts partake in an immersive socio-linguistic indeterminateness, indexing socio-historic flux in its fragmentary and allusive gestuality.

Marlene Gottlieb indicates of this period that the poetic voice, the lyrical "I" that "speaks" the poem and formally marks the ambiguous relation poet/speaker, has been nigh entirely effaced. Only the proper name's re-iteration marks the works presented, piecemeal or in their entirety. She underlines that in the *artefactos*

el individuo desaparece y sólo se oyen los gritos de combate de la multitud. En el artefacto el poeta no inventa imágenes de pequeños mundos individuales. Verbaliza algo que ya existe y que anda disuelto en el aire cultural que todos respiramos... [l]a creación del poeta consiste en dar forma a algo que existe fuera de él, algo que marca un espíritu de época, una herencia cultural común. (89)

This stage of his work solidifies the break with previous forms and indicates an almost complete submersion of the poetic in the ambivalent field of reciprocal recognition characterizing the social's ethicality. If in *Poemas y antipoemas* Parra bore witness to a crisis in literary rules and normality, coinciding with a general crisis of art that facilitated its communicability, now his poetry opens to the world without taking refuge in any past rules.²⁰ Perhaps no surprise, both texts operate under, in the sense of repressed as well as hidden by- as other than yet constituting the legibility of- what Nelly Richard terms the dictatorship's "self-founded [...] truths- truths closed in on themselves by a doctrinary chain that sought to reinforce the inexpugnability of meaning" such that "[t]he persecution and censorship of politics and the political during the first years of the military government led art and literature to serve as substitute means for the evocation- invocation of silenced voices" (*Insubordination* 41). Both illustrate techniques for a poetics of solidarity, so I will attend to them chronologically.

Due to their polysemic nature, there is something in these works that touches on almost every possible concern. So, linking the sections of *my* work, let's begin with a simple *artefacto*- "TODO // ES POESÍA // menos la poesía" (*Chistes...* 133).²¹ Initially it asks to be read as replicating the universalization of the poetic and therefore romanticizing life- the complete dispersion of Art, or rather potential objects of art, being strongly reminiscent of Kantian natural beauty. But by introducing an unexpected interjection, a *tertium datur* marked by the shift from capital to lower-case script, Parra undermines the ability of any art, *especially* poetry, to capture this "poetry". He reaffirms the real's excess alongside art's irreversible adhesion to, and separation from, life. This

conception conforms to the effects of the contextual distancing performed by linguistic negation and reaffirms art's socialization. Anything is or may be poetry and yet, upon being named poetic, ceases to partake of life's poetry. In a similar, although more vulgar vein, we have "LA / POESÍA / MORIRÁ / SI NO / SE LA / OFENDE // hay / que / poseerla / y humillarla en público / después se verá / lo que se hace" (135). Shocking with the suggestion of violence against an always already feminized poetry, the fragment reveals, against expectations, that poetry now only exists publicly, humiliated and degraded though it may appear. What may come of poetry, no longer cloistered away, cannot be foreseen and is born by the future tense. But it would have remained impossible had poetry not entered the coarse, ambivalent social world that may yet negate it- autonomy in a critical apparatus renders its criticisms sterile.

As socialized, these proclamations find in each reader a third party never assuredly their addressee. They force each *possible* addressee to confront a sudden shift in their understanding of poetry and its social function. Jolting or dark humor exposes and enacts alternative poetic discursivities, formally exemplified by sudden interjections of a *tertium datur*. These fragments illuminate what Virno calls the zone of indistinction- the zone between a conceptual rule and the regularity of its "use"- from which spring new, tangential articulations of language. Or, to reframe that, therein is exposed the play pervading the structure of the law and its absent center, here written ~~Parra~~.

This gesture jolts more strongly when the *artefactos* are explicitly political. The melancholy tone of "REVOLUCIÓN / REVOLUCIÓN // cuántas contrarrevoluciones / se cometen en tu nombre" is further accentuated when one accounts for *Artefactos* being

published in 1973, knowing that Chile had been undergoing a prolonged conservative counter-revolution to the rise and policies of the Allende government (134). The inclusion of the lowercase, almost whispered interrogation as postscript demands constant (re)evaluation of the initial, capitalized injunction. Writing's iterability supplements the initial, incomplete context's trace, rendering it simultaneously lament and interrogatory. What would seem a commonplace graffiti theme in any country undergoing political upheaval and militant class tensions is recast in a new light, highlighting the asocial negativity that may be provoked by generative, radical change.²² By refusing to ignore the possibility of opposition and the anxiety with which this invests radical action, it resists being read as a superficial rejection of militancy and reminds the reader of the risk inherent to action that seeks generativity from within ambivalence. Read during counter-revolutionary violence or as a historical retrospective, the quiet aside's inclusion- not comic, although otherwise abiding by the Freudian structure of the joke- rends the public proclamation's univocal understanding and opens paths for melancholic and chagrined readings of the spirited invocation. Restoring ambivalence to a politico-cultural experience that would determine the tone of not only the poem but the historical moment, the *artefacto* signals alternative discursive modes without language from within it and striates the state-centric discourse's surface at its regulatory limit. This etching indexes, and almost maps, the experiential fragmentation unveiled in and by the violent, authoritarian political experience that unfolded in a perverse dialogue with the specter of social revolution. Each of this surface's ridges is an unrealized breach of the *golpista* discourse's presumptive totality, signaling its possibility without pretending to

capture thriving, unspeakable discontent; the necessarily unspeakable resembling a general strike without language, un-incorporable to the law yet provoked by its threat of violence.²³ Thus, these works do not pretend to re-present a protest before language, already within language themselves. Rather, they are situated at the limit of what can be written and belie totalizing pretenses, as a document of and in the constantly (re)forming space of the State.

More pointedly, and these postcard *artefactos* all have jagged, torn edges, there are examples like: “L’ETAT C’EST MOI / LA REVOLUCIÓN / CUBANA / SOY YO” (135). Conjoining Louis XIV’s famous proclamation with the Cuban revolution brings forward the progressive totalitarianization of the Cuban revolutionary state, likely not ignoring Castro’s recent visit to Chile.²⁴ Again, it is too easy to read this as a rejection of the entire process- a view commonly held at the time. Rather, the sharp critique underlines the *caudillo* fallacy, wherein the revolution dwells in its leader and his actions alone- explicitly Castro and implicitly an idealized version of Allende-, a reasoning which reinforces a state-centric political strategy that can only replace a sovereign, without challenging the State’s institutional materiality. Given poetry’s position as interlocutor with(in) the social, the irony underlines the faulty assumption that revolutionary action is executable only via the sovereign exception, which pertains to a structure determinate of and determined by the capitalist order- a reality all too apparent ending 1973.

The *artefactos* take full advantage of humorous resources to develop a sharp-witted critical mode reliant on common linguistic forms and diction; nonetheless, they

still retain a grotesque, formal trace of the anti-poems' authorial voice. Not until the later publication of *Chistes...* does this signature's effacement near, without reaching an end, as it is articulated most extensively with(in) the ambivalent social sphere. With *Chistes...*, Parra takes up the earlier potential for decentralized poetic subjectivity that Gottlieb says he fully realized in the poem "Graffiti from the Mausoleum of Ezra Pound". Dispersed, multivalent writing on the wall, it engages singular readers, unknown addressees, through their capacity to simultaneously re-write the work on the surface of a mural that Parra has re-presented in the text, free of and yet supplementing the name of the poet. As such,

el mural, aun más que el artefacto, es una poesía colectiva. Es la culminación de la despersonalización gradual que se nota en la poesía de Parra. El poeta no quiere ser unilateral. Abre su poema a todos; cada uno escribe en su propia letra, cada uno se expresa en su propio estilo, en su propio nivel. (95)

A poetic opening to the world whose sociality blurs to minimality the distinctions between reading and writing. However, realizing such a socio-poetic aperture uncovers anguished traces within the poetry that, following Virno, are a natural response to this conjunction, due to a sense of "not feeling at home." An anguished sense of risk engendered in a post-metaphysical "homelessness" is central to multitudinous praxis beyond the State- and is generatively mitigated in and by intersubjective linguistic play. To wit- concerning this anguished potential, take the case of the poet and poetry. More than misinterpretation, there is the danger of unveiling the secret at the center of his work, behind his proper name- of exposing himself completely, as entirely knowable in his writing. However impossible an unveiling, this danger pushes him to defer the work's authorship and interpretation on to others. Called as he is to write, given the re-socialized poet's uniquely double position as singularity-*cum*-critic, Parra responds by

disseminating his writing into the public sphere and decentering himself as authorial voice.²⁵

These poems' presumed materiality- the space occupied by writing- reinforces and extends this decentering. The *artefactos* are conceived of as and initially published on unsigned postcards; further, frequently conjugating together symbolic and linguistic modes of communication by supplementing text with drawings, they reinforce the lack of a single context by effecting a constant, doubly-articulated chain of meanings whose incessant resignification is determined by the situated interpretive decision to favor one symbolic mode over another, or not.²⁶ Cast into the world, they are offered much like the *chiste*'s graffiti-esque jottings, both continuing to "act" in the poet's absence. Missives, they act before the (im)possibility of an addressee to come and take up anew the process of signification, de- and re-codification, regardless of the author's in- or at-tention, or support for "the plenitude of his meaning, of that very thing which seems to be written 'in his name'" (Derrida, *Signature* 316). The assertion of their indexical function hinges on the space in(to) which these jottings are offered and, thus, the relation that obtains between art and the social. We are due a detour to elaborate it.

As Nelly Richard says, "[t]he structural relationship between aesthetics and society is based not on the linear correspondence of form and content, but rather on responses set loose by the multiple fractures of signs involved in symbolic creation, which unsettle every order based on linear transfers between text and context". This leads her to affirm that "artistic-cultural practices [...] actively dismantle and reformulate tensions and antagonisms via figurative languages that intervene in social discursivity,

redistributing its signs, and changing them into new, multiple, and fluctuating constellations” undermining, or at least complicating, the totalizing impulses of any ideology and Ideology in general (*Insubordination* 67). As for periodization, she presents this in the context of the *Avanzada* group with which she worked during the late 70’s and the 80’s. While Parra was at most indirectly involved via his daughter Catalina, the destabilization of linear transfer and fragmentation of social discursivity is equally well affirmed of his work in these collections, which signal the shifting social terrain beneath and beyond the dictatorial State, without attempting any univocal incorporation of the unnameable otherwise. They emphasize and exacerbate the contradictions in what Henri Lefebvre refers to as “absolute space”, which, within the language I have been using, is a correlative of capitalist culture’s representational order. My sense of art’s (re)socialization runs *parallel* to what Lefebvre denominates “differential space”, which emerges from abstract space through the accentuation of difference that “will restore unity to what abstract space breaks up- to the functions, elements and moments of social practice” and “will put an end to those localizations which shatter the integrity of the individual body, the social body, the corpus of human needs, and the corpus of knowledge” (52).

Parallel, but not co-incidental, because Parra resists the name’s spatial unification, as per the anarchic bent I read into his work. Because of this, I speak of it as *indexing* the incremental articulation of this alternative spatial practice, without founding it or pretending to totalize the fragmentary, polyvocal cacophony seething elsewhere. In a space not yet present; one perhaps to come. As I demonstrated with his ironic double

negations, Parra writes from within and through an order of institutional language, while simultaneously supplementing and undermining *the same order, the order of the same*. Although his works cannot take full account of coming movement, neither contained nor containable by any extant institution, they do serve to texturize the presumptively smooth and impenetrable discursive boundary at and from which they are situated. In its indexicality I find the core of Parra's writing in solidarity, and of poetry's general solidarity- *without facilitating epistemic capture, it sees and allows to be seen other, possible movement*. Displacing author-ship and author-ity onto the social sphere by way of unsigned works' (de)contextualizing iteration, this poetry unleashes and is integrated to a constancy of modulations that signal an exodus from predominant capitalist spatiality into space yet to arrive.

With the weight of authorship now shifted onto the oscillatory dynamic between poet and public, the nameless and unnamable reader is a third person bearing witness to an interminable, strange dialogue. This shift is due to extreme modifications to poetic language, for Schopf exactly what facilitated the older anti-poems' wide reception and status ("La antipoesía..." 181). Gottlieb contrasts the role of this nameless reader with that of the reader of Machado's proverbs, saying of them that "el lector pasivo que recibe las palabras proverbiales de Machado, poeta-profeta, es [al leer a Parra] un lector activo, cómplice, participante en el artefacto" (93). Our acceptance of the reader as participant in the poetic dialogue between Parra and public, a singularity that bears witness to writing yet cannot fix the author's place, offers up, anew, the exodic thread binding these scattered fragments. As I referenced above, this poetry attempts to make visible

something constantly beyond the work. Something before us, facing us, looking us in the eyes- Parra's ironic humor. Let us then take the title of the second work at face value, as its titularity enjoins us to, and consider these disaggregated *bricoleur's* pieces *jokes*.²⁷

In his analysis of jokes, Virno returns to Freud's work to highlight how the third person is the *audience* of the joke and, at the same time, "not limited to amplifying the effects of the witticism; this 'intruder' actually makes it possible" (*Multitude...* 80). Whereas the joke's author expends "excessive psychic energy" in crafting it, and thus cannot laugh heartily without reflection, the third person "who shares the *same inhibitions* as the joke teller, can enjoy the overcoming of these inhibitions without assuming any psychic waste" (*Multitude...* 81). Where Virno most diverges from Freud is where he is most informative to me. For him, in a play on J.L. Austin's seminal work *How to Do Things With Words*, telling a joke is doing something *new* with words.²⁸

Moreover, it is

[...] a 'doing' whose reality depends entirely upon the presence of outsiders and, in the strongest and most complete sense, upon *public action*. It is nothing less, let us understand, than a political discourse held in a general assembly that urges towards insurrection against the constituent powers: if enunciated in the absence of witnesses, it is as though this discourse had never occurred. The intrinsic necessity of exposing oneself to the observation and judgments of one's equals carves out with precision the sphere of praxis. (*Multitude...* 82)

The intersubjectivity necessary for the joke's realization is the crucial point. As I have echoed in my analysis, the joke is a microcosm of praxis's functioning and puts in relief the interplay of the two levels, as all particular actions will. Jokes signal the possibility of new relationality by highlighting how language can reveal social practice's limits and the regularities that support, yet are produced by, its rules. Parra's texts coincide with the

panic or calls for action that characterized both moments in which they were written.

They seek out and suggest alternative routes that may have gone unnoticed or unconsidered when the social order was not facing some sense of crisis. Here I am again echoing Richard, when she speaks of how the *Avanzada*'s fondness

for dismantling meaning transformed its critique of *power in representation* (the official power's totalitarianism) into a critique of *representations of power*- that is, into a critique of figurations of the system that reiterated the violence of discursive intimidation in each enunciated series, grammatical chain, or subordinate phrase. (*Insubordination* 49)

To reconstitute this lens in my own reading, now to the *chistes* themselves.

Fragmentary, short bursts, they share graffiti's tone and styling, scrawled on the page as on an alley. Even the first person proclamations read as vague and contingently cast into the world; for instance, "CREO EN UN MÁS ALLÁ / DONDE SE CUMPLEN TODOS LOS IDEALES / AMISTAD / IGUALDAD / FRATERNIDAD / EXCEPCIÓN HECHA DE LA LIBERTAD / ESA NO SE CONSIGUE EN NINGUNA PARTE / SOMOS ESCLAVOS POR NATURALEZA" (155). Alongside the indeterminate first person singular, deflecting interpretation on to a realm of reciprocal reading-writing signaled by the switch to the first-person plural, this interjection is decidedly bitter. Understood as a partial index of public discourse, it refers us to a moment in which disillusion caused by state violence and the still livid marks wrought upon the body politic provoke a skepticism of bourgeois liberal ideals. The social fabric has been severely rent by the preceding and ongoing dictatorial violence and public discourse, in a public sphere only just reemerging, is understandably terse. This graffiti, then, as now, is writ on the State's walls in its victims' blood; desiring no proper name, it invokes an

incomplete differential space by demanding that all silent passersby sign it anew, with the names of another. That is, “de aparecer apareció / pero en una lista de desaparecidos” (158).

The *chistes* even seem to negate the role of the poetic without society, including this bit: “poesía poesía / cómo si en Chile no ocurriera nada!” (157). As though criticizing readers, witnesses to this rattling breath being born anew in the social, the imperfect subjunctive reminds us that it is time to veer from gilded texts. Yet, its ironic ambivalence also jabs at those who dismiss poetry outright, as though it did not occur *in Chile*, as though it were a non-event, something a-social. The *chiste*'s fragmentation and hastiness enact an anti-poetry, scoring the walls raised amongst us; this faux-graffiti's illusory materiality both binds and disjoins reading subjects. These “jokes” enact no pretense of subtlety, shocking with sudden turns and combinations that force recognition of the unsayable, disrupting conscious defense mechanisms and inscribing themselves within the reader's mind.²⁹ They manifest a public sense of *kairós*, the proper moment for performing an action, while also undermining any *proper* moment in favor of the moment always arriving, in which we form the social and the common.³⁰ Orienting themselves toward the coming *re*-combination of violently disassociated concepts, they shock the reader by forcing her to recognize relationships yet to obtain. Their thematic ambivalence opens a space where the reader might bear witness to sociality's reconstruction.

And also its desperation. “YA NO PEDIMOS / PAN, TECHO NI ABRIGO / NOS CONFORMAMOS / CON UN POCO / DE // **A I R E** // **E X C E L E N C I A**” (156). This *chiste*'s tone and intent are deferred until the incessant moments of reading,

which allow a repeated public re-airing of grievances. Lacking a clear intended signified for the boldened *excelencia*, it also implicates the reader as object of the complaint—always possible when your words are written on the walls. The reader is not the State and yet is within it, in that, signing the poem upon reading it, (s)he is always already imbricated in state language and the law’s spatiality. Subjectified and yet simultaneously outside as well, the reader is ambiguously included under the sign of *nosotros*, as much subject as object of the complaint. This ambivalent duality reinforces the text’s sociality and authorial dissemination, further re-marking the horizontally articulated ethical-political relations of a common subjectivity superseding any pretensions of state capture. Any appeal to authority is belied as futile and always too late in the renunciation of the most basic needs (bread, a roof, clothing), as the text resituates an understanding of a possible, just social sphere beyond the State’s rigid discourses and with(in) an exodic, horizontal field of im-possible mutual responsibility.

And yet, and yet, it must be acknowledged that in other *chistes* we can still intuit the effaced author’s grievances, himself a part of this multitude, sharing its concerns. Etched into one wall is: “CANCIONES PROTESTA // LOS POLLITOS DICEN PÍO PÍO PÍO / PORQUE TIENEN HAMBRE / PORQUE TIENEN FRÍO / PIECECITOS DE NIÑO AZULOSOS DE FRÍO / COMO OS VEN Y NO OS CUBREN / MARX MÍO!!” (156). Substituting Marx for Dios at the end should not be read as a critique of Marx *per se*, but rather of those that hold up Marxism as *the* revolutionary way in times of suffering, while doing nothing but singing protest songs from a far haven. The unexpected replacement in the common phrase caustically suggests that *Dios* would have

been an equally viable insertion, for all the good it would do. These are words on the wall of a *pueblo* that has no time for tame(d) messianic visions espoused at a distance. No longer a truly univocal *pueblo*, it can only overflow that sign into the realm of generative action. The singers' distant, almost haughty perspective does less for the social than even this poetry and fails to recognize that criticism can no longer produce the illusion of its own authorization, nor await it from above. Mocking them, this figurative wall bears witness to foolish appeals to the law that binds it, yet on which it refuses to make claims. Rather, indexing social movement and fragmentation, this poetry-graffiti demands of the singers an excessive resocialization- without demanding anything of them at all. Perhaps here, not in but beside this poetry and constantly fluctuating sociality, is an interminable political project. A politics to come and, paradoxically, already here, in implied relational modes that can only exceed the State's language. Perhaps that is Parra's politics: a will to solidarity; an anarchic refusal to name, incorporate, bound and tame; the grand "I would prefer not to". These poems, as their way of being political, uncover the authoritarian State's limits by indexing their instability- the instability of a State trembling as it endlessly attempts to ground itself, failing to find a wall to lean on.

Politics, Somewhere Outside

Responding to the criticism of Nicanor Parra's poetry requires that one begin to cut through the competing ideological slants of the perspectives and, further, of the work itself. One cannot help but situate the work within the greater constellation of literary significance, immediately exceeded; nor can one ignore the acutely unique political position adopted by it, perhaps not political at all. To begin responding to this, I

understand literature, and all art not subsumed to the culture industry, as re-socialized in the wake of the collapse of art's social autonomy as explicated by early bourgeois conceptualizations. Reconfiguring our critical lenses in this way also re-determines the politics of any writing, or action, attempted by "artistic" production, such that we can recover the threads of a political project beyond the hegemonic struggle for state power. Parra's writing is thus decidedly political and, more importantly, articulated with(in) an ambivalent social space. While it might be said *im*-political by the standards of a politics preoccupied with the immediate struggle to assume hegemony, asserting and abiding by its *own* terms, it is necessarily not *not* political. Rather, the work's politics are radically distanced from the State's apparatuses and the people's artifices. His poetry announces part of a coming exodus (or one perhaps already underway) from the rules previously determining politics, accomplishing the older popular poet's goal as a worker whose work speaks for, by speaking in solidarity with, the multitude beyond the State.

I have attempted to articulate within my reading how techniques of negation and fragmentary dispersion predominant in Parra's poetics, particularly in works that efface the poet's proper name and open space for readers to come, signal a sense of space and solidarity other than the hierarchical state apparatuses determinant of the political. Not to aver that this poetry serves a political *mission*, but rather that it offers up a sense of space superseding that of the law's regulatory discourse. A space within and through which, perhaps, one might approach an understanding of political action and discourse that effects a general ethico-political removal from the overdetermined representational spaces of the capitalist State's economic and legal discourses, suggesting an-other

approach to the terrain of politics as such. A space the bonds and functioning of which are determined by love in and of solidarity, throughout time, underlying and persistent in political praxis and not suddenly made present all at once. A space of active solidarity, which this poetry enjoins us to further explore without striving to univocally name.

Endnotes

¹ In commenting Pablo Oyarzún here, I refer to his work “Arte en Chile de veinte, treinta años”, *Georgia Series on Hispanic Thought*, 22-25 (1987) 291-324.

² Here and throughout the work, references to play within language are citing implicitly or explicitly, the article by Jacques Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” *Writing and Difference*, Trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: U Chicago, 1978) 278-93.

³ With regards to antipoetry’s relation to surrealism, see Ricardo Yawal, “La antipoesía de Nicanor Parra y su deuda con el surrealism,” *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, ed. Marlene Gottlieb (Princeton: Linden Lane, 1993) 185-200. Nonetheless, I do not wish here to negate *all* relation or agreement with surrealism or the idea of the necessary conditions for art’s free production- quite the contrary, I see them as essential to Parra’s, and thus my, project. One would be hard pressed to find disagreement in Parra with André Breton’s “Manifiesto for an Independent Revolutionary Art”, *What is Surrealism?: Selected Writings*, Ed. Franklin Rosemont (New York: Pathfinder, 1978), when he makes the strong claim “If, for the better development of the forces of material production, the revolution must build a socialist regime with centralised control, to develop intellectual creation an anarchist regime of individual liberty should from the first be established” (245). Rather, Parra does not seem to further share the belief that “the supreme task of art in our epoch is to take part actively and consciously in the preparation of the revolution” (245-6). His position is more ambivalent, subtle, and is what I seek to tease out.

⁴ I am borrowing this understanding of solidarity from the work of Alberto Moreiras, *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies* (Duke UP: Durham 2001).

⁵ Here I am principally referring to Iván Carrasco Muñoz, “El antipoema de Parra: una escritora transgresora,” *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, ed. Marlene Gottlieb (Princeton: Linden Lane, 1993) 115-129 and Federico Schopf, “La antipoesía y la vanguardia,” *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, ed. Marlene Gottlieb (Princeton: Linden Lane, 1993) 131-184.

⁶ This idea is strikingly similar to, and complemented by David Lloyd and Paul Thomas in *Culture and the State* (New York: Routledge, 1998) when in their analysis of the interpellative role played by the autonomous field of art in bourgeois society they assert that “Culture produces the consensual ground for the state form of representative democracy by drawing the formal or representative disposition in every individual out of each person’s concrete particularity” (14-5). Further, both supplement in turn, in my reading, the dual definitions of culture offered by Herbert Marcuse in “Affirmative Character of Culture”, *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*, Trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro

(Boston: Beacon, 1968) 88-133, originally published in German in 1937. He says of the “useful” definition that culture “signifies the totality of social life in a given situation, insofar as both the areas of ideational reproduction (culture in the narrower sense, the “spiritual world”) and of material reproduction (“civilization”) form a historically distinguishable and comprehensible unity” and in contrast that “[t]here is, however, another fairly widespread usage of the concept of culture, in which the spiritual world is lifted out of its social context, making culture a (false) collective noun and attributing (false) universality to it”, which he refers to as “affirmative culture” (94-5). While I hesitate to accept both of these definitions simultaneously and/or unqualifiedly, they, along with Bürger, are constantly in play in my discussion of culture and, more narrowly, art, throughout this work.

⁷ This echoes what Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle* (Detroit: Black and Red, 1983), analyses with regards to the development of what he refers to as the spectacle. Debord says of (bourgeois) culture that “the entire vicious history of culture can be understood as the history of the revelation of its inadequacy, as a march toward its self-suppression. Culture is the locus of the search for lost unity. In this search for unity, culture as a separate sphere is obliged to negate itself” (par. 180). Particularly relevant to this discussion of the tensions following the “demise” of the avant-garde, Debord asserts that “[i]n the case of representations, the critical self-destruction of society’s former *common language* confronts its artificial recomposition in the commodity spectacle, the illusory representation of the non-lived” (par. 185).

⁸ In terms of understanding the meaning of a cultural crisis and the leveling of the grammatical and syntactical, or the rules and regularity, I refer here to Paul Virno, “Multitude: Between Innovation and Negation,” (Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e) 2008) 52-5

⁹ In this sense, I agree with the general chronology that Federico Schopf refers to throughout his writings on Parra.

¹⁰ All further citations from this text will be from the same edition of *Poemas and antipoemas*.

¹¹ I am thinking here, in particular, of the analysis of the role of the mother, and specifically the Virgin Mary, in art that partakes of Christian morality and society in the work of Julia Kristeva, “Stabat Mater”, Trans. Arthur Goldhammer, *Poetics Today* 6:1-2 (1985) 133-52.

¹² I am referring here to León Rozitchner, *Freud y los límites del individualismo burgués* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI 1988).

¹³ Parra's demystification of the teacher compliments, interestingly, certain assertions of Lloyd and Thomas, *ibid.*, regarding the pedagogical nature of culture (see: note 5) and the role of the school and the teacher. Of the school and the teacher they assert, "The school, in other words most effectively permits the transfer of the subject from the private domain of the family into the public world of the political, not by teaching civics but by representing representation" (20). Thus, Parra's gesture takes on a further valence, that of undermining the classic institution of the bourgeois state's drive towards representability.

¹⁴ Here I think of the affirmations in the article Ivan Carrasco-Muñoz cited above and reflections by Parra in Leonidas Morales, "Conversaciones con Nicanor Parra," *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, ed. Marlene Gottlieb (Princeton: Linden Lane, 1993) 313-372.

¹⁵ In fact, following the analysis of Victor Muñoz Cortés in *Sin dios ni patronos: Historia, diversidad y conflictos del anarquismo en la región chilena (1890-1990)* (Valparaíso: Mar y Tierra 2013), by the time that Parra gained prominence for his poetry and anarchic literary gestures, there was effectively no Chilean anarchist movement to speak of, it having lost prominence after the government's legal incorporation of labor concerns during the 30's and more so with the concurrent rise of state centric, USSR allied communist movements. So, perhaps tragically, we may never be sure if he *would* have torched police cars, had there been a large movement inclined in this direction.

¹⁶ In this sense, I must mark a difference with a recent champion of Poetry with(in) philosophy, Alain Badiou, who asserts in various places the manner in which Poetry *names* or can name such an ambiguous beginning. See, for example, Alain Badiou, *Conditions*, Trans. Steven Corcoran (New York: Continuum 2008).

¹⁷ In reference to the general intellect as language and its role as common ground in relating to the hierarchical structure of rule of law see Paul Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms-of-Life* (Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e) 2003) 35-41 and Giorgio Agamben, *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Form-of-Life*, Trans. Adam Kotsko (Stanford: Stanford UP 2013), in particular Part 3 of Chapter III.

¹⁸ The most fully formulated articulation of a populist theory of hegemony can be found in Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso 1985) and with regards to the critique of the theory in the Latin American context see Jon Beasley-Murray, *Posthegemony: Political Theory and Latin America* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota 2010).

¹⁹ Javier Martínez and Alvaro Díaz, *Chile: The Great Transformation* (Geneva: UNRISD 1996). While this text is in many ways controversial, in that it asserts a certain

necessary linkage of the nationalization and socialization projects of the two governments preceding the dictatorship to the neo-liberal “reforms” carried out during the latter, I feel that its analysis of the economic and political currents is indispensable for understanding the role of the Chilean state before, during, and after the dictatorship vis a vis the move towards neo-liberal, global economic policy.

²⁰ In thinking the general social crisis of the epic of *Poemas y antipoemas*, the reference is decided to the brief but suggestive thoughts of Gilles Deleuze in “Postscript on the Societies of Control”, *October* 59 (Winter, 1992) 3-7. If we follow the analysis in Muñoz Cortés (*ibid.*) we might find further support for the assertion of a general crisis, particularly for the anti-capitalist left and non-state centric groups, in his discussion of the military junta of the thirties and the way in which the legal incorporation of methods for allaying the concerns of workers and the chilling effects that this had on effective left organizing of all stripes, although he focuses particularly on anarchist thought.

²¹ All further citations referencing *Artefactos y Chistes para desorientar a la poesía* are taken from the same anthology.

²² While referencing here the class tensions that were present in Chile at the moment, it deserves mention that these can reasonably be conceived of as otherwise than the actual, presidential level power dynamics at stake in the coup. With regards to the cleavage between civil society and the political civil class as operative of a second level tension, beyond and supplementary to the material class conflict, in Chilean politics of the last two centuries and the manner in which it reproduces a single, albeit polyvocal, political ruling class, see Gabriel Salazar Vergara’s extensive work in *La enervante levedad histórica de la clase política civil (Chile, 1900-1973)* (Santiago: Penguin Random House, 2015).

²³ In referring here to a general strike in, and of, language against the violence of the state, I am thinking simultaneously of the discussion in Walter Benjamin, “Critique of Violence”, *Reflections*, Trans. Edmond Jephcott, Ed. Peter Demetz (New York: Schocken, 2007) 277-300; and Jacques Derrida’s elaboration of the theme that extends more explicitly the non-claimant gesture of positioning a protest beyond the language of the law, that is, the state, in “Force of Law: The ‘Mystical Foundation of Authority’”, Trans. Mary Quaintance, *Cardozo Law Review* 11 (1989-90) 920-1045.

²⁴ My emphasis here falls decidedly on the progression after Castro’s *Palabras a los intelectuales* and the work of Desiderio Navarro, “In media Res Publicas: On Intellectuals and Social Criticism in the Cuban Public Sphere”, Trans. Alessandro Fornazzari and Desiderio Navarro (*Nepanthia: Views from South* 2.2 2001) 355-71.

²⁵ My thinking about the duty to respond to a call and the secret is decidedly shaped here by Jacque Derrida, *Pasiones*, Trans. Horacio Pons (Madrid: Amorrortu 2011).

²⁶ A number of anthologies recreate the original form of the *artefactos*, in as much as that is possible. See for instance, *Poemas para combatir la calvicie: antología*, Ed. Julio Ortega (Santiago, Chile: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013).

²⁷ The idea of the poet as a *bricoleur* is borrowed from Patricio Lerzundi, “Introducción,” *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, ed. Marlene Gottlieb (Princeton: Linden Lane, 1993) 74.

²⁸ It is perhaps possible to read in to this assertion on the part of Virno a touch of Derrida’s analysis of Austin and, more generally, the speech act, particularly with regards to the written sign, of which Derrida points out “By the same token, a written sign carries with it a force of breaking with its context, that is, the set of presences which organize the moment of its inscription” (“Signature...” 217). Thus, in a certain reading, all written signs carry with them the trace of the joke, just as the joke partakes of writing and its play of *differance*. This will significantly inform my reading of Virno on this issue.

²⁹ Here I am relying on the exposition of the Freudian idea of shocks and their relation to the disruption of the conscious and the function of memory in the urban environment given in Walter Benjamin, “On Some Motifs in Baudelaire”, *Illuminations*, Trans. Harry Zohn, Ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken 1969) 155-200.

³⁰ Concerning the idea of *kairós* and its relation to the telling of jokes, I refer here to Paolo Virno, *Multitude: Between Innovation and Negation* (Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e) 2008) 87.

Chapter 2

Endless Act(s) of Love: Juan Gelman and Sweetly Writing (for) What's to Come

Infinity, if there is one, is thus found rustling among the abandoned clothes and old stuff accidentally bequeathed by the dead- no one's property anymore- the rags, recycled, that eventually, perhaps, get taken up by some other body, in some other movement, evanescent and alive.

-Judith Butler, "Hegel's Early Love"

*Assim fazamos nossa vida um dia,
Inscientes, Lídia, voluntariamente
Que há noite antes e após
O pouco que duramos.*

-Fernando Pessoa, "As rosas amo"

Gliding beneath love and revolution and death, recollection and survival, there is a duration and a faithfulness *to*, an infinity grasping out through and toward nothing. An act of passion that is a passion (re)enacted that, despite its object, if an object can be had, is both a past and a future that is not quite yet, a not quite present that propels us forward, in our recycled rags and life and awareness of death that never quite hits its mark. But it nonetheless leaves a mark which can be a model, traces of an act of faithfulness and a carrying inside of oneself that undoes both of its terms, inside and one self. Love, the first thing and the last, constant and constantly (re)created, a passion made by and making other passions. Revolutionary, filial, fraternal, erotic- love is the trace, and thus the model, beneath the other passions that constantly inscribe it there and move from and over it, in the single day, with night before and after, that we last.

Yet, with all that, I still haven't said much of anything about love. Perhaps love does not belong to the *I* nor the realm of the thematizable; it is a sensual act that burns up in realization, without leaving the merest cinders to satisfy a concept. This idea underlies

much of the philosophical reflections on love: that love is an always incomplete action, constantly rehearsing itself, different from and yet bound to and binding its actors. But within that discourse, too often does the stress fall upon *eros* and its accoutrements such that, even metaphorically, the concept is bound strongly to a distinct index of passions.¹ Within the intimately related field of literary criticism, so often a space reflecting upon love due its object's contingency upon it, the situation is entirely worse. We have very few, if any attempts, to tease other loves out and learn from them, preferring to let them lay in the realm of the completely sensuous. Ignoring the positive lessons of love is, perhaps, a mistake, as it often retains an ethical element or coexists intimately linked with one- and ethics lends itself intimately to the lesson. However, as love is always an *act of faith(fulness)*, it resists any total conceptualization, makes its marks and moves on, leaving behind a question and a call to answer in its passion's wake. So, my work will strive to tease out a lesson from traces of a revolutionary's love left in his writing, to discover a model, a pedagogy of love, (im)proper though it may be.

Whereas in the prior chapter the focus was on a writing in solidarity as an a-nominative index of the otherwise that escapes the political as determined knowable by the State's law, here I wish to concentrate on the impulses and faith that drive such a gesture. If the unnamable space of a politics otherwise demands an impossible and forward-facing solidarity from even those not participant, it demands even more strongly from those that might occupy it, if only briefly, profoundly durable, imperturbable faith and love. I read in the poetry of Juan Gelman, so full of love and yet also melancholy, politics and loss, a framework for the faithful lover, the revolutionary. This work will

focus on his slim and striking volume *Si dulcemente* and *how* it births itself as an act of friendship-as-love, reenacted despite the beloved friends' loss; an ethics of revolutionary love that lends itself and the remnants of the dead to learning *how* to carry on being faithful to love's encounter, *as one already many*. This will require, principally, decoupling love from its erotic confines, allowing us to trace a process based on an ethical and non-proprietary experience that will form the core of a literary pedagogy of love. To approach this, I will read Emmanuel Levinas's reflections on love from *Totality and Infinity* through the lens of Jacques Derrida's *The Politics of Friendship*, using the latter to bring out from behind *eros* the former's effaced loves, and so understand the love in friendship and the politics therein bound. Turning then to the work itself, I will trace a sensual experience through poetic language's contortions, so proper to the work of Gelman. While within the Levinasian framework a *work* cannot be nor provoke an ethical encounter *stricto sensu*, in the improper sense of friendship-as-love writing is the place where love leaves its trace and begins its lessons.

So, then, where?

Peering out from time to time throughout this chapter, there is a very material question to be addressed, initially here. It concerns the nature of the revolutionary actions that Gelman and the *Montoneros* were involved in, during which this love began to be; and further, the state of Gelman while writing this text- where and when, if not to presume a why. While a longer discussion of these other, silenced themes cannot here avail itself of the necessary space, I must insist on their being otherwise than the State, against it and beside it, and attempt to sketch out my reasons for this insistence. In a

similar vein as what Gareth Williams details in his analysis of the *pueblo*'s immanent, egalitarian nature overflowing the bounds of the sovereign and his¹ exception- the ability to thematize the Other as Citizen within the law, what Levinas identifies as characterizing the State's violence - *loving as herein read supersedes all determinations of the State's law*.² The action of loving inscribed in and by the text is a model for the constant redetermination of a just, extra-state sociality lived as a constant action of springing forth anew from language's edge.³ This requires a longer fleshing out, a historicization, an embodiment, such that it might take up the abandoned clothes of the beloved and bear them forth beyond what the text teaches us to teach. I will attempt, for now, to situate the *Montoneros* and Gelman, and in doing so will highlight some major themes to follow.

As we are moving forward, and have already done so, we must confront the moments past from which we live as present. Perhaps the most intriguing way, in this case, is signaled in commentary on the supposed polemic between Gelman and Oscar del Barco, an Argentine philosopher and ex-militant in the *Ejercito Revolucionario del Pueblo* (ERP).⁴ Not wanting to revive nor prolong that debate, already well commented, it suffices to say that I find that del Barco fundamentally simplifies the Levinasian ethical imperative and essentializes the assumption of ethical responsibility, albeit for a legitimate reason, failing to allow for multifarious manifestations of ethical commitment. Further, demands that former militants acknowledge and assume responsibilities for their actions in the interest of "truth", commonly citing del Barco poorly and further muddying ethical concerns in favor of epistemo-historicist ones, are based on a historical

¹ Because it is usually a he, and the structural position of sovereign itself forces a masculine face out of any person who might assume it

misunderstanding as regards the *Montoneros*. They consistently and in the moment did just that- announcing their authorship and reasoning for the attacks, within their conception of politics and strategy (and, implicitly, ethics).⁵ But that little aside there, at the end, gives away the game- the imbrication of the ethical and the political in this debate, and how that allows us to approach it.⁶ In this debate concerning what may be fairly called an accusation of ethical *failure*, what is ignored and yet makes possible the accusations, is the concomitant *political* failure. Only insofar as they failed to re-found *or* escape from the State can accusations of a supposed *ethical* failure be leveled. The State, any state, will have always already intervened in an encounter with its functionaries (the predominant *Montonero* target, at least initially) by masking their face with a uniform or title- an intervention which suspends a decision on the possibility of a properly *ethical* encounter with said functionary whenever the encounter occurs in the context of a challenge to the State's order.

More precisely: despite their material situation and potential, the *Montoneros'* failure to pursue a consistent, univocal political agenda (wherein politics comprehends the State as a central referent for hegemonic articulations of power) permitted prior repressive and ideological structures to persist, grounding accusations of ethical failure. Yet, this is also what makes them most interesting to me. They maintain a surprisingly ambivalent relationship to the State and its politics, and they have a unique position vis a vis the State and what occurs otherwise. This may seem an incongruent statement to make concerning a militant *Peronist* organization, so it requires some clarification. Carlos Altamirano lends us a first sense of the issue- as he says, the *Montoneros*

established a Schmittian distinction of absolute hostility, “Peronism versus anti-Peronism”, at the same time that they maintained a secularized vision of the socialist revolution as eschatological *telos*.⁷ Thus, one might assume that they were overdetermined by the Political writ large, such that they manifested two seemingly distinct projects articulated together. But others would say it in another way- the always prickly León Rozitchner states very plainly (much as he did for years) both that the revolutionary movements in Argentina were farcical and misguided and that Peronism as such lacked any meaningful political consistency. This succinctly undermines both of Altamirano’s assertions and brings to the fore later comments, wherein Altamirano foregrounds doubts about the *Montonero* leadership’s commitment to state-centric Peronist efforts.⁸ While my argumentation follows a different path, I think these two points are well placed beside one another- while Altamirano correctly presents the nature of their rhetoric, a nature that led some, such as Adolfo Gilly (who will return shortly) to see in them the future of Argentine left organizations, so too does Rozitchner correctly identify the group’s failings. But it is exactly this double failure- both as a state-centric Peronist group and as a revolutionary militancy- that interests us, as it situates the Montoneros at the limitrophe of the political as articulated in and by the State and permits us to index the moment and *its* failings.⁹

What do I mean by this assertion of a double failure and why do I make it? The latter before the former. As I have stated or insinuated, the logic of radical love I trace exceeds, and in doing so unveils, the bounds of hegemonic, state-centric politics and, therefore, must operate at and spring from politics’ limit, although it must fail to escape

in doing so (another failure, one which offers us an object to study). *Their* failure, though, is both double and deeply rooted in the specificity of the Argentine situation. Here Adolfo Gilly is revealing in his understanding of the political climate in Argentina and the *Montoneros*' role. For him, the Argentine working class's roots are horizontally extended throughout the social, as what he calls a "capillary social organization" and amongst which the *Montoneros* explicitly situated themselves. This he opposes to the Chilean situation, characterized by a general parliamentarianism and a strong electoral presence (something underlying much of the previous chapter's commentary on the mainstream Chilean Left) (62-4 translation mine). This might complicate Rozitchner's assertions, but I'd like, rather, to highlight how it reaffirms them while positioning the *Montoneros* otherwise than exclusively within the State (not, of course, to deny their extensive and routine involvement in the return of Perón and his early government). For a base, a source of legitimacy and an orienting point within the political milieu, they referred constantly to the *people*, to Peronism as a *social* movement and organization. In other words, while national, they set aside the preeminence of the -state half of nation-state to focus on the necessity of positioning oneself alongside those that form a social movement's true force. This was their first 'political' failure- a failure to derive their necessary organizing principle from the State as central referent for political organization. For as much as they did engage with and in state-centric politics, they consistently strove to ground themselves otherwise than within the letter of the law.

Gilly, in a phrase I'm fond of, refers to the form of social organization characterizing the Argentine left as the "sindicato real." This encompasses "todo ese

tejido que va desde la sección y la fábrica, pasando por los delegados y las comisiones internas, hasta los dirigentes regionales y nacionales de cada categoría, unidos todos en una relación interior plena de contradicciones y choques pero integrando una misma realidad social indivisible” (58). The functioning that Gilly ascribes to the *sindicato real*, particularly as situated in the factory, the workplace and, moreover, the fabric of human socialization, signals the strong possibility of reframing this concept within the discourse of the multitude- particularly as regards the multitude’s work of love as both generative and cooperative, and achieved in militancy.¹⁰ But this is not to force the point of the multitude. Rather, it is to signal the key difference that both Gilly and the autonomists attribute to the *sindicato real* or the multitude- its distinction from the people or *el pueblo*, which for Gilly was absolutely essential insofar as the *sindicato real*’s “lived experience” separated it from and enjoined against simple inclusion within the people of the nation-state (66). The second failure of the *Montoneros* is this- as Gilly indicates, they operate within and manifest (internally) the (internal) logic of bourgeois social structures, which “es su cobertura y, al mismo tiempo, su debilidad” (64). They failed to meaningfully incorporate themselves to the lived experience determinate of the *sindicato real* and, despite seeking their grounding therein, were always already separated from it by an insuperable hiatus- much as their revolutionary leanings separated them from the State. Or, to use autonomist language, they were trapped within the bourgeois, individualist thought of the sovereign State and, therefore, failed to escape into the flux of the multitude. Their state politicking under the name Peronism, perhaps, refused to let them go beyond the confines of the national, the people. So, given this double failing,

they per force exist at a conceptual limitrophe, between and yet indexing both state politics and that that moves otherwise. But how in the world did this happen?

To unravel this history, because Gilly's analysis focuses on the later history of the *Montoneros* and the Argentine moment of the late 60s and early 70s, Richard Gillespie's *Soldiers of Perón* is crucial. As he argues, with extensive historical and politico-economic substantiation, from as early as their transition away from origins in a nationalist, conservative-leaning catholic youth organization, the core of what became the *Montoneros* consistently displayed a disjunction from the country's lived economic experience- that of the *sindicato real*. Because they drew from predominately middle-class families in their organizing and formation, as opposed to the stronger roots of, say, the CGT in long-standing syndical organizations, they consistently (re)produced the hiatus between them and the class interests they claimed to espouse. Thus, even as they adopted bakuninist urban guerilla strategies, taught to them by Spanish expatriate Abraham Guillén, they lacked the meaningful horizontal support to situate themselves as participants in the *sindicato real*.¹¹ Hence their rhetorical insistence on situating themselves alongside exactly those from whom they were infinitely distant- in need of radical justification, of grounding, they perpetually sought it within the *sindicato real*, despite being unable to bridge the experiential gap between them. Still, this clarifies the complications caused by their distancing from the State after Perón's deceptive return and, as such, their first failure.

A sense of the second failure also dwells in the organization's origins but does not seem as inevitable as it will in hindsight. Nonetheless, Juan Gasparini makes it apparent

that this internal bourgeois, hierarchical structure was a graver problem than even Gilly intuited. In his monograph *Montoneros: Final de cuentas*, in a chapter dedicated to militarism and its role in the *Montonero* commandants' decision making, he leaves no room for equivocation- of those leaders he says “[z]ambullidos en el elitismo, nadan lejos de los millones” (131). He goes on to reinforce that the predominate issue at stake for the majority of later *Montonero* defectors was exactly the hierarchy and elitism distancing the organizational command chain from those on behalf of whom it claimed to be operating. As he details, despite their formation as a “sociedad paralela”, their dependence on and, in fact, preference for violent means made it such that they removed themselves from currents within the *sindicato real* that tended toward and clamored for peaceful democracy, just when those currents clamored most loudly- wherein “no admite disociación entre medios y fines” (196). By continuing to insist on violent guerilla tactics in a moment when the support was simply not present- mostly due, according to his testimonies, to decisions by the central *Montonero* leadership- they cemented their second failure: the lack of solidarity and generative cooperation, in mutual becoming, with the *sindicato real* that subtended and moved otherwise than the Argentine nation-state's sociality. Thus, in their development, the *Montoneros* as a militant organization, despite, or perhaps because of, their initial promise, irremediably situated themselves between the state and the multitude of the *sindicato real*, pushing against both yet never entirely embedded in either. Their rhetoric notwithstanding, their double failing is, in this understanding, exactly why they could produce a loving militant as capable of indexing, with the fullness demonstrated, the point at which he found himself. A failed point, yes,

but one from which it was possible to generate a new movement towards the to-come. So, before moving along with him, a brief note on his participation.

Any attempted discussion of Gelman would be unpardonably remiss to understand him as anything other than integral to several levels of the *Montoneros*, which is also a major thread in the debates around del Barco's naming him. In fact, both Gillespie and Gasparini reserve an explicit place for him, both sympathizing with his efforts and setting him apart from the morally questionable leadership, and detail his work as a literal exemplar of the movement- particularly abroad, where he cultivated the internationalism that Gilly highlights as essential to a situated national revolutionary movement.¹² Still, Gelman also split in one of the major moments of organizational decomposition, due explicitly to his rejection of the internal hierarchical organization, tendencies to espouse "la lucha armada pura", and the manner in which these alienated the movement from the masses.¹³ This is all to say that, despite the del Barco debate, and despite, or because of, the *Montoneros'* political failures, Gelman has always occupied an exemplary position in relation to them- indexing the just currents in the group that itself indexed the point at which the larger political ecosystem, dominated by an indeterminate, populist political tendency, ceased in effectiveness. The point where one begins to grasp at, although not attain, the ethico-politico being-with of the *sindicato real*, the multitude, the lived reality of the Argentine masses- howsoever you might call the (always already ethical *and* political) being determined otherwise than the bourgeois, authoritarian State's totalizing law.¹⁴ Gelman retains the earlier promise that made possible the group's meteoric rise, without succumbing to the a-strategic and indefensible violence that

characterized their twilight actions, nor some later, nigh inexplicable conciliatory tendencies.¹⁵ From this brief sketch of the organization and Gelman's relation to it, we must return to the underlying question: what trace, what affect, what motivation and movement pervade Gelman's work following the limitrophe militancy captured in the *Montoneros*'s double failure? What might we learn from his continuous writing, the endless worlding in his acts of language, the cooperation between friends and revolutionary comrades, otherwise than death? Love, it was always already love; it drives him, lights the traces of his pen, and lends itself to our learning. Where? When? Most importantly- *how*?

Movement, before melancholy

Before love moves the act of writing, it moves within it, a theme that resounds in Gelman's earliest works and perhaps contributes to its predominance within critical discussion of his *oeuvre*.¹⁶ Yet, even from this internal articulation, preempting its unfolding from the status of theme into the act of thematizing, love is at once tender caring, revolution and a vision of what (perhaps) will come; something otherwise than the horizons that yet determine the world wherein one loves. Thus, it's worth reflecting, briefly, on the early sense of love in Gelman's poetry, which may turn out to be less than irrelevant in its future doing.

As early as his second book, *El juego en que andamos*, collecting works from 1957-58 and beginning of the shift away from his affiliation with the Argentine communist party, love and revolution are coupled.¹⁷ This is telling, not only given his involvement in revolutionary movements, but also his work's later shifts towards a vision

of poetry, and writing in general, as integral to changing reality.¹⁸ We must tease out this link between love and the revolutionary act, if only to later ask to what end love acts revolutionarily, if it could even end. In the poem “Camaradas”, a sense of the revolution as entry into a more immediate reality encompasses an odd triad: pain, love and death. These comrades “Han sustituido el dolor por la certeza del dolor, / el amor, por la inocencia del amor, la muerte, / por la íntima amistad” (52). There is an opening in revolution, a gesture towards the immediate limits of life lived through action. In place of certainty, the certain experience, in place of a *vision* of love, *love*, and tellingly, in place of friendship, death. Moreover, and this begins an ambivalent linkage that continues in his later works, a syntactical ambiguity engendered in enjambment links the last three terms- love, death and friendship. Friendship and thoughts of love are themselves set back, seen as states of peace and potential that, enacted, are effaced by actual *loving*, its certain uncertainty, and the death beyond friendship. Early on, he establishes a tension in which hang both the unspeakable *act* of love *and* the death that springs from acting out of friendship- a tension that nonetheless, or perhaps inevitably, opens toward the world. While it may yet stop, this tension contains a *not yet*- “Adónde, adónde, cuando la vida es ancha a / partir de ellos, a partir de sus brazos tendidos / hacia el mundo” (53).

From here this interlocking continues as a theme, notably in the later “Fábricas del amor”, a meditation on the night-covered creation of a beloved. Walking dark paths under the night sky the poet speaks to the beloved, “Yo te oficié, te recité” (58). Creating love is always an action, constantly re-doing itself, time and again; before the beloved speaks a word and after-words, after the ambiguity of the beloved’s many names. And at

the end, it can only finish in reality: “En realidad quiero decir: me haces andar contra la muerte” (60). Again, the act of loving, of creating love and the (be)loved by loving them, positions itself as forestalling death only insofar as it is a moving against. And both are characteristic of the comrades named by the prior poem, the revolutionary act’s anonymous face. Thematically, this interweaves love and revolution in their status as unstable acts; as a moving towards and through, and not that *from which* one sets out, not the thought of setting out but the having already gone. Yet further, in *Gotán* (1962), in speaking (of) Fidel Castro’s acts in the poem sequence “Cuba sí”, his actions and his heart unfolding like a revolutionary flag are “como un golpe de amor en la cara del miedo / como un hombre que entra temblando en el amor” (89). Again, and again, love and entering into the act of love are interwoven with leaving behind stable friendship to re-do being in the constant, boundless flux of revolutionary struggle, death and pain. But only later does the theme of love fully unfold, in the 1968 text *Traducciones II: Los poemas de Yamanokuchi Ando*, in which, by destabilizing its set perspectives, Gelman dislocates himself within poetic language and pushes past a given state language’s boundaries, undermining his earlier work’s lyricism.¹⁹ Love as a theme is pushed to its breaking point, past the limit of the written page, to blaze a path forward into the world. In the fifth poem of the sequence of “translations” this cleavage is clearest and, so, the poem demands extensive citation

si tanta luz o intensidad de amor
no pertenece o cabe aquí o necesita
otro mundo ¿cuál es la realidad?
¿la ausencia de piedras veloces como el mar o voces
que vendrán tiernas? ¿o esta es:

*amor que se cumple como
fuego que todo alumbra dudándolo?
¿y cuál será la vida que se dan
realidad y amor tristes
por negación vergüenza o furia?
¿o no se tocan jamás?
¿o insoportables se tocan para
envenenarse y quisieran
la una en el otro cambiar y
de nuevo empezar
a ver qué pasa ya sabios?
(254-5 italics mine)*

In the intimate coupling that predominated between love and reality, a hiatus begins to open, forcing a reevaluation of the real state of love, its actions and the life it brings. That is, it shifts to a realm written and at odds with reality, a world of action determined by acting. Love shifts from the act as theme to the act of thematizing, that which impels itself forward as action and makes that action an act of love. Still, it is not revealed by opening toward the world; it conceals itself in its uncovering, remaining a passion behind those it sends off in(to) the word. What is love? Rather, *how* is love?

A Vision, an Act

If, in a cleaving that spans and undermines time within love, such that love's acts are always different, love begins to motivate writing as much as, or more than, it is thematized within it, *how* does one read this? *How* is love done and, in reading after acting, re-done? This problematic begins to become clear in an article by Kate Jenckes, "Juan Gelman's Open Letters: Mourning and Mundo beyond Militancy." She sets herself a dual task in the piece. She simultaneously confronts accusations, based on del Barco's subtly misguided reading of Levinas, that Gelman is an exemplar of unethical mid-twentieth century militants and, also, readings (in the article, by Ben Bollig) that, while

not repeating the ethical claims, make him a “melancholic militant” that cannot let go of the past.²⁰ Based in an excellent reading of his *oeuvre*, she says that “Gelman’s poetic project is dedicated to the possibility of rethinking politics as an exposure to what may come, beyond ideals, identity, or calculation” (157). Assembling an understanding of Derrida’s view of positive mourning, she centers on how the act of mourning is such that “[t]he aporia of mourning invokes a kind of taking in of something that cannot be taken (insemination as dissemination, if you will)” to highlight how “a holding close that is also an exposure to the unassimilable nature of the other involves an experience of the past that will always exceed our attempts to remember or represent it, and of the future as the ever-present possibility of an event, the irrepressible fact that things happen” (159). Parting from this taking in of the other as an excessive overflowing of horizons of presence, signaling a futurity hidden in his supposed melancholic nostalgia, she analyzes his *Carta abierta*, an incredibly difficult book addressed to his disappeared son- an address that doubles the impossibility of any arrival by obviating the question of the supposed addressee.

She signals that “[f]or Gelman, as for Derrida and Celan, poetry- far from being a machine of redemption- is a reminder of the ongoing nature of survival and world, irreducibly divided by time and inscribed by the possibility of what is to come, which can arrive from both past and future.” She then ends on an open note, a wound signaling a wound- “Gelman compares poetry and survival with love. Their impossibility, paradoxically, is the condition of their very possibility: love, poetry and life itself are not instruments of production, bringing the possible into the actual, but, [...] are open to the

possible, come what may” (18;19). In this final linkage, Jenckes signals the same tendency I have traced- locating love at the level of poetry, concomitant and motivating, an echo of its own echo, a reflection of a mirror set before its merely thematic expression within the work itself. Differently and yet coinciding with my reading, love is positioned as a force logically anterior to the actual, positively melancholic work that unfolds in writing poetry- in a sense, a potential for actual passions.²¹ Yet, it is also here that her framework undoes itself, positing a revolutionary poetic project dissociated from said revolutionary’s understanding of love’s force. In Gelman’s words, she treats only love’s *innocence*- the potential, the pre-revolutionary-, and not love *itself*- the action, the unfolding that led to its own escape from the word toward the page, (un)expressing itself as being inexpressible, constantly re-presented. Jenckes, privileging the metaphor of pregnancy, an apt one to be sure, stops her analysis at the carrying with in opening towards the world, focusing on what Gelman’s poetry carries, with an eye toward the future. Yet, Gelman consistently associates love with action, as I have shown, and as astute an analysis as this article offers, insofar as it does not carry with it the action of love, only what love potentiates, it excludes something essential to Gelman’s project (without, of course, erring at all). So, the question reasserts itself: *how* is love? Jenckes’s analysis, as sharp a blade as any, hesitates before that cut- but it does give a sense of the target.

Perhaps this has much to do with her suturing of Derrida and Gelman; perhaps a turn to Levinas will lend a hand in loosening these ties. The love behind *Carta abierta* is, as evinced by the poems’ addressee as well as Jenckes’s focus on the pregnancy

metaphor, always a *filial* love, which can only end in an asocial centering of the poet's (unbounded) ipseity folding back on itself. The blurred boundaries of filial love in Levinas are such that "[t]he I owes its unicity as an I to the paternal *Eros*. The father does not simply cause the son. *To be* one's son means to be I in one's son, to be substantially in him, yet without being maintained there in identity" (278-9). Further, Levinas signals that "[t]he paternal *Eros* first invests the unicity of the son; his I qua filial commences not in enjoyment but in election. He is unique for himself because he is unique for his father. This is precisely why he can, as a child, not exist 'on his own'" (279). The book's motivating love is thus folded over upon itself, and yet ruptured by passions that predate the loss. The ideal loving relationship, between the child as Other-that-is-you and simultaneously absolutely other, is also to *be in* the child, to see extended beyond yourself your self, to be given infinity in the Other that is radically separate from you and also the face before which you are infinitely responsible. And so, following Jenckes, in mourning, in taking in something of the other and thus making possible an opening to the to come, the father further takes in a part of himself that was cast out and taken in by the son-as-absolutely Other. There is, then, a snapping back of an impossible fragment of his ipseity hidden in the taking in of the Other that reintroduces the I to itself, in the Other's guise. That is, if the Other also carries you within them, by taking them in you also take (back) in a part of yourself, dis-guised in that Other. Thus, the motivating love inscribes a fundamentally egoistic loss, that of one's futurity in the child-as-Other, and signals a, partial or temporary, return to interiority's bathing in the *il y á*. There the I lives from... without the introduction of exteriority, that is, the ethical encounter, as, for Levinas, "the

element [the “there is” (*il y á*)] separates us from the infinite” (132). Death, in Gelman’s case of the son, would not be the loss of or doing away with this particular love- rather, the love is frustrated in its projection on to/ward a material(ity), in the son, and this impedes its being carried forward.

Facing death, the poet’s will produces a work of labor within the element, as “[t]o will is to forestall danger. To conceive of the future is to fore-stall. To labor is to delay its expiration” (Levinas 166). As Levinas explains of labor, it is an attempting to possess, as “[p]ossession removes beings from change” (160)- a carrying on of the poet’s future as the doubly undeliverable writing of filial love that removes it from change. While true of all works- to which I will return- in this instance, the play of the self re-sounds the loss of itself as future, and precludes for this love, which *would* be an opening to the world, that it have a social aspect. *Carta abierta* ceases to be political as such, cleaving to the Derridean reading of mourning without undoing its own radical interiority, the fault of the lost object; again, the son. Yet, love still hides behind this writing and it seems that, allowing a different Derrida to guide us, it may yet appear. Although, it now falls to me to clarify this term I’ve danced around, before (re)socializing it.

Love, or rather loving, is, as we have seen time and again until now, an action always underway, directed towards the to come, characterized by a faithfulness and a constant demand for (re)doing. Loving is, further, marked by the traces of a strong ethical force that determines the responsibilities between those that love one another- lovers, family, friends. Levinas’s thought sounds a call to love’s *action*, as opposed to the innocence of love that Gelman places *before* the act and, read through the deconstructive

lens that has been one of *my* work's themes, this provides the most fruitful understanding of the term. For Levinas, love partakes of the same nature as the face-to-face encounter, which is to say all relationships with the absolutely Other. And yet, it goes further, beyond the other and towards a future, completely undetermined- "through the face filters the obscure light coming from beyond the face, from what *is not yet*, from a future never future enough, more remote than the possible" (254-5). For Levinas, "to love is to fear for another, to come to the assistance of his frailty. In this frailty as in the dawn rises the Loved, who is the Beloved" such that in the encounter with the beloved "[t]he essentially *hidden throws itself toward the light, without becoming signification*. Not nothingness- but what is not yet" (256 emphasis in original). His reading characterizes love by a constant sensual grasping at the secret beyond the face of the other that is exposed and, by its exposure, concealed; the secret, the interiority of an other expressible only in the impossibility of its present expression. Loving is, or seems, in many ways, a relationship of constant hoping or grasping for some fixity of the other's subjectivity, understood as their infinitely unknowable alterity. A figure best thought as the inefficacious hand, the metonymic figure *par excellence* for the act of taking possession, in this case constantly grasping at a secret yet to arrive and impossible to unveil in exteriority, which is the force and marking of its veiling. Nonetheless, Levinas draws a fine line between love and friendship. If love is always "the love of the love of the other", then "love accordingly does not represent a particular case of friendship. Love and friendship are not only felt differently; their correlative differs: friendship goes *unto the Other*; love seeks *what does not have the structure of an existent, the infinitely future, what is to be engendered*" (266

emphasis mine). Derrida and *The Politics of Friendship* may aid us in understanding the untenable drawing of this line.

The disjunction between the two otherwise similar thinkers is immediately apparent in Levinas's assumption of the essential, preexistent stability of the I and the Other as operative in his formulation of the encounter. And in a rare moment of direct address, in his essay on Levinas's thought, "Metaphysics and Violence", Derrida states just that- "[i]n order to reject the Kierkegaardian notion of a subjective existence Levinas should eliminate even the notions of an *essence* and a *truth* of subjective existence (of the Ego, and primarily the Ego of the Other)" (*W&D* 110). Which is exactly the dividing line drawn between friendship and love- by not presuming the existence of the Ego, the other and the one, and the one's desire to reproduce itself as accomplished only in sexual reproduction, the distinction between correlatives tumbles before the impossibility of the arrival *at* the friend of the address *by* the friend. The experiences of friendship and of love become nigh indistinguishable. So, Derrida's friendship allows me to extend my thought of love, reminiscent of Levinas, into the realm of the friend, the enemy, the political.

Walking a single path through Derrida's body of works is a task that undoes itself but allow that I follow the trace of one within many. That is, that "friendship consists in loving, does it not; it is a way of *loving*, of *course*. Consequence, implication: it is therefore an act *before* being a situation, rather the *act* of loving, before being the state of being loved. An action before a passion" such that "well, it is to love *before* being loved" (*PoF* 8 emphasis mine). We see here a path, a double sense of friendship as loving that

posits love as an action, as a matter of course, and then further as an action that cannot know its correlative, being as yet undecided. A simple corrective to the Levinasian formula and yet, one that forces its radical conclusions- in friendship you are constantly loving for the future, over a gap that can never be bridged, without any sure signs of love on the other side. Acting thus, one tries endlessly to bring the action to an end, bring an end to the action, bring forward the event's culmination in what Derrida calls a *teleiopoetic* act- asking that they come, in the future. Its doing marks an "anchoric community of those who love in separation" for whom "[t]his is not all they love, but they love; they love lovence, they love to love- in love or in friendship- providing there is this withdrawal" (*PoF* 35). They do not presume to possess, to contain or grasp entirely the friend or the certainty that love is reciprocated, and so they do not love the love of the other but rather they love the other without need for a reply, without insisting on knowing them completely. A radical distillation of the responsibility arising in the face-to-face encounter with the other; the discourse breaks down before it can be given, always unsure, one loves them while grasping for a future in which perhaps you may know their pardon; one is infinitely responsible before the responsibility can even be recognized. Ideas which Levinas takes up later, in *Otherwise than Being*, having taken in Derrida's comments, seriously.²² So "this friendship is a species of love, but of a love more loving than love" as it proposes no fusion: it is sheer value of proximity and action with its concomitant (im)possibility of reciprocation (*PoF* 64). And, well,

[p]erhaps, one day, here or there, who knows, something may happen between two people in love, who would love each other lovingly [...] in such a way that friendship, *just once*, perhaps, for the first time [...] will become the correct

name, the right and just name for that which would then have taken place, the condition being that it take place between two... (*PoF* 66)

... so, then, it misses the mark to say that nothing is engendered in friendship-as-loving, as it rather constantly carries itself to term, engendering itself as action, the act of loving. And in being a love of loving it pushes one to love yet more, many, an amount uncounted, breaching the political in the determination and taking on a pedagogical tint, as one always wishes to show how to love well, in the hopes that that teaching might return (to someone already gone). That pregnancy metaphor was not a casual slippage- I now return to Jenckes and the discussion of what one carries inside oneself. For Derrida, that is the core of the responsible decision in friendship, a giving in the moment “[w]here I am helpless, where I decide what I cannot fail to decide, freely, necessarily, receiving my very life from the heartbeat of the other” or, as Derrida refers to it, *lovence* (69). But one must avoid the filial trap here, where this occurs only in a relationship that produces the infinity of the I, and step away towards a social being-with, one in which all decisions, and friendships, are constantly made *only by the other(s) in me that carry me in themselves and re-place a me with-in me*- a realm of singularities coappearing and, in generative cooperation, engendered in and for the to-come.²³ A co-existence in friendship-as-love needs to be brought forth- the action of loving the act of loving the friend constitutes one’s sense of loving, as well as those that are loved. The action of friendship-as-love establishes this strange sense of community, and of politics otherwise, constantly re-enacted with an eye towards the future, regardless of the friend’s absence or presence. For this project, returning to Gelman, the text that immediately follows *Carta abierta* is far more apt: *Si dulcemente*.

An act that becomes a route, that traces a route through friendships by acting out of love; it is loving. As Julio Cortázar says, opening the book, “[u]n solo y único poema nace de todos ellos, el último ilumina el primero como el primero contiene el último, y cada uno es un paso en la continuidad de la ruta” (425). A continuing *teleiopoetic* gesture that seeks to bring loving (to) an end, an event in which Gelman might know his friends’ love, despite their death- it carries on with carrying out the act of living with the friends, loving them for what is not yet. Gelman re-invokes the *perhaps* that is lodged at the center of the act of loving the friend, my preferred political gesture, in which one is constantly *living with* while hoping for what’s to come, the event naming one a *friend* and not an *enemy*.²⁴ The text enacts what Simon Critchley expresses as a unity in the temporality of friendship, “the (present) time of writing, the moment of iterability that writes for friendship, for the other (future) is provoked by an experience of loss (past). *One writes here and now for the future of friendship by recalling the past*” (258 emphasis mine). Thus, the act of *Si dulcemente*: the writing of friendship-as-love that I will trace within the play that Critchley here notes- the play of time and place, in and by writing.

Still, there must be a brief pause here, appended after the fact in order to begin, about whether a work can be called ethical, as this book is a *work* written by *one*. Levinas, keeping in mind the prior discussion, most succinctly responds to this. Of language and representation, he signals a dual movement- “[t]he *hic et nunc* itself [from which a word extracts a thing] issues from possession, in which the thing is grasped, and language, which designates it to the other, is a primordial dispossession, a first donation. The generality of the world institutes a common world” such that “[l]anguage does not

exteriorize a representation preexisting in me: it puts in common a world hitherto mine. Language *effectuates* the entry of things into a new ether in which they receive a name and become concepts” (174-5). Put plainly, speech offers up *to the Other* things we have taken into ourselves as concepts so that a common, which is to say social, world can be instituted in the play of thematization. Or as Cesare Casarino puts it, “To converse is to be in common, to produce the commons” (2).²⁵ But it bears stressing that, 1) the instrument is language offered up to the other, in the face-to-face encounter and 2) the other, who overflows all horizons, cannot be possessed nor entirely contained within and by a concept. Any idea of the other ceases to be (the) other and, conferred, can only be an inadequate approximation. No writing offers up the other, only *concepts* of the other held by another. Further, concerning the act of the I in representation,

[w]e have defined representation as a determination of the other by the same, without the same being determined by the other. This definition excluded representation from reciprocal relations, whose terms meet and limit one another. To represent to oneself that from which I live would be equivalent to remaining exterior to the elements in which I am steeped. (Levinas 170)

No representation can ever make a concept of the I, which cannot be extracted from its interiority (even if there is no essential I, and that interiority is already bound to exteriorities equally bound, producing the recursive gesture of taking in- in that case, there would be nothing to extract and nowhere from which to extract it). And so, no work can re-present the author, the *one* who writes. There is no face-to-face encounter through a work, through writing, so there is no ethical responsibility engaged upon taking it up. Nonetheless, it is still *motivated* by the ethical encounter and, as such, offers as theme or concept the *mode* of responding to the other’s face and, as it here offers a *loving*

friendship with the other, allows that model to be taken in, to become substantive of a common (social) world. Love's pedagogical nature springs forth, here- it instructs others in loving, offering them a model for loving for the future, being faithful to a love even after the beloved's death. So, then, here and now, in *Si dulcemente*, we are given (how) to love our companions.

There is a time...

From the text's opening, from even before it opens, there is no hesitation as regards the state of the friends whom the text remembers- they are dead, their deaths are a thing of the past and are referred to as past. Even as the poetry addresses a *tú*, the text itself being a present of writing, the events with which it deals are those of the past: "si dulcemente por tu cabeza pasaban las olas // del que se tiró al mar/ ¿qué pasa con los hermanitos // que enterraron?/ ¿hojitas les crecen de los dedos?/ ¿arbolitos/ otoños // que los deshojan como mudos?/ en silencio" (453).²⁶ The present is a time of growth from the dead, who *have died*, whose time has already passed and who are no longer alive, here and now. Nonetheless, the act of friendship-as-love that is writing, the space of friendship opened in writing, always contains that fact, that death, and pre-dicts it. There is, then, a continuing of love, the act of addressing oneself to the friend, grasping for a friendship yet to arrive; not a continued life of the friends, but a continuance of the act of loving the friend that precedes and impels all other passions that arise while writing a present perfect. Part and parcel of the act of loving (the friend)- "I could not love friendship without engaging myself, *without feeling myself in advance* engaged to love the other beyond death. Therefore, beyond life. I feel myself- and in advance, before any contract-

borne to love the dead other. I feel myself thus (borne to) love; it is thus that I *feel myself* (loving)” (Derrida *PoF* 12). A faithfulness to love so strong that, “[t]here is no reliable friendship without this faith [...] without the confirmed steadfastness of this repeated act of faith” (*PoF* 15). And still, as we have seen, the event of friendship is yet to come (to a close), and as such the act of faith must be repeated constantly, beyond death and before the friend’s silence. Gelman writes, time and again, the act of faith to the love for the friend that pulses behind this poetry, that *is* the poetry, a constant acting out of faith in an event yet to arrive. An act reinforced, moreover, by the dead friends’ silence- in a paradoxical manner. Because “[f]riendship does not keep silence, it is preserved by silence” and yet “[f]riendship tells the truth- and this is always better left unknown” (*PoF* 53). Friendship-as-love is always attempting to unearth the secret of the friend, bringing to the fore that to which one calls, toward which one grasps, across the abyss that infinitely separates and yet over which we intermingle.

In writing, the past might always seem to be made present and thus denied- as voices of the dead made present. But that will always be an equivocation. They are not the voices of others, only the thought of them thematized as voices in the poet’s work. Gelman does not fall into this trap- he maintains these memories in multiple *tiempos*, multiple tenses *and* times.²⁷ From the beginning, “los hermanitos hablan de la vez // que estuvieron a dostres dedos de la muerte/ sonrén // recordando/ aquel alivio sienten todavía // como si no hubieran morido” and “ahora están hablando de cuando // operaron con suerte” (433). There is a constant tens-ion in this book- they speak now of what had been, as if what had been had never happened, as if they were still alive, *as if they were*

speaking. But only *as if*, only as the words written on the page, unearthed and thought anew in the poetry. The voices are suspended across the hyphen of tens-ion, as though they could still speak, and not be hung across the page bereft of any presence to speak of. They think the poet thinking them, “los compañeros // me piensan noche a noche/ dan vueltas // sin dormirse/ incómodos en sábanas // de tierra o agua donde están yéndose”, but they think laying un-thinking in earth and water, thinking the poet only insofar as the poet thinks them (434). He lives his love for them, re-acting the friendship endlessly, its being now disseminated across the page, and so “ard[e] del arder // que arden” (434). Always a play of time, the poet’s time now encompassing that that was once the time of his friends, the tens-ion in the many voices on the page faithful to love’s act.

This tens-ion spreads out on the pages in every direction, drawing together multiple articulations of time as language, pulling past and present together to thrust them toward the future. As the poet speaks of them, he speaks of what their past looked for in the future, repeating them as “matando a la derrota general/ compañeros // murieron/ dieron vida para que // nada siguiera como está” (445). Companions, who we already understand as committed to action, to the pain and love and imminent death of revolutionary action, who died to defeat, to undo, any totality of defeat- to spread themselves out in the minds of those to come, becoming a concept of the future. Their deaths, in a sense, were themselves acts of faith to friendship-as-love, love in revolutionary acts. A constant grasping for a to come within the loving community of (solitary) friends- thus, much as in dying, those that love as friends are not so alone, they can thematize those that they love and continue to love in time.²⁸ In “dulce // recostación

como humillada vía donde todos // los compañeros apagaban dudísimas // como lo grande
 que del pueblo crece/ por fin/ // en la mitad del pueblo/ alzada el alma // revolucionaria
 como alta de Dios” (436). In death the friend snuffs out grand doubts, doubts of fealty as
 of the future, and becomes that of which one may write, that for love of which we act.
 Their deaths opened toward the future and the (re)writing of deaths is due to do the same,
 as those deaths were “como escribir en la alma de la noche // las gracias por la luz que
 recibiéramos/ // o amor al cuello quieto en respirar” (439). Held constantly in the tension
 of the imperfect subjunctive, they are the wish for an unknown future in the past, re-
 presented in writing as a wish unfulfilled and yet relevant- “se derramasen probando otra
 vez/ la // delicada pólvora del ser/ durísimo // equilibrio del vivemuere” (436). They
 become the “vivemuere”, that lives dying, the coming back to being but not as a being,
 not as living but within the living, time and again renewed within the act of faithfulness
 to love. All acts spurred by friendship-as-love contain a revival, a surviving, that does not
 pretend to bring life to the dead but instead survives in love for them, specters. The dead
 companions are “abrigando // pechos que tiraban del poncho de la Victoria para acá/ //
 para este lado/ los de los pobres que serán victoriosos un día”, in death holding to what
 lived in them of the others, that gave them life, and who will be victorious one day, to
 come, allowing the dead a taste of victory, as well (437). Loving struggles carry with
 them the social that was forged in the recursive intermingling of others within each
 Other; in the faithful act the taking in that enables the political decision is re-affirmed,
 despite, or rather because of, the beloved friends’ deaths.

Then, and actually, by necessity, from out of the deaths of the poet's beloved friends springs the possibility of any reaffirmation. Of them it can only be and is written that "sueñan soñados/ quietos/ // nunca verán los rostros donde crecen/ // asoman/ continuados/ a este sol" (441). Themselves, they have no future, torn from the eternal by death's infinity- they have no faces to see and be seen. And yet, they grow behind the faces that will come; in death they are as ideas, possessed by and possessing as specters, that grow within and behind countless other faces- of the poet, of the readers, of comrades to come who will learn from and act a-new loving. The future of the past is behind those faces that carry it out and forward in their love, forestalling death. They will say together with others as the others speak, "alguna vez al sol de la justicia/ caminaremos", as it is "amor donde los compañeros pueden ser", love as when and where they can re-present themselves carried within the poet (441). These "compañeros moridos/ // tristes agrandan el amor/ // sentados en mi alma a dos sillitas", continue their broken speech from within the poet, visible in the imperfections of his language. Fragments of others within him that carried him within themselves have returned him to him, in a cacophony of speech- "quejándose/ // o comparando/ hablando/ meditando/ evaluado/ // como cuando vivíamos/ luchábamos/ juntos" (442). The gerund, the doing, is active in the present as traces of the past, the product of joining what was once together with what is present in the writing, which will later be, itself, a once was. Love acts toward the future and thus is always re-starting, beginning a-new, from the deaths of comrades that behind the face of the poet, of us, "esperan que empecemos otra vez" and realize a rupture in the act of love and writing, a decision beyond the act (446).²⁹

As the text opens itself, explicitly, to hope and the future, this rupture is registered in the unfolding. As Cortázar signals opening the book, all the poems together form one poem, the last line of each becoming the first line of the following- with the exception of the last two, which both borrow only “esperan” as a title, playing off each other as a call and response. They break the continuous structure that interwove the future perfect and the present to point openly toward the future. The initial hope is composed of questions that undo any perceived fixity of belief in the actual continuance of an essential presence of the dead that may have arisen from the preceding poems, letting them lay there in death and gesturing toward a future opening. Thus, “pasás a paso de olvido/ calladita/ // no respondés a mis palabras/ tu // mejilla es luna no ofrecida/ beso // que los pasados días no besás/ // patria o peso del pecho/ corregís // tanta amargura/ bellezas del mundo/ // con ninguna te puedo comparar/ // sola/ abrazando a tantos compañeros” (447). A last kiss of an other gone, that slips towards forgetfulness’s infinite past- here likely the granddaughter he thought dead before birth. But not yet gone for good, there is still hope- “[f]or to love friendship, it is not enough to know how to bear the other in mourning; one must love the future” (Derrida *PoF* 29). Setting aside doubts, then, in the second poem of the same name, the obligatory response that can never truly respond to the first’s questions, calls and doubts, there is an open reaffirmation of the future more future than the word, “vamos a empezar la lucha otra vez/ el enemigo // está claro y vamos a empezar otra vez” that sees the poem, and the book, end “otra vez/ otra vez/ otra vez” (447). Undoing doubts, the time of the book, woven so carefully from a chorus of voices past,

present, dreaming of a future yet to be, promises to be the future again and again and again.

...and a place...

And yet, and yet...this friendship-as-love was forged within and acts from a revolutionary passion, and every revolution in space must have a place, if it is not to be utopic- and Gelman's revolutions were not, neither in writing nor fighting.³⁰ However, the space of writing is suspended above the page. So, beyond time, we must also understand the spaces folded into his work- spaces of revolution(s) folded into the space of writing, disseminated as potential across the page, preempting writing and, in writing, pre-figuring revolutions that are not yet. Held within the work's futurity is the hope of folding out into a new space, unfolding the page in an action learned from and as love's action; being in life the same rupture as on the page. As the preface to the book, the poem that serves as epigraph and the poetry of Gelman itself attest to, the revolutionary struggle in Argentina is suspended over these pages, deferred in the deferral of presence effected by writing. Of the poet's voice, shaded by countless specters, it becomes preoccupied and "ya caminando con la pies del mundo/ preguntaría // dónde los ríos de pasión de los compañeros // corren/ queman qué mar" (434). In this thematization, the action of loving the dead comrades realized by Gelman, the struggle itself is thematized and held as revolutionary potential to be disseminated into the other's- sustaining the silent possessive, opening *toward* the others as part of the commons and *into* the other's struggles, as a potential model to be realized in loving action.

The spaces folded into this book's verses in many ways echo the interlinked triad

of temporal indicators, distinct and yet bleeding into one another in slippages unveiled by the loving that moves the friends between them. Death, writing and the future all occupy their own real and metaphorical spaces of (un)folding within the long act of being faithful to those that have, will have and will act within them. Death, then, hides beneath sea and stone, in beds of water and soil within which, as we have seen, the comrades speak in the poet's speech. They are spaces anchored in the past, where "se tiró al mar" and where lay "los hermanitos // que enterraron", that have relevance in the present insofar as they ground it, in the sense of the logically past, what must come before in order to speak now, as well as the chronological past, marked by the preterite tense of their inscription (433). And yet from them "empezó el misterio del mal olor/ // el mal olor subía de cenizas podridas/ // el mal olor cubrió a los compañeros como nube", signaling interment's space, the earth and the waters, as contested and, further, indicating the internal space of death-of the two enemies, the obvious external and the internal's creation or discovery (437). Death resides inside, and "los // enemigos de adentro son difíciles de ver/ tienen // cara de compañeros/ son compañeros/ se equivocan/ algunos // tienen las cenizas podridas/ dan mal olor // sobreviven/ no sobreviven porque sí/ // los mejores cayeron/ y lo peor // es el pueblo callado" (437-8). Internal death is the space opened by failing to act faithfully, failing to continue in friendship-as-loving and going silent while the best fall. This death, different from the loving acted out in this poetry, is the forgetting, the letting die inside of the idea of those that carried each other in love, the death of the others you took in that returned to you part of yourself in them. Something that becomes one of the "paredísimas" circumscribing death's house, the space from which those that continue

loving or should most demand your love are excluded. The space that forgets death, where “cerrás la puerta a huerfanitas // de dichas y victorias/ no servís/ // humeás por dentro oyendo disolverse // los companeros en el páis/ paisándose” (443).

Outside those walls, in writing’s space, is where the faithful lover dwells, where loving continues and death is held in suspension for the future. A space of “barrios de fuego // donde pasaba mi alma como voz // ya caminando con la pies del mundo” (434); space open to the world, of the world, where one recreates the common (social) world in the infinite responsibility before the other *and* in the act of (still) loving those who were loved. Where there is fire, there is pain but thus also action, love, and eventually, forestalled yet not forever, death. Writing’s space is death’s postponement, the act of the will which sets aside the end for enjoyment of the now, its pain and love notwithstanding, rather, constitutive of the space and the fire. Within the literal, physical *pueblo* we find the space of writing and love, along with the suffering before the violence of capital and the State; the space of the “sol // que se levanta a pura voluntad // sobre la pecho que desgarran cierres // como pobres del mundo/ a pie/ de pie/ // contra el negocio de acudir al mundo // solísimos/ ya ciegos/ de mirar” (436-7); the space of the *pueblo*’s collective will to move together and not alone. Here the lover’s soul walks amid the suffering of action, revolutionary and loving, and yet bears with(in) it the past, which is also the space of death, of dead companions “sentados en mi alma a dos sillitas” (442). So, the internal space of love’s act opposes through contestation the internal space of death, which it shares yet from which it differs, and it is in this contestation, as will be seen, that a space to come blooms.

Much like the birds that only fly away in and from this work's lines, the future casts itself forward from the chest of the poor, the *pueblo*, the poet; from inside, the space contested by death and writing and, in loving, opened towards the future. Overlapping the space of death, under ground, at the bottom of the country, it still breaks out in the future tense, as "el frío de los pobres que un día triunfarán/ cruje // en el fondo del país" (438). In the future, then, where time and space are conjugated together in faces where the dead grow, they will carry on unto the not yet the loving that laid the foundation for revolutionary passion. A space to come, where "al sol de la justicia/ // distribuidos/ altos/ pan que pana // la vida de vivir/ como niñitos/ // descubriendo el país de la bondad" (441). *País*, peace and country together, accented within one word, a space yet to come that unfolds itself, *as the yet to come* (re)articulates the loving community *folded onto the space of the page*, the literal space of writing, *and buried in the past behind the page*, the memories bound to the loving act that carries this space forward.

Through articulating this final space, conjugating together the text's other spaces and temporal plays, the problematic of the opening to the future world, acutely signaled by Jenckes's reading of *Carta abierta* and carried through my own reading of *Si dulcemente*, fully unveils itself. For all that the text suspends revolutionary potential in an act of love that folds space and time into the present space of writing, it must nonetheless unfold itself anew in actions that take up the model of friendship-as-love articulated with this poetry. While we can trace the force of love that moves the poetry, itself the act of loving from within and beyond death, for the opening to the world to be *actualized* in a revolutionary practice it must be *practiced* by a coming community founded by loving

that, in producing new *representations* of space through ethical loving of others, also forges a new way of *living* space.³¹ The best a text may do is instruct its readers such that they more fully *learn and teach* in their face to face encounters within the commons, within exteriority; thus diminishing the war of existence and adopting their infinite responsibility before the Other. In this sense, it may guide others in realizing what Casarino refers to as a “surplus commons”- a non-teleological conception of a commons in language, action and affect that will always overflow any attempted incorporation by capital. A commons beyond value and capital, a love beyond possession and loss, a space and time come into being all at once that would facilitate a political reconceptualization of love as beyond measure, a way of being in common beyond the bounds of the State.³²

...to teach and be taught

I must briefly preface my attention to the work’s pedagogical slant- but this preface will allow me to open my own writing more to the *avenir*. For several reasons, although I will focus on a historical one.

My segue here has to do with this text’s historical moment and how it indexes a single experience of what I see as the affective tensions pervading the Argentine moment after the dictatorship’s fall allowed for more public, or rather common, reflections on the left’s recent failure(s).³³ The hiatus between the initial writing of the text in 1984 and its more widely available (re)publication in 1994 encompasses the moment between the dictatorship’s end and the slow fruition of Menem’s neo-liberal policies- as it is simultaneously embedded in a failed (old) left milieu reflecting on the relatively recent past (exemplified, for instance, in the del Barco debate). Inscribed within it, in the death

that belongs to the comrades it recalls, is that left's failure- yet, unavoidably and, I argue, distinct from other memories mired in failure, Gelman's modelling of the continued action of love born in and from solidarity allows for a revolutionary continuance and becoming in the same gesture that it indexes the common scars of failure's experience. Thus, he is doubly important as an auto-didactic pedagogical model- both for those that were and must continue, and for those that are and are becoming, those to come. His singularity offers itself in writing as an experiential nexus that facilitates a temporal junction in and from which revolutionary time may rejoin itself in the actions of multitudinous revolutionary subjects acting in common from an ethical striving toward and within love, as he models. I do not believe this gesture to be an accident, and so I insist we teach ourselves from and be taught by it.

Returning to Levinas, we see that the encounter with the other is, in unfolding, one of teaching- a conversation that brings two in common. In his thought of it, "[t]his voice coming from another shore teaches transcendence itself. Teaching signifies the whole infinity of exteriority. And the whole infinity of exteriority is not first produced, to then teach: teaching is its very production" (171). Hinging a reading on the metaphor of the other shore might tempt us toward the river Styx, towards death as instruction- but nothing could be more of an error. For all that the text may collapse time and space into writing to later bloom, at once, into a new mode of (revolutionary) life, it cannot reproduce the processual face-to-face experience Levinas here describes. Sweetly, it bears the marks of lessons learned, and allows itself to be made a lesson, but always as prior to and only realized in the student-reader's encounters with the other- a potential

realized in, as well as presupposed by, the ethical encounter of subjects-to-come (re)producing life otherwise than the terms of global capital.

Teaching is a force immanent to that encounter that does not allow itself to be transposed; although, as a mo(ve)ment in love, its traces may be laid down in a text- as in Gelman's. Teaching is the anti-hierarchical force that manifests in the other face, in which "[h]is alterity is manifested in a mastery that does not conquer, but teaches. Teaching is not a species of a genus called domination, a hegemony at work within a totality, but is the presence of infinity breaking the closed circle of totality" (Levinas 171). But I approach this topic cautiously because, as established, this work itself is no encounter with Gelman, nor the dead he carries. Rather, insofar as the re-socialized text partakes of social tools- language as general intellect within the common-, it traces forces and modes that persist in a love of an un-incorporable surplus of life overflowing the law, moving otherwise than the State's language.³⁴ This then is where the work's paradoxical *instructing but not teaching* arises. Being only a thematization of that which articulates itself through it- a revolutionary teaching/learning through friendship-as-love-, even as a concept of the other that the other spills out of infinitely, it cannot reproduce through representation the experience of the face which is teaching's present in the ethical sense.

And yet, the loving action that is and motivates this work cuts through this aporia, in a way. Or rather, it offers up the blade which may time and again be re-taken in order to make that cut, that decision, the political act in its purest movement, which will always and can only be taken up beyond the text. Traces of lessons given and received proffer an auto-didact's pedagogy of love, modeling action such that one may learn to act in

accordance with the love, faithfulness, reality and timelessness composing this loving text. Such that one may learn to act sweetly in a common world where each one, unbounded in the differential binding to others that composes the deferred I's sociality, may ask "I am I and chosen one, but where can I be chosen, if not from among other chosen ones, among equals?" (Levinas 279). In the anarchic state of equality that subtends and constantly overflows the State's repressive violence, and its totalizing imaginary, one becomes amongst equals "a subject of being not by assuming being but in enjoying happiness, by the interiorization of enjoyment which is also an [affective] exaltation, an 'above being'" (Levinas 119). Acting sweetly *is* the action of loving those beside you, making friends and living with them, teaching them and being taught, constantly reaffirming the friendship-as-love affirmed in living, beyond time and death, in the multiple spaces of life, death and the future. The very schema modelled in the loving poetry of *Si dulcemente*, to be taken up anew, as new, along with the relational revolution that preceded the book and will follow it, beyond it, in a new way of teaching and being taught. Here we have the *teleiopoetic* statement that reaches out to us and through which, through loving, we reach out toward the consummated event of friendship in which Derrida says one way, and Gelman differently, you

...feel responsible towards *them* (the new thinkers who are coming), therefore responsible before *us* who announce them, therefore towards *us* who are already what we are announcing and who must watch over that very thing, therefore towards and before *you* whom I call to join us, before and towards me who understands all this and who is before it all: me, them, us, you, etc. (*PoF* 39)

Endnotes

¹ Of recently works, I am thinking here of Alain Badiou's *In Praise of Love*, Trans. Peter Bush (New York: New, 2012), which continued with his project of positioning love in relation to the Lacanian discourse on desire, which he most clearly establishes in his earlier work, *Conditions*, Trans. Steven Corcoran (New York, NY: Continuum 2008). The work of Antonio Negri offers us a potential escape from this shortcoming but, as we will see later in this chapter and in the following, has deep flaws to be worked through.

² Williams analyses this scene of *Pedro Páramo* in the first chapter of his book *The Mexican Exception* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2011).

³ Concerning the relationship between language, the law and justice, I here think of Derrida's "The Force of Law", Trad. Mary Quaintance, *Cardozo Law Review* (1989-90 11) 920-1045.

⁴ Del Barco's letter may be found archived at <https://lectoresdeheidegger.wordpress.com/2011/09/22/oscar-del-barco-no-mataras-carta-a-schmucler/>

⁵ An example of this reasoning can be found in the article (and the general discussion engaged therein) by Ceferino Reato, "Gelman- ni dos demonios, ni ángeles y demonios", *La nación*, 20 January 2014, <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1656847-gelman-ni-dos-demonios-ni-angeles-y-demonios>

⁶ For an excellent exposition of this imbrication, upon which I am leaning heavily here, see Patrick Dove, "Memory Between Politics and Ethics: del Barco's letter", *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* (2008 17:3) 279-97.

⁷ See Carlos Altamirano, *Peronismo y cultura de izquierda* (Buenos Aires: Temas Grupo, 2001) 128-30.

⁸ As concerns the comments by Rozitchner, see his interview in *La izquierda en Argentina*, ed. Javier Trímboli (Buenos Aires: Manantial, 1998) 181-220. For Altamirano's discussion of the masks of the montonero leadership, see: *ibid.* 137-42.

⁹ In this sense, the Montoneros find themselves, singularly and plurally, despite dramatic lived differences in their actions, absorbed in the same epistemological impossibility and ethico-political immanence I highlight in Parra's writing during the 80's, in the previous chapter.

¹⁰ As regards the rigorous thought of the multitude as articulated in and through love, see Antonio Negri, *Time for Revolution*, trans. Matteo Mandarini (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013) pp. 211-4. Concerning militancy and love, see pp. 218-20.

¹¹ As regards the economic disjuncture and catholic roots of the Montoneros, the first chapter of Gillespie's work does an impeccable job of detailing the exact fluctuations occurring in Argentina after the initial ousting of Perón. For his commentary on the tensions with the working classes underlying and caused by recruitment from the disillusioned bourgeoisie and the shift to an anarchist strategy, see pp.76-80.

¹² Concerning references to his role within the organization see Gillespie p. 255 and Gasparini p. 158. For Gilly's take on the necessity of internationalism, in line with scolding non-argentine left organizations for writing off the Montoneros, see pp. 69-70.

¹³ As regards his anti-heirarchical stance see Gillespie p. 266. Concerning his pro-masses and anti-militarism stances, see Gasparini p. 180.

¹⁴ This "being-with" is very much a reference the work of Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being Singular Plural*, Trans. Robert D. Richardson and Anne E. O'Byrne (Stanford: Stanford UP, 200). The middle ground that Nancy establishes through his elaboration of being singular plural, the being-with as ontologically originary in the simultaneity of coappearing singularities, will serve as a conceptual bridge between deconstructive ethics and autonomist politics, with an eye towards announcing an anarchist reading of the (dis)juncture, principally in the following chapter. For now, it serves to make explicit the reference.

¹⁵ Here a point that Gillespie and, to a lesser extent, Gasparini are insistent on deserves reiteration- at no point should it be understood that there is an equivalence being suggested between state terror and the strategic guerilla violence of militants (a claim, perhaps wrongly, often made of del Barco, et al.'s critique). Whereas the state's violence was indiscriminate and meant to sow chaos, instability, distrust- in short, mindless terror- amongst the population, the so-called "terrorism" (even the later, less discriminate acts) of the militants was rooted in a strategy with an eye towards de-capacitating the apparatuses of state terror and the bourgeois capitalist order. Even in their lowest moments of harming civilians, the militants were fundamentally directing their attacks at singular manifestations of a violent being determined by the interests of the dictatorial capitalist state, and always made that explicit. As concerns the conciliatory acts of lingering Montoneros, Gilly's commentary on the War of the Malvinas is illuminating. See *ibid.* pp. 71-83.

¹⁶ What strikes me as one of the most fascinating, explicit treatments of an ontological value of love in Gelman's work, cleaving close to my reading and yet at many points infinitely distant, can be found in the article by Geneviève Fabry, "Palabra

testimonial y valor ontológico del amor en los últimos poemarios de Juan Gelman,” *Memorias en tinta: Ensayos sobre la representación de la violencia política en Argentina, Chile y Perú*, ed. Lucero de Vivanco Roca Rey (Santiago de Chile: U Alberto Hurtado P, 2013) 149-163.

¹⁷ For a brief but precise chronology of Gelman’s life, see: Miguel Angel Dalmaroni, “Juan Gelman : Cronología 1930-2000”, *Orbis Tertius* (2001 4.8).

¹⁸ Concerning this poetic mission, see: Víctor Rodríguez Núñez, "Relaciones y Hechos De Juan Gelman: ‘Disparos de la Belleza Incesante’", *Revista Iberoamericana* (2001 67.194) 145-59.

¹⁹ On the ways in which Gelman’s play of language and “translation” situates him as speaking beyond the bounds of a state, see: Miguel Ángel Dalmaroni, “Juan Gelman: Del poeta-legislador a una lengua sin estado”, *Orbis Tertius*, (2001 4.8).

²⁰ Derrida succinctly addresses this particular misreading of Levinas in his article “Violence and Metaphysics”, *Writing and Difference*, Trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: U of Chicago, 1978) when he reminds us that, “It is true that Ethics, in Levinas’s sense, is an Ethics without law and without concept, which maintains its non-violent purity only before being determined as concepts and laws. This is not an objection: let us not forget that Levinas does not seek to propose laws or moral rules, does not seek to determine a morality, but rather the essence of the ethical relation in general” (111).

²¹ Concerning the logical relationship that obtains between potential and actuality, and the manner in which the actualization of a potential is cast backward into a point of logical precedence that facilitates the production of chronological temporality, Paolo Virno’s text *Déjà Vu and the End of History*, Trans. David Broder (New York, NY: Verso 2015), is illuminating.

²² Levinas adjusts his stance in *Otherwise than Being*, Trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP 1998), such that one is responsible even before the face to face encounter with the other- this understanding, however, while informing our reading of his earlier works, goes beyond the scope of this essay.

²³ Here, as previously insinuated, I am relying on a presumptively feasible fusion, despite and against complaint on the part of some, of the autonomist view of the living labor of love in Negri and the ethical experience of being as being for the other in Derrida and Levinas, fused with a linkage through Nancy. While I will later flesh out this reasoning, I would like to here insist strongly on the necessary maintenance of a rigorous thinking of the ethical experience of the singularity as requiring this inter-singular coming to ipseity. I think it resolves one of the less productive aporias of Negri’s thought by allowing for experience as not overdetermined by his theorizing of the common.

²⁴ Derrida explores this tension throughout the text of *The Politics of Friendship*, Trans. George Collins (New York: Verso 2005). Here I am thinking primarily of pp. 19-23, 58-9 and 70-2.

²⁵ The invocation here of Casarino, and by extension Antonio Negri, in reference to their joint work *in praise of the commons* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota 2008), is by no means simply fortuitous. Their explication of the concept of the commons at play principally in Negri's work, but also that of various Italian autonomist thinkers, heavily informs the political (under)tones of this chapter and will play a large role in the following. While it will not enter strongly into play within this chapter, it serves us to mark the specter of its importance.

²⁶ From this point, hereafter I will be using the // to indicate line breaks, in order to maintain Gelman's use of the / in the text.

²⁷ Elsa Crites, "Gelman: Endurance, Despair and Love", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* (2005 82.4) 491-500, explores this maintenance of multiple diachronic moments in a thorough fashion.

²⁸ Here it is worth asserting that this does not come to form a thematic economy of sacrifice, as described in reference to "dying for" by Jacques Derrida, *The Gift of Death*, Trans. David Willis (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1995), principally on pp. 40-6. I say this because, distinct from dying *for* the writing, these deaths could at best be economized within the internal logic of militarism, which we've seen to be doubly inscribed by failure, and itself extinct. Moreover, in thematizing, due to love or otherwise, as I've already discussed, there is no true possession of the other, even in their death- rather, what is (re)produced in language is the frozen *concept* of the other, and therefore also of their (uncountable) death. The logic of loving, the action of love, then, while tangential to the economic, supersedes it insofar as they come into contact, and escapes as otherwise than even an incomplete, fragmented economic dialectic. Nonetheless, I do agree that one should further take from the cited section the role of understanding one's death to come, given to us in the death of the other before whom we are therefore responsible, in establishing the singular(ity). Unfortunately, I lack space for a fuller exploration of the consequences of this, here.

²⁹ While not entirely equivalent, this thought of fragmented, we might say *cariological* time is decidedly indebted and referring to several points in Giorgio Agamben, *Infancy and History: On the Destruction of Experience*, Trans. Liz Heron (New York: Verso, 2007).

³⁰ Again, I refer here to the work of Victor Rodríguez Núñez, *ibid.*

³¹ I borrow the term “the coming community” from Giorgio Agamben’s work of the same name, *The Coming Community*, Trans. Michael Hardt, 8th ed. (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota 2013), which explores the development of a community of love that has as a predominant feature the play between the universal and singular subject(s) and the constant opening toward the future of that community. Concerning the method and necessity of constructing radical spaces and spatial practices within left movements, I refer here to Henri Lefebvre’s work *The Production of Space*, Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden, MA: Blackwell 1991).

³² Casarino and Negri, *ibid.* pp. 34-7.

³³ Here I rely on the excellent work of Idelber Avelar, *The Untimely Present* (Durham: Duke UP 1999), in which he succinctly resumes the tensions and divergences in the Argentine left after the election of Alfonsín, while emphasizing the continued process of neoliberal transition in the moment, leaning on ideas he borrows from Willy Thayer.

³⁴ Here I refer back to my analysis of re-socialized poetics in Chapter 1.

Chapter 3

The Violence of Failure, or the Failure of Violence: Documentary, Video and Radical Political Subjectivity in Neoliberal Argentina

*And therefore as a stranger give it welcome.
There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Then are dreamt of in your philosophy.
-Hamlet, William Shakespeare*

*...the fate of the documentary in the postmodern world
becomes to unveil the irrelevancy of the pretensions of intellectuals
-Philip Rosen*

A chasm opened in the last chapter, extending itself between its end and this beginning. Not merely in the temporal sense of shifting from the remnants and rags of a failed but fruitful moment to another, more ambivalent one- which I will address- nor as the bridge between chapters and materials, with all the suturing that implies. No, the hiatus that opened to consume and consummate this chapter is also its object, the gap I have implied is not so easily overcome, even as it is constantly effaced: that between a so-called singular subject and what is common in it, and the common itself, insofar as I *am* in common, and in being so I act. To return to the previous chapters' language: *one* must act in and out of solidarity to maintain beyond the patriarchal and its apparatuses of epistemic capture a subjective excess otherwise than state language. If the *one* is driven by faithfulness to a love ever to be enacted, that yet teaches us to act over and over, do that loving engagement's traces survive to become social, entering the sphere that determines their possible, if always failed, aestheticization?¹ If reading Gelman's loving work, attuned to Parra's sense of solidarity, we are meant to learn (in order) to teach and be taught, can we ever be sure that those lessons have been realized as more

than words on a page? This chapter will explore a tentative answer by intertwining a reading of post-2001 *video rebelde* and documentary in Argentina and a confrontation with Antonio Negri's thought of love and the common, across the chasm opened by and throughout the prior chapter. Alongside and while commenting the audiovisual materials, I will test whether Negri's multitude and its paradoxical telos of constantly generative revolutionary subjectivity are sufficient to the Argentine, or any, moment. By placing the multitude in a constellation of collective subjectivities, including my attempt at describing the subjectivity inherent to these videos, can we better understand how to productively think *with*, and not merely *about*, what happened and continues happening in Argentina and elsewhere?

If I led with a question of exemplarity, it can be stated more or less as such: given that Juan Gelman is a single figure, although an important one on the Argentine left, to what extent can I show that his work and, further, its lessons have become common? When any subject acts out loving solidarity born of an encounter with a comrade, friend, or Other, how can we understand the singular action's commonality? In Gelman's case, aside from his general renown, we have documentation of his reappropriation by forms of sociality that supersede facile or totalizing representations and, thus, incorporation into the State's language. He is indirectly represented as a radical model in the 2008 documentary *Corazón de fábrica* by Ernesto Ardito and Virna Molina. The documentary deals with the Zanón ceramics factory in Neuquén (aka, FaSinPa) and the events and *tomas de fábricas* before, during, and after the 2001 financial *saqueo*. Zanón was one of many factories recuperated by workers after capitalist abandonment due to a supposed

unacceptable decline in profitability and, like Brukman textiles in Buenos Aires, operated in a horizontal, assembly based, socialist-leaning manner (which was not always the case amongst recuperated factories).² Molina and Ardito, in solidarity with the workers, document their struggles and organizational methods and, moreover, their solidarity with other recuperated factories and *piquetero* groups. They produced a documentary that while often cleaving to conventional tropes, also overflows them by being embedded in the worker's ongoing struggle against capitalist and state aggression. While I will return to this, the scene of most interest now is brief but fortuitous for *my* project. One of the workers' representatives is recounting efforts in solidarity with other organizations that include producing tiles inscribed with unpublished poems by Gelman, to be displayed and later donated to other locations. They capture the literal inscription of Gelman's work on walls marking the limits of the political in Argentina, in an act of loving solidarity both singular and yet collectively taken. By not following the tiles, both expressively and in terms of content they reproduce the limits of attempts at totalizing this excessive subjectivity, the persistent and multitudinous *sindicato real*, to make it legible to the State. Glimpsing this suggests that perhaps Gelman's lessons signal a collective model through which

...the political forces of love [may] form so many institutions [...] social and political institutions [that], on the one hand, provide a place to which not only you but anyone can return in order to extend, intensify, and conjugate the desired encounters. And, on the other hand, are constituted by transformative procedures that express or translate the force of the event in a temporal process. (Michael Hardt 12)

However, this example also contains the trifecta of concerns I wish to address in this chapter. Of the first order is a general question of representation. How, if it's at all

possible, might one represent these emergent subjectivities, given that their principal characteristics include rigorous cynicism concerning and rejection of the representative act?³ While directed at the State's political institutions, insofar as documentary (and cinema in general, in different ways) claims a particular, conventional representative authority concerning its subject, it is subject to the same admonition- even as we recognize that advances in cinematic and distributive technology mean more participatory models of engaged cinema.⁴ Despite the documentaries' politics, they are embedded in a social sphere striated by their efforts and yet overdetermined by the capitalist State's sociality, repressive apparatuses, and their historical development. This determines the works' reception and dissemination *just as* it determines the political and its articulations, albeit to a greater or lesser extent. Because of this, and given the proliferation of cheap, hand-held camcorders, digital cameras and platforms for disseminating the videos, new modes of iterable, fantastic identification have overflowed questions of intentionality in (re)production and dissemination and demand we think alternative forms for a coming political engagement and its re-presentation.⁵ To this end, when attuned to resurgent interest in audiovisual indexicality and, further, digital video's seemingly *dual* indexicality and its emergence from (and perhaps dependence on) tensions between the substances of its content and expression, we can determine these texts' politico-archival functionality, or lack thereof- and whose interests it most serves.⁶ When analyzing a film like *Corazón de fábrica*, produced in a country with a history of engaged cinema, insofar as documentary conventions reproduce forms of legibility functional to state institutional authorization and recognition, we must question whether that mode is apt for a pseudo-

genealogical tracing of emergent subjectivities.⁷ Still, the audio-visual's proliferation in the moment is undeniable, as Jessica Stites Mor demonstrates, so I set aside poetry to explore how different audiovisual forms are echoed by and explicate theoretical inversions key to my understanding of this moment, and my larger project. So, to summarize this first concern: given the boom in "documentary" production, in quotation marks because many videos eschew documentary's conventional expressive tool-kit, (how) can it model alternative approaches to this historical juncture, to texture critical conceptual limits?

Somewhat more specific, the other two concerns are linked: *to what extent* and *how* can we speak of these subjectivities? Both in their practice and self-documentation, not to mention documentation produced about them, their fluctuating intensities and expression reject, and yet exceed the implicit dialectical relationship with, older political models' representative orders. I have concentrated, until now, on specific, single works and their limits when engaging an ethico-political demand excessive to the point of impossibility. Now, however, the moment's commonality and its representational modes demand that I more thoroughly interrogate my idea of horizontal, multitudinous recognition and authorization. My previous citation of Michael Hardt might suggest that I intend to continue with the multitude, but I instead mean for it to mark the emergence of the debate alluded to in the previous chapter's notes. I maintain much from his and Antonio Negri's thought of the common, as indispensable for thinking radical politics during neoliberalism, but it strikes me as unacceptable that it subordinates singular bodies' actions to common generativity's necessity. They open, or maintain open, the

possibility that common relational modes fail, and obviate the continuity of radical thought and subjectivities otherwise than our knowledge. Given my anarchic framework's rejection of the State's total circumscription of power, these gestures are verboten as senseless and blind, respectively. Exploring scenes captured, albeit incompletely, in Argentine video, I instead attempt to offer a corrective that explores the ethico-political import of what is common *in* any I, given the (perhaps not so) new realization that I *am* in common.

Dinosaur Cinema⁸

The definitive event for the emergence of new forms of being-together was the end of December 2001, but I will begin with a later, if no less infamous, event. On June 26, 2002, two *piqueteros* were murdered by the Buenos Aires police during the repression of manifestations at the Pueyrredón bridge, historically a transitional point between neighborhoods strongly marking geographically situated class distinctions.⁹ One was Darío Santillan, associated with the autonomist *piquetero* collective Coordinadora Aníbal Verón, which subsumed several uniquely generative organizations, including el Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados de Solano.¹⁰ Several threads set loose by neo-liberal reforms, from the early 80's through Menem's presidency, came forward at that moment to be gathered together, dramatically, in proceeding days.¹¹ Emblematic of the corruption, cronyism and inefficacy of the Argentine government, and Buenos Aires in particular, were the police and their role as chaotic agent provocateurs in a political power play against then president Duhalde. Marcelo Fabián Sain explores all of this in a

piece exemplary of the state of Argentine politics, albeit not without its faults.¹² I will explain, as it covers several aspects of the Argentine state at that historical juncture.

He meticulously traces, from the 80s through the 90s, continuities in Buenos Aires police corruption and their extra- and outright illegal activities- association with organized crime, drug dealing, prostitution, and other routine violence. All tacitly approved, ignored, or benefitted from by political figures usually expected to step in and regulate the free-wheeling, mafia-esque violence of a repressive apparatus meant to enforce a hegemonic political and ideological program while maintaining the dominated classes at a remove from the State. He paints liberal institutions as radically repurposed or purposeless, due to inefficacy or lack of interest, during burgeoning neoliberalism. While for liberal Sain the center doesn't hold and everything is somewhat catastrophic, a lack of regulatory intervention highlights, *for me*, how changing institutionality, reoriented by global capital's demands, negatively affects the masses.

Most interesting for a reflection on the neoliberal State are the political machinations that likely led to the commands given, or not, to the police that day. He clarifies that, in a baldly necro-political shift, "the police action occurring that June 26 was *not intended to control, limit, or demobilize the piquetero protest*, but rather to provoke an open confrontation between the police and the mobilized poor" (52 my emphasis).¹³ Protest was excluded from political power, its demands illegible to state institutions, and yet its bodies were included in bare life's manipulation by dominant class fractions seeking to effect a hegemonic shift. Pushing the dominated to the point where their struggle met with death, that death could be taken in hand by these fractions,

furthering their gain. Here is the neoliberal State imitating ouroboros capital, consuming itself from both ends, within and without, while smothering the life beneath it. Politics no longer pretends to be incorporative but is, rather, a beast apart from multitudinous, excessive life, which can barely exist in it as a spectacular, negative re-presentation- gore soon forgotten, with none of Poulantzas's "long range" effects.¹⁴ The masses' life, denied as such, is but another weapon for those class fractions to mobilize against one another.

Sain, despite describing failed attempts to reconfigure and purge the police of corruption, still proposes reform and "resocialization" for maintaining democracy as it "ought" to be. But this could only remedy the disjunction between efforts at neoliberal institutional re-configuration and the State's previous recalcitrance- related to individualism's insistence on a synecdochal sovereignty, which impedes a smooth shift from national to domestic capital due fear inspired in nationalistic politicians and citizens by alterations to state (and thus individual) sovereignty. This program would be life's complete investment by state power, as self- and "community-" policing, wherein the State elides *constant* repression for *targeted* repression, as a translation machine between life's quotidian (re)production and global capital flows.¹⁵ Reforms of this sort are, unfortunately, fairly successful in subsequent years, making Sain retrospectively prescient. Nonetheless, what interests me is the status of the lives taken by repressive forces- more precisely, the status of life as such, not supplemented by repression's *post mortem* (re)subjectivation. If rebellion persists in loving solidarity, despite individual deaths, one must always ask *how* lost life continues in the intensity of a life in common that yet acts. Focusing only on its being taken by the State would reify that life as

incorporated, by death, to capital- which cannot be acceptable for anti-capitalist thought. To explore these lives, I offer two distinct audio-visual representations of death: Fernando Solanas's *La dignidad de los nadies* (2005) and Grupo Alavío's *Crónicas de libertad* (2002).

Although released later, I'll begin with Solanas. *La dignidad de los nadies* opens with a digital hand-held camera shot of travel- a *literal* traveling shot-, transitioning to shots of an impoverished area outside of Buenos Aires. From the outset, it documents the moment's massive nature while being primarily constituted by face-to-face interactions. Or rather, face to camera; although, insofar as Solanas speaks from behind the camera and is a recognized *auteur*, he is fused with the mediatory apparatus with which *he* chooses to capture the *pueblo*. He foregrounds the documentary's substance of expression- composed primarily of his body and the camera fused to it- to facilitate a fantasy of participatory reproduction, wherein the spectator, less than identifying with Solanas *per se*, understands that they, too, would produce *this* text, if they were *there then* with a camera. This participatory potential's emphasis goes a certain way towards obfuscating Solanas's ideological construal of the content, as documentarian intervening in a performative documentary and in the montage- which I will here interrogate because, as Bill Nichols says, "[o]ur willingness to agree with what is said relies to a surprisingly large extent on rhetorical suasion and documentary convention" (178).¹⁶ But explicating this also remits to the digital's dual indexicality, mentioned above. Digital images are in no way only virtual- they are *physically written* to a hard drive (assuring the image a continued indexical function) and any of the much-feared manipulations are not made to

the original file, but rather *over-write* it as an altered copy, a second file. The first remains as something more than a trace- that a skilled technician can again bring forward. In this way, the digital serves not merely as an archive of contingency, but *also of* supplementarity- of all the changes rendered, manipulations made, and edits provided that, without great effort to the contrary, accompany the first impression. So, I insist on manipulations of the substances of expression and content as also indexed by digital video- in Solanas and the following videos- as a way of interrogating their representational value for thinking the moment, these subjectivities, and their various discursive appropriations. This reverts to the ontological value of indexical images as representations- problematizing yet reinforcing it discursively, being thus of interest to my thinking about historicization and the archive.

Returning to the documentary, his ongoing construal is essential to the above emphasized terms- *he* is noticeably in control of and frames the film as stories *he* is beginning to tell *you*: stories of *no-bodies*. This initial framing vacates the indexed bodies, rendering them *no-bodies* and virtually incorporating them to a spectacular authorial vision articulated with Solanas's cinematic language, which positions us alongside and before Solanas as story-teller, the only body allowed plenitude as decisive subject. This is consistent with his long-standing insistence on a necessarily authoritative position for rationalizing his films' sensorial aspects, towards radicalization- a task he reserves himself.¹⁷ Secondly, he speaks of a *pueblo*, a *people* whose consistency and construction he doesn't doubt, and whose new forms of struggle he re-counts as directionless. This extends a point made by others: his films from this period index the

lack of an Argentine “people”, so Solanas constantly attempts to *construct* a people through his *construal* of the substance of the film’s content.¹⁸ So, its consistency *and* its directionless-ness are only concretized in the language with which Solanas construes the *pueblo* as *unitary* political subject, re-embodying it discursively. This despite divisions apparent filmically, undermining an illusory univocity- he alternates scenes of and interviews with middle-class protestors expressing a problematic, reactionary catharsis, with sections dedicated to emergent forms of popular, collective resistance.

Part of the sequences dedicated to collective struggles, at the film’s approximate mid-point, he presents the Pueyrredón repression and murders of Maximiliano and Darío.¹⁹ The presentation is telling- favoring something between medium and wide shots of faceless masses overflowing urban infrastructure, he offers no firm sense of motivations nor of scale. We watch the event’s chaotic devolution and the section ends with the police murdering and manhandling Darío; then he cuts to an interview with an elderly man reflecting on the repression’s frightening intensity. Accepting Laura Podalsky’s assertion of affective touch-points beyond only the profilmic that invite audience encounters and overflow moralizing directorial intent, I read this jump cut as delimiting possible affective (re)encounters with the multitudinous event and ensuing violence in favor of Solanas’s narrative moralizing.²⁰ The moralizing ensues with shots from within the crowd at Darío’s funeral and wake- unidentified women performing conventional public mourning and some political, but reactionary, commentary conveying grief at injustice. This scene begins Darío’s cinematic *martyrization*. The scene can be read as a microcosmic instantiation of the film’s attempted melodramatic

modality, meant for active radicalization of spectators. Footage of the women and crowd is edited in without any clear indication of chronology nor provenance, expressively justifying Solanas's ideological construal; the radicalizing melodrama here relies primarily on suffering's closeness to assert the material's reality. But if this is melodramatic, a subjective return to innocence is desired not for Darío nor the no-bodies, but for the arche no-body: *the Argentine pueblo itself*. Yet, since the Argentine people as historical-political subject is absent but for Solanas's construal of its unicity, there can be no return to innocence. How, if its arrival could only ever be for the first time (as though we can accept the nation or State *innocently*, both built in blood)?²¹ His construal is more interesting: Solanas solidifies Darío's martyrdom when shooting, sustaining that verb's polysemy, the corpse. The shot is a fortuitous citation of the photo of Che Guevara's corpse in *La hora de los hornos*, reinforced later by a shot of Darío's photo with Che's face taped over his. On the wall behind the body is an Argentine flag embroidered with the letters MTD and, between body and flag, a cross. Solanas completely elides the flag and letters, implicitly expressing the invisibilization central to his construal of this space and practice as direction-less, a facet of the *pueblo's* suffering.²² For me, this is a second killing- of the specter of a life lost in loving struggle, in the name of a nationalist narrative that Darío's actions problematized. Solanas centers traditionally indexical and iconic material in a larger sequencing to recast Darío as an *iconic martyr* within Argentina's national militant history, rendering his exodic work invisible.²³

Continuing this, the film introduces Darío's partner, Claudia- and I sustain that possessive because, as the close following shots and non-diegetic, melancholic music

reinforce, the film recasts her within the heteropatriarchal narrative of a woman left behind to beatify a man. This, too, is part of the film's always already failed melodramatic mode, whose attempts at incorporating these bodies to its narrative are structurally analogous to the law's incomplete and thus processual subjectivation. Despite re-counting their first meeting in a collective space, there is no space for *her* subjectivity as forged in struggle and in these spaces, thus framing this section as a pilgrimage to see the martyr's works. She and the spaces, both articulated with(in) the radical, exodic *piqueteros* action here absent, are invisible but for their iconic value. Solanas, in his authoritative narrative construal and the montage that allows no one site to come forward as it articulates *itself*, make them invisible despite, or because of their hyper-visibility. That her mourning is due to the loss's *immediacy* is left only *implied* as she recounts the event and is re-framed to render her a passive observer for not advancing to the protest's front line, like Darío, to whose life hers is subsumed. Again, in cuts from the manifestation to this sequence, the amount of time past and how Solanas became aware of this group are completely obviated. Foregrounding her mourning and rendering her invisible but as the widow carrying the martyr's memory forward as loss at an *indeterminate* future moment- thus eternally- Solanas reinforces the hetero-romantic structure determining the State's utilization of the family in capitalist relationality. This sequence covers about 10 minutes, plus a later aside to add that Claudia, et al., "brought the perpetrators to justice"; dubious, given what Sain details about Argentine police.

On the other hand, we have Grupo Alavío's "Crónicas de libertad", *collectively* produced and released in 2002 and also seemingly filmed with a handheld camcorder.

The short lasts just shy of 15 minutes and begins with a not-quite establishing shot of burning street barricades, then a quick aerial shot of the multitude arriving to Pueyrredón, and then jumps to an interview with an *encapuchado*, who begins detailing the events. This structure determines the short as analogous to broadcast news- its interviews and jump cuts to the events establish indexical authority, despite the interviews' settings not being a newsroom. True to similarities that others note between Grupo Alavío's works and the CNT's videos, the short reports back on events as counter-information contesting the official narration.²⁴ In a way opposed to Solanas, wherein the substance of expression was used to move attention away from his ideological construal, here the expressive is subsumed to an explicit, up-front ideological functioning, proper to a contestatory report-back. Structured around these cuts, the short details the events, their motivations, the reasons for the hoods, and so forth. The field footage alternates between shots of individuals being physically harmed by police, the multitude engaging the police, and police reveling in violence. Insofar as there is narrative framing, the interviewees provide it- tellingly, and implying why the intercalated shots of repression and interviews do not clearly mark a temporal hiatus, an *encapuchada* recounts how she still wakes thinking of the violence. Contradicting the temporality associated with cuts between events and their supplementary re-telling, her testimony reframes these cuts as more *spatial* than temporal, destabilizing documentary narrative conventions in favor of the journalistic mode. Retelling events this way insists on their presence and lends the video's indexicality a strange sense of affective iterability: as not relegated to the past but, rather, images whose intensity continues to affect the present of lived struggle. Neither eliding

repressive violence, nor the protestors' (less) violent response, this short informs us of the events *and* their reasons, as opposed to only of tragic deaths.

Moreover, re-presenting the interviewees' effacement via masks renders the report-back collectively singular, retelling reality via a paradoxically polyvocal univocity. As told, the coverings symbolize their rebellion, and embodying that rebellion themselves and with clothing the individual faces *bear rebellion together*, becoming singular subjects in common and *allowing rebellion to speak itself*.²⁵ These subjects' facial coverings bring forward the existential threat to the Argentine state that these protests posed, akin to what Jacques Derrida refers to as the *anarchic* or *anarchy* drive- the silent, imperceptible, archive-destroying drive at (state) memory's instituting moment, thus also the moment of memory's structural decomposition.²⁶ Filming their effacement, that is, *rendering indexable, specific and thus repeatable the bourgeois individual's conceptual and yet paradoxically embodied death*, the short assumes the metaphysical obscenity that André Bazin read in cinema- and then doubles it by appending collectivity's birth to the individual's "death", birth being analogous to death (as specific, specifying and yet universal).²⁷ *Solanas* mediates reality with a cyborgic extension, one so associated with his performative persona that they have fused, indissociably linking *his* vision to the reality *it* re-presents. This *short's* collective force comes from its re-presentation of and from collective and collectivizing anonymity, diminishing the importance of any individual, or individual's, perspective. Bourgeois history's subject is undermined in the individual's visual, and then technical, effacement, as no *one* voice is overprivileged, centered, nor even named. Reproducing their effacement in the substance of its

expression, aiding its ideological construal, the short formally necessitates the experience of what it indexes as of a common, thus im-possible, anarchivic referent. It allows the multitudinous manifestation's concerns to be aired in solidarity, without encapsulating the many within a single spokesperson, nor face, in its present-ation.

The discussion of Maxi and Darío's deaths further reinforces this multitudinous solidarity- the latter of whom they indicate was killed tending to the former. Yet, instead of ascribing to Darío and Maxi martyrdom's *iconicity*, they frame them as companions fallen in a collective struggle- not to be mourned, they are present in struggle's commonality. While this does not obviate the possibility of their martyrdom, it renders it contingent upon others' interpretations and extraneous to the short- thereby also ambivalent, undecided, deferred. Their deaths are not given a central nor prolonged role and are, instead, treated as another indexed contingency. While this may sound cruel, I would argue just the opposite- by allowing them to persist beyond death in common *loving* action, Grupo Alavío and the *encapuchados* render their deaths non-functional to any transcendental, moralizing narrativity as they carry on in friendship-as-love. They take pride in what they accomplished and celebrate their fallen comrades as continuing in rebellion's present, otherwise than death. Not as martyrs, because martyrs are never *present* and must necessarily be referred to *retrospectively* through a supplementary *iconicity*, voiding for them any futurity. The short closes superimposing non-diegetic music onto shots of marchers and ends on a still of Maxi and Darío together. This is the closest it comes to any sense of martyrdom, but by ending with a photograph from behind them as they look to the horizon, it again structurally elides retrospectivity and ascription

of innocence, gone or to come. Instead, it formally reproduces their presence in a struggle to come, as they become *symbols* of the love driving their action, beyond death.²⁸ The short presents struggle as a loving opening to coming radical being and new relational modes otherwise than what is now called the political.

Contrasting these two filmic representations, I mean to pose a larger question, or a conjunction of questions. They pose a problem of continuity and historicization regarding these emergent subjectivities and their relationship to the last several decades of Argentine left political narratives- at *least* as far back as the 1955 coup against Perón. I've privileged their representation of Darío's death because it brings into relief each film's indexicality (thus historical legibility) as dependent on manipulations of the expressive substance and their content, and thus how they in-form non-state movements' futurity through re-presentation. Solanas, an embodiment of left continuity and action, depends on a mythopoetic narrativization of the Argentine people that renders value unto death within a sacrificial economy trading in martyrdom as the basis for alternative national-political imaginaries. His negative affective investment of Darío as an iconic Argentine martyr fallen in struggle against a repressive State permits only a reactionary encounter with death and, as such, a reactionary imaginary that precludes both rupture *and* continuity. This despite adopting new expressive tools as a way of encouraging a fantasy of participatory reproduction, which ultimately only guides spectators into assuming his reactionary, national imaginary. Thus, narratively re-placing past over present by framing Darío as one martyr amongst others functional to hegemonic politics, he offers us not a generative understanding of changing politics that comprehends the

moment's innovation and genealogically relates it to prior subjective modes, but rather a memorialized re-hashing of failures past. A martyr's iconicity can only re-signify *past* political projects and constrain rebellious discourse within a revolutionary model dependent upon state language, obviating the post-*saqueo* moment's exodic reality as one of fluctuating intensities and multitudinous affective investment in new relationality.

I contend not that Grupo Alavío and the common subject of its short offer us a sense of pure rupture; instead, they are by far more faithful to a sense of radical continuity, both politically and cinematically. Much as MTD Solano and the *piqueteros*, the *tomas de fábricas* and the large scale popular manifestations evoke a legacy of radical action, Grupo Alavío and other collectives represent the outgrowth of the New Latin American Cinema (NLAC) named, here ironically, by Solanas's generation.²⁹ Continuity is not and cannot be simple repetition without difference, an impossible hypostasis only imaginable in gestures like Solanas's; and yet, it must innovate without knowing nor forcing epistemic closure, which establishes temporality and inheritance. It's the construal itself, and not the expressive substance and form, that strikes most poignantly in Grupo Alavío's short- it does not economize death in a discourse nor a filmic modality of national-popular memory, nor does it negate it by perpetuating an unproductive forgetfulness. Death, violence and repression are constantly *present* alongside the to come, both literally as a pregnant *encapuchada* and figuratively as their report-back's pride and forward-facing end. They carry forward out of a love born in encounters between friends and comrades, acting from and for the death that was, while never presuming to (representationally) contain it nor be caught in a backward flight propelled

by, and fixated on, past failures. In doing so, and in being forthright in representing that, they encourage us to, ourselves, adopt this model. That being said, there might be a role for Antonio Negri's sense of ethicality when discussing the short's treatment of death and action's nature-to-come, as he says of death during post-modernity that: "individual death is only conceivable as *the common decision of overcoming death*, that is, as struggle against death. It is only in taking up this choice of overcoming that the decision can be called 'ethical'" (245-6 my emphasis). Yet, this foregrounds tensions between my formulation of moving from and yet for death, out of love, in singular action, and Negri's formulation of the common, key to his overcoming death.

In the citation, individual death is only overcome as decided upon in common- an apt formulation for his project. But this presupposes the functionality of common generativity's logically prior premises, including a *constant* positive generativity of love driving common innovation. I will explore this at length below, but this presupposition effaces negative affections and implies negative affect's impossibility within and for radical action.³⁰ To read this short, and the moment it synecdochally relates, through a strictly autonomist lens, we would have to ignore the *complex* affective state of both. In the profilmic and afilmic registers, this short, its common subject, and the historical moment are crisscrossed with not only love but anxiety, fear, hope, sadness, pride and countless other affections. I hesitate at calling this ethical in *Negri's* sense, but I do see an ethical understanding, specifically in the common uncovering performed by the singular coverings- in the play of masks. By bringing many voices together as a common voice, the interviewees' masks foreground the impossibility of encountering their *rostro(s)*, an

exterior simultaneity of each body's many, possible affective contortions or "face(s)".

The screen's spectral logic of absent presences, which consistently undermines any complete archival consignment, then multiplies this impossibility beyond measure.³¹ The tension between *rostro* and *cara(s)*, sheer communicable exteriority and uncountable interiority, forces us to take into account the masks effacing that exteriority, *as if* to remind us that to be in common, we are subsumed to a greater commonality as one, much as alone we are already the potential for that coming into common being.³² That assertion seems to coincide with Negri, but it is a deceptive similarity. I would instead emphasize that while a mask may conceal a singular *rostro* to bring forth a common one, it does not efface the face(s), the *cara(s)*, beneath. To the contrary, it brings that plurality into relief along with its incommunicable affective complexity and excessive reality, without revealing that singularity as knowable. Its multiplicativity then enacts what I above referred to as the short's strange, but not yet uncanny, affective iterability, in that it can only be understood as multiplying the affective register prior to signification. Masking adds texture to the *rostro* by effacing it, the presumptively smooth and impenetrable common surface, underscoring the incommensurability of *rostro* with *cara(s)*. Their audiovisual iteration is the exterior re-presentation of exteriority's effacement *by* exteriority, an effacement *of* exteriority *in* an exteriority coincident with and produced by the archivization due to its conventional legibility. Yet despite that legibility, their evident but unspeakable affective complexity makes these figures' incorporation to the patriarchive as political or historical subjects impossible, except as the silent, destabilizing anarchivic drive.³³ It highlights the possible *failure* of any autonomist

analysis by demystifying the common in its inevitable incompleteness, without discarding it; rather, it reminds us of each component singularity's persistence, and the impossibility of totally subsuming them in the becoming of a paradoxically transcendent singularity plainly legible as the multitude, no matter the medium. But failure runs counter to the short's futurity, and so the autonomist analysis appears frustrated. Failure, much like death, is present for us and moves us forward only as we move backwards, trapped in a retrospective on things past, the martyrs and failures of the once was. Only acting anew out of loving solidarity do we escape failure's grasp; this is the short's lesson. So, if I intend to salvage the common, I must confront the failure to allow singular love head-on, situating my discussion vis a vis the post-*saqueo* moment and its aftermath.

The Violence of Failure

A question of scholarly work's hermeneutic authority has pervaded *my* work and driven its interrogation of nomological authority, both of the *auteur* and the authoritarian. By making explicit divergent analyses, I have raised that specter again, as a critical *framework* forces the question of the patriarchal's structuring of history and knowledge, given its intimate, foundational relationship to the State.³⁴ Above I attempted to bring forth not only the films' different aesthetic decisions but also their distinct relationships with death, memory, history and continuity. I am primarily concerned with maintaining the sense of loving solidarity I've elaborated- seeking out *how* to work *in* the spirit of anarchic subjectivities and *with* the *encapuchado* spirit that takes pride in action, moving forward from death. As a perverse allegory for an archive obsessed with failure, Walter Benjamin's angel of history is to be avoided. We must ask *how* to avoid failure's violent

ascription and life's consignment to the archives of national politics and its halls of martyrs- in all authorial modes, including mine.

Failure belongs to the teleological, to a politics overdetermined by absolutes and the law- and is only appropriately applied therein. An end must be set, a goal determined, the terms established and agreed upon beforehand. Expansive openings toward the to come cannot fail, if only given their inevitable movement *toward*, and saying otherwise violently and strictly delimits being, contrary to any generative expansiveness. My writing and the archivization it inevitably does (and hopefully undoes) while re-framing past events are striated by thematic tensions and their performative functionality to university knowledge production, so I hesitate before too eagerly adopting a hermeneutic.³⁵ One must problematize even terms that they are fond of, settling only *their own* position vis a vis what intrigues them, without limiting its reality. Hence why, before, I conjoined the multitude to the *sindicato real*, attempting to destabilize autonomist univocity- and the same is due now, with a term from this more recent history. As I mentioned, Negri's discussion of love and the common in the multitude retains the possibility of *failure*. But that would contradict the post-*saqueo* subjectivities and efface any *singular* persistence of coming radical subjects aligned with innovative groups' sense of continuity. So, I again offer a term to tense the autonomist framework, discovering its limits and what they cover.

Ana María Fernández's work on the *asambleas* and the post-*saqueo* moment presents us a term. To explore the possibility of failure her term unveils in the multitude, I read her alongside Negri's *Kairós*, *Alma Venus*, *Multitudo*, a theoretically rich

elaboration of the multitude's logic that provides insight into his ontology of common being. I will address both his use of Spinoza's thought of love and his tendency to subsume the singular to the common- here I will focus on love. But I ought to begin with Fernández. Her works dealing explicitly with 2001-2005, collected in *Política y subjetividad: Asambleas barriales y fábricas recuperadas*, are anchored by field work done at the time- interviews with members of and, modelling Colectivo Situaciones's "militant intellectual", participation in the *asambleas*.³⁶ She stresses several key aspects of these emergent subjectivities, grounding her observations in, yet subsuming them to, the assemblies' "situational logic".³⁷ That is, to the vertiginous immediacy of the to come in, or rather before, the void demanded by the slogan "que se vayan todos", which drove these heterogeneous gatherings (Fernández 55-6). As she explains, this is fundamental to the assemblies' constitutive action, being structured rhizomatically and characterized by incessant de- and reterritorialization.³⁸ The assemblies were singularly plural in both composition and interactions, working towards an engaged, generative, and yet unknown to-come.

Emphasizing the resistance to homogenization inherent in the immanent work performed by *being there*, she summarizes the actions' productivity as inventing modes of existing *entre-muchos* or, in an immediate appositive, *entre-algunos* (71). Simultaneously, she explicitly rejects the autonomist *multitude*, by name. She insists on the eminently *numerable* groupings' strong particularization, effected in irreplaceable *face-to-face* encounters. The subtle perspectival inversion of the *entre-muchos* is due to this opposition.³⁹ Fernández emphasizes the singularity's constitutive, yet indeterminate,

ethical experience, *comprehended by a human body encountering the face of another in situated action*- undoing the common's primacy vis a vis the singular in the multitude. Her preferential shift- for the many as one, as opposed to the one of many- opens a futurity which allows for but moves otherwise than failure, without discarding the common. Her inversion is also key to framing *my* disagreement with Negri. But this conceptual inversion's importance is not initially apparent in that moment- rather now, because the State's incorporative politics, affective and physical violence have dulled the brilliant optimism of the early millennium in the two decades since. Only understanding the need to trace radical persistence *despite* the various forms of violence against it do we further understand the shift's import.

In later essays, Fernández already begins to note a continual diminution of assembly participants, and she takes pains to explicitly attribute this. Reasons include: disruption by constituted movements, e.g. traditional left parties, with distinct agendas and goals; resolution of prior material difficulties; the *continuance* of precarious living situations whose resolution asserted its immediacy; and apathy, disillusion, debates around methodology, and so on.⁴⁰ Further, she is far from alone in noting this- a common thread in work on the following years emphasizes the role of Nestor Kirchner's government in containing the energies of 2001/2, by placating the economic concerns motivating the middle-class to take the streets and then incorporating the more moderate *piqueteros* into his government.⁴¹ Key is that these conflicts were primarily affective and material ones that diminished singular subjects' capacity to act, especially in common, *or* as part of a larger singularity.⁴²

The multiple temporalities revealed in post-*saqueo* relational modes marked-commenced and made sensible- new emergent subjectivities, yes, but *also* a more concerted effort by constituted power in Argentina to implement global capital's hyper-individualistic control society. In a sense, this effort is a necessary step *toward* the real subsumption central to the multitude's emergence in resistance to Empire. But these steps, and the neoliberal transitions' inconsistency revealed by the State's necessarily continual pursuit of its implementation, destabilize the broad temporal assertions fundamental to Negri's work. This revelation, more apparent for the recent increasingly visible, strongly rooted times of production, is already reason to hesitate before the term multitude. To account for these ongoing struggles, we must emphasize the *processual* nature of both successive Argentine governments' attempts to more thoroughly integrate capitalist production's various axes to the State *and* the emergence of alternative subjectivities dependent upon, despite being both agonistic and antagonistic to, the State's efforts. Totalizing flights of optimism tangential to struggle's temporality will not do.

Moving past Kirchner's incorporationist policies, a core function of state institutionality, State resistance to new relational modes provides a lens for viewing various policies. See, for instance, the privatization of recycling, or Buenos Aires's prohibition of dancing in unauthorized spaces- both restricting forms of sociality and work not easily contained by global capital and the neoliberal State. These actions, but more importantly policies and maneuvers during both Kirchner presidencies, accelerated a process of localized incorporation of Argentina's domestic capital to global capital's

functioning, despite or perhaps because of the complexities involved.⁴³ By 2015, years of backlash at various levels lead to openly neoliberal president Mauricio Macri, who enriched himself throughout the previous decades by relying on his family's ties to industry and politics dating to the Videla dictatorship, and manipulating public discontent to climb political ranks in Buenos Aires. Macri embodies the opposite of the hoped for emptying out of the political in "que se vayan todos", being instead the reinstatement of prior political modes.⁴⁴ Taking everything together, from police repression under Duhalde up to Macri's presidency, we have what hegemonic politics would consider a sound defeat; a failure culminating in the assumption of power by forces diametrically opposed to the left, let alone alternative political being. And while the autonomist framework avoids acknowledging failure, it's hard to see how constant, common innovation could account for these setbacks- that is, how the generation of the common can account for it as processual, and not always already given, in the face of capitalist repression. It doesn't provide the tools to think these decades, especially if we hope to glimpse political continuity otherwise than the State, as Grupo Alavío's short insists we can. I don't want to discard the common, as a sense of it pervades rebellious continuity, but I must confront Negri's thought as effacing possibilities of singular subjective persistence by eliding the irreplaceability of situated encounters. If I do not, I have no justification for reflecting on this past, as my reading could only ever be catastrophic, instead of generative and hopeful.

Not to malign his foundational reading of Spinoza but, his metaphorically overdetermined focus on a specific spinozian love denies the multitude affective

complexity. He sets out in *Alma Venus* to show that since Spinoza, “love is the desire of the common,” and it further “constitutes the dynamic innovation of being”, making a subject of common action as embodied by poverty (*Kairós*... 209). There are several conceptual leaps required to arrive here, which he details extensively in *The Savage Anomaly*.⁴⁵ In brief, implicit herein is the primacy that Spinoza lends the affects caused by Reason and not as passions, being thus more perfect.⁴⁶ This is crucial for Negri’s assertion of the positive, generative nature of love as innovation in common. Mahmut Mutman’s work on Negri illuminates this operation by tracing a *specific* sense of love in Spinoza- *pietas* or *love of God*- used by Negri, in translation, to aver that *love as such* drives each singularity to desire that *all* be in *common*.⁴⁷ The slippage he effaces by choosing *love* to translate *pietas* without distinction, thereby still implying its other meanings, incapacitates much of his argument- and undermines it. Negri says, “[g]eneration is love that follows the thread of time from its beginning and so weaves its fabric in the common;” and further, “[t]here is no solitary love: love constructs tools, languages and politics of being” from the standpoint of the singular (*Kairós*... 211). He asserts love’s persistence through time into the common and a necessary, social constancy for that generativity. But his failure to account for its *intensity*, which fluctuates with affective interplay and the possibility of the body’s capacity to act decreasing due to a negative affection, is only tenable accepting his translation, as *pietas* is not subject to the passions’ fluctuation.⁴⁸ His is an idealized affect dependent on an always already predefined reason’s unchallenged predominance and, frankly, seems not

to have discarded a metaphysical tendency to overdetermine multitudinous social action and inter-singular relations.

While his assertion about love's social character is accurate to a point, denying solitary love errs by effacing the possibility that the imagination reproduces love's external cause after loss, or in solitude. Allowing this, cases of which I examined in Gelman and "Crónicas de Libertad", allows for love's persistence in a singular human body despite a setback in the common's generativity caused by a strong negative affection. Maintaining these effaced complexities rescues a politics of love in forms beyond *pietas* and its transcendental tendency- forms I call "love(s) of the particular". Despite having just named them, this name is of course excessive, and not only because of what always escapes a name. No, far more simply- *all* love is *always* a *particular* love. Even insofar as a singularity is in common, it is always the singular that loves, and loves a particular other singularity- even without assurances of its im-possible reciprocity. It is the singular experience of the other acting *in me* that permits me persist in love, ethics and politics, beyond death and toward the *to come*, despite negative affections. Attempts to socialize that, even mine, cannot avoid *some* representational flattening, nor the tension of the force field marking the impossibility of that translation's adequation to the excessive life experienced in love and im-possible faithfulness. Its translation to a social force cannot but be an experience of impossibility entailing some flattening of intersubjective social space, which, left unchecked in Negri, makes his theorizing somewhat naïve.⁴⁹ So, we must hesitate before presuming a generalizable, therefore transcendental, love- but Negri does not.⁵⁰ He effaces any decrease in love's intensity

and, therefore, anything other than constant common generativity. All without elaborating the sexual-social metaphor inaugurating love's function in building community, effacing his translation's repression, that is, the subsumption of multitudinous forms of love to a term overdetermined by intertextual usage.

He comes closest to explicating love's productive functioning when discussing love in space, *or* co-operation. Love constructs space because it "seeks the common, both the eternity of the common (i.e. the already generated) and the *to-come* of the common (i.e. that which is to be constituted on the edge of time)" (*Kairós*... 212). Again, love is an *exclusively* social force at being's threshold seeking cooperative networks of inter-singular relationality in the eternity of space, that it also constructs. And if love's progress pauses, without diminishment? Or cooperative relationality's possibility is quashed? Does space vanish, retreat, when we're forced apart? Or is it emptied, leaving us alone and loveless; that is, undoing us? To what extent does this cooperation presume a subjective determination and fixity that calls back to the tension between immanence and transcendence, reproducing the metaphysical suppositions Negri claims to be challenging? He reinforces this dilemma defining co-operation as "love that proceeds by making itself common among multiplicities [...] [as] the space constituted by the common and so [...] multiplied in its productivity- productivity: nothing other than the capacity of the common to become increasingly common" (*Kairós*... 213). Compounding the problems- love is always *only* common, being produced in the common space that *it* produces, and which is presumed productive.

Key to the above disagreement, this productivity is always *only* actualized towards greater commonality. Presuming this actuality causes the above grave problems; what's more, while it produces *its* common space, it also has not exited the space overdetermined by the *State's* productive spatial practice, which actively opposes alternative, common relational modes. The events indexed by the above videos are proof enough of the conflict's violent intensity, regardless of modifications to their indexicality due the respective productions' cinematographic decisions. While one assumes this would be accounted for in a *resistant* subjectivity whose productivity is explicitly opposed to another, it is not. For Negri, "politics is a daily task revealed by love as the productive power of the present. It is the quotidian responsibility for the generation of the eternal" (*Kairós...* 214). In short- while I also insist on suturing love and politics, this metaphorical and narrow deployment excludes difference and difficulty. One could argue that love's task ideally continues despite difficulty, but that ignores the extent of capitalism's capacity to negatively affect common singularities, making only the most strained persistence possible. Which may be enough! But it is an unnecessarily myopic optimism, bordering on quietism, to assert the multitudinous *telos's* ineluctability in Argentina, especially given global capital's violent and incomplete localization, which either impedes or incorporates resistant productivities. If in Negri's paradoxical non-teleological teleology we must necessarily activate singularities "in view of the construction of the common- *which is what the finality of the singularities themselves consists in,*" we must ask after those singularities' persistence when facing insurmountable capitalist resistance or other, competing universalities (*Kairós...* 215 my

emphasis). As these singularities' *presumed finality*, if their political activation must be horizontal, spontaneous, constitutive- *therefore, common-*, facing momentary faltering one can only think of deactivation, *or failure*. A lack of faith, perhaps. As we've seen in the Argentine videos, this is an unacceptable imposition on their futurity. Negri might never support that, but his insisting on love's *necessarily* generative nature leaves little room for singular persistence, despite the impossibility of common advances. Yet, the cacophonous burst of video and documentary post-*saqueo* shows us, *entre-muchos*, how that can/not be.

A Cacophonous Chorus

As insinuated, the prior discussion is material to the audio-visual tensions I explored above and demands a return to that analysis. But I do not intend to again contrast the NLAC dinosaurs with newer video productions. Rather, I'm interested in the contrasts and tensions within what Jessica Stites Mor has termed the third generation of transition cinema, primarily as part of the *documentalismo* movement that begin during Menem's neo-liberal politicking.⁵¹ I focus on representativity's tensions in this audio-video constellation for several reasons, the first due to how these filmmakers frame themselves as an *innovative* continuation of NLAC politics while positioning themselves *alongside* the current political moment, denouncing the violent and repressive nature of neoliberalism in Argentina. To renew a go-to-the-audience ethos in the neoliberal era, they eschew authorial narrative imposition via re-socialization, relying on epochal solidarity to horizontally (re)authorize their work, as one voice amongst many.

Beyond mimicking earlier documentary's somewhat *auteur* style, they adopt a fuller ethos of participatory production that complicates any complete attribution of authorial intent to the directors. Performative documentary's technics demand they highlight their presence as filmmakers but given the subject matter, they thereby *subordinate* their participation to the filmed sites' situated organization. While they still retain control over editing and dissemination, somewhat, the material arises from and returns to the polyvocal moment of emergent, horizontal subjectivities that it relies upon for recognition. Of further interest are the effects of technological advancements and Argentina's 90s economic bubble for proliferating filmmaking materials and schools, including in historically impoverished areas like the Avellaneda neighborhood (locale of the Pueyrredón bridge). According to Mor, the 90s introduced key technological advancements- widely available hand-held camera technology, easily reproducible VHS recording, digital technology, and so forth- and social changes- an increase in spending to open film schools and training centers and growing informal markets for video that bypassed traditional, heavily regulated official markets.

This surge generated two tensions that interest me. We see that promoting neoliberal models of spectacular audio-visual production, a culture industry tactic for capitalist identitarian subjectivation, ultimately produces the rebellious subjects it hopes to elide. Echoing Negri's assertions around becoming common, by facilitating oppressed groups' acquisition of tools to produce and disseminate "camera as a gun" denunciatory cinema, these policies produce the arms to be used against them. Hence the first tension- imposing neoliberal socio-economic policies to subsume civil society to the State, as a

method of control and subjectivation, capacitates the excesses that become sites of rebellion. Incapable of containing the fluctuating intensities and excessive common life characterizing an increasingly interconnected global population, in their attempts the neoliberal State and global capital end up providing the technology and knowledge required for emergent self-reflexive, collective, ethico-political being to increase cooperative relationality and better practice the autodidactic pedagogy of radical love inherent to continuity with past rebellion.

I can know groups like Grupo Alavío, Ojo Obrero or Cine Insurgente because of this paradox, all cinema of solidarity that arose not from without but within social movements, attesting to state repression of the excessive life beyond the subjectifying capacity of its *nomos*. Despite the contestatory mode's legible engagement with the State's patriarchive, as its obverse, they still undermine that archive in ways anterior and excessive to their contestatory engagement. Their solidarity and re-socialized production allow them to function at the limit of state language. As an example: while "Crónicas de libertad" provides a reproducible and therefore archivable text, by filming *encapuchados* the text also disseminates and puts a face to an effacement of the bourgeois individuality necessary for legible, subjectivizing archivization.⁵² Productions of this sort add texture to the political's limits, attesting to life's un-repressible affective reality as otherwise than state subjectivity.

The second tension is not explicit in Mor's text. It arises from her book's historical framing and, perhaps necessarily, its expansiveness regarding film around the 2001 crisis. Beginning at that statement's end: discussing transition cinema's third

generation videos and documentaries, she folds into one category multiple styles, from independent video to documentaries (including the texts I discuss). She structures *her* argument around social networks and productive relations during certain political moments, which legitimates this leveling. But while this captures the broader cinematic moment, it elides economies of scale that do not factor into her analysis, particularly relating to social capital and the prevalence of the projects' respective ideological tendencies. For all the period's technological advancement, it is dishonest to say that works by Solanas and Grupo Alavío have the same opportunity to be screened, reproduced, or even brought to potential audiences' awareness. Newer platforms like Youtube, which post-dates most of her texts, have leveled the playing field somewhat, but *auteur* name recognition as manifest social capital still determines much awareness of a work. Moreover, while Solanas did adopt hand-held digital camera technology, that Mor can attribute to *his* work a growing critical acceptance of low cost, DIY approaches furthers the point. Production modifications do not obviate cinematographic and narrative decisions, and no amount of participatory intent and fantasy can equate his ideology with Grupo Alavío's. All of which also holds for directors and producers more aligned with emergent, singularly plural relational modes, like Ardito and Molina, insofar as they cleave to conventional documentarian tropes by persisting in non-innovative *stylistic* continuity with NLAC documentary.

Which brings us to the first half of the phrase, concerning the text's historical framing. Again, it is in no way a failing that Mor sets the upper limit at 2004, when Kirchner begins codifying long overdue changes that permitted independent cinema to

thrive. Yet, as I've explored and as historical, political and sociological texts insist, *Kirchnerismo* was not nearly as benevolent as it may appear, from a perspective of rebellion and radical thought. Nestor Kirchner began to incorporate more moderate groups to the State, while simultaneously banning more radical, autonomist organizations- in short, he disabled prior large-scale movements by placating the middle and working classes. While there are scant documents attesting to effects on the production of denunciatory video, Ojo Obrero's prolonged silence (before returning in 2016 with a film about abortion and femicides, *La cena blanca de Romina*) and the later debates around funding cuts and machinations in INCAA under Macri remind us of the State's power to limit unaffiliated, contestatory groups' capacity for action.⁵³ The State can negatively affect these movements, decreasing their capacity to act in various ways: fracturing a movement's ranks by encouraging identitarian chauvinism, overriding solidarity in difference; eliminating their subjects, both those producing them and those centered by them, via economic or political means; and preferentially adjusting legal mechanisms to impede independent groups' access to funding, limiting the ability to cooperatively produce their work and reach those who re-make it, the audience. We must always ask why some persist and others not; or rather, why we still know of some and not of others. Who is recognized and whose works get passed around- and what does that tell us about them as archival texts? Recognition and dissemination are, thus, concerns intersecting ideology and aesthetics- requiring a return to the textual analysis beyond Mor's work. But this time, instead of Solanas, we'll see representations of one event in *Corazón de fábrica* and later in independent video.

Near the end of Ardito and Molina's work they document a Ska-P concert at and in solidarity with Zanón. The scene is fairly conventional concert documentation: alternating mid-range shots from the stage wings with several from immediately in front, we see the band's interactions with both the audience and the factory's representatives as they speak and are spoken about in terms encouraging solidarity with their struggle. What is interesting here is not their ideological construal, *per se*, which is consistent with my above comments on third generation transition cinema's performative embeddedness, but how the film positions *its* audience vis a vis the spectacle and, more importantly, the *spectacle's* primary audience, in a doubly representative act. Primary is very intentional here. A concert, even one documented audio-visually, generally has an immediate intended audience: the group of people attending. This doesn't preclude deferred audiences, but the primary is an integral part of the event. That audience's audio-visual treatment, particularly in the context of anti-capitalist solidarity, is key to the dual representation's allegorical functioning. The *film's* audience is given preferential access to the stage, encouraging identification with the workers central to the event's organization and the documentarians reproducing it. The *concert's* audience, however, whose presence facilitated, formed and gave sense to the concert, is visually homogenized. Instead of being imbedded within the concert's multitudinous audience, the cameras have preferential access for filming and, thus, re-produce, thereby doubling, the *film* audience's distance from the *concert* audience. We either look out over them or are made to perceive them as unified within the camera's, that is, *our* perception. The expressed fantasy is of unitary subjective perception, wherein the *we* implicit to a

collective spectacle, participation in which is proffered audio-visually, is subsumed to the *I* by the presumed transparency of the univocal perceiving subject that the camera becomes.

Despite the main ideological gesture- the film is in solidarity with the workers and does not do them a disservice-, by cleaving to this style of spectacular documentation, it highlights the tension I mentioned regarding audio-visual productions in solidarity and, moreover, solidarity from and for love. A visual analog to the difference between Fernández and the autonomists, we are made *to see* the multitude, the one of many, as opposed to *seeing from* the many as one, the *entre-muchos*. When we're shown them, countless audience members are already one, accounted for by and subsumed to the shots presenting a unique spectacular vision. The *composite* singularity emerges in the spectacle's situation, *and yet* the *multitudinous* singularity is presumed as logically prior from and by our point of view, making sensible the experiences of each singular human body retroactively composing it. Their love and solidarity are only (technically) legible insofar as they are subsumed to a greater project and process, here Zanón's which is, in turn, subsumed to Ardito and Molina's in our later viewing, due its effective iterating of contingency. They are sensible only in service to a revolutionary *telos* overdetermining representation of the moment and the experience. A *telos* framed as legible, with the effacement legibility implies, according to a theoretico-political logic necessarily determined, as we've seen, by the capitalist State's bourgeois, mythopoetic historicizing. Despite, or because of its intentions, this documentary is a *product*, reproducible and consumable regardless of any immediacy in the spectator's relationship to the events

represented. This is both its strength and its weakness, depending on your purpose- its iterability re-presents the event for affective purposes, moving us (to act radically) just as the event moved others, but is also part and parcel of its archival legibility as indexing a *historical* event. Leaving *me* with the question, as I am interested in the audio-visual's viability as rebellious documentation, of whether it can participate horizontally as radical indexicality in a way that does *not* appertain to the State's archive. Briefly, the answer is both yes and no. Because of this, I will focus on a series of videos attesting to the same spectacle.

While the amount of video produced at that concert is likely uncountable, we do have some examples in the collection *Argentina Arde*. If I posed a terribly obnoxious conundrum to end the previous exposition, it's not too difficult to unpack. Yes, of course *I* can offer these videos as documentation of the post-*saqueo* moment's cacophonous visuality as manifest at that concert but, no, they are not as such functional to the hierarchically determined archivization of reality as it is re-presented by audio-visual material. If film's indexical strength, which I've been exploring, is due its relation to contingency and, as Mary Ann Doane states, "cinema has also historically worked to make the contingent legible", we have to ask (230): what do these videos index and are they at all legible *as such*? The latter first, with a quick answer- no, *as such* they are not, as they do not do the work of framing, thus contextualizing, themselves. Their legibility is entirely dependent on supplementary archivization and interpretation- they are only contextualizable as part of the anthology, and their identification as *documents* of this event, indexical to it, originates in *my* cinephilic association of the concert with footage in

Corazón de fábrica.⁵⁴ And so, to return to my comments on digital video's dual indexicality as determined in questions of construal and expression, the video *itself* lacks a determinate ideological construal, other than supplementary critical approaches and anthologizing. Moreover, its substance of expression takes Solanas's fantasy of participatory reproduction to its aporetic nexus by allowing spectators only the fantasy of *presence*: of *being there*, wherever there may be. These videos only index a *having happened*: sheer contingency, the vertiginous being there of a singularity already *entremuchos*, commonality's kernel. Here, more than analysis I offer celebration: of each video's *cacophonous singularity*, for "videographer" and for spectator.

First, the noun. Each video is fundamentally singular yet produced in common. Lacking universalizing pretensions, each video, filmed from the concert audience and at a distance from the stage, does not pretend to encapsulate the audience's entirety nor the concert's essence and is not marked by montage. Much like contemporary hand-held cellular phone video, each registers the "videographer's", if I am still permitted the term, affective experience as one amongst, or of, many. Video quality and perspective, as well as what is (not) included, bear traces of singular decisions taken without concern for the final "product's" reproducibility or marketability, which as the scare quotes suggest, is barely such.⁵⁵ While they do circulate through unofficial channels, that is a secondary effect of the multitudinous singularities gathered in loving solidarity with these rebellious acts. We cannot confuse capitalist market forces as determinate of these admittedly not aesthetically pleasing pieces' dissemination. But that's not to deny indexical functioning, given that singularity is a core aspect of contingency, as Doane insists in the above cited

chapter. Rather, its indexicality follows Jane M. Gaines's understanding of evidentiary indexicality, wherein as moving image, videos can provide a microcosmic, object lesson in determination within a given mode of production.⁵⁶ Attesting to the emphatic relationality of the post-Fordist mode of production increasingly relevant in and determinate of this millennium, these videos are an early index of its determination of sociality, later more fully realized by social media algorithms, etcetera. Yet, they resist any facile extractive attempts in the sheer plurality of the media's singularity, and the archival impediments implied by that ambivalence.⁵⁷

So, then, second- they do not situate the always unnamed and unnamable spectator in an authoritative position; rather, they submerge us in the cacophonous reality of the *entre-muchos*. Cacophonous in the sense that Merriam-Webster lends the term, defining it as a "harsh or jarring *sound*" (my emphasis). Their singularity is cacophonous, a harsh and jarring *sound*, because it is always and necessarily illegible to the archivist and the researcher (re)turning to that archive- sound and fury, signifying nothing. Always out of place, always interfering, always disrupting signification; each video's cacophonous singularity submits the spectator to the ambivalent reality of the *entre-muchos* without universalizing itself. If Philip Rosen is right in characterizing the archivization inherent in the process loosely written event-document-documentary as "the ongoing project of conversion of a relatively unbridled visual indexicality into sense", then we must recall these cacophonous videos' demand for supplementarity when he says that "the closer the image comes to being reduced to pure presence, the more it threatens to become unreadable and requires explanation" (63-4). In each person, in any moment of

and surrounding the video, an excess of decisions re-signifies constantly, refusing to be named and refusing to name; instead, it demands the fantasy of constantly folding our effort in to the cooperative experience of a love of the particular, such that it folds out into radical action's persistence. Unlike its documentary cousins, this video does not reject, but rather embraces the potential in/of early film's specter "of comprehension of the real through a decentralized, potentially free-floating spectatorship" (Rosen 75). Again, a *paradoxical auto-didact's pedagogy*, through which we learn and teach in turn and simultaneously, in, out of, and from faith to the situation whose image flits before our eyes.⁵⁸ Rejecting any sense of catastrophic history told through bourgeois mythopoetic incorporative narrativization, these videos register without capture an insuperable act of loving solidarity.

The videos' supposed aesthetic deficiencies are what allow us to register the past situation's plurality in our supplementary analysis and categorization. This analytic doubling of plurality's register adds discursive texture- both to authorizable aesthetic production concerning that moment *and* our conceptualization of it, meant to provide legibility yet inevitably presuming the legible's form. While it is somewhat apt to say that so-called "videographers" "eschew" the aesthetically pleasing, our awareness of its minimal presence foregrounds how structures of authorization and archivization overdetermine, on the superficial level, documentary production, *and* on a deeper level, our preemptive expectations and demands of said documentation. The contradictions and confusion of the intellectual feedback loop this produces is what reactionarily grants centrality to texts *a là Corazón de fábrica* when discussing radical documentary and

documentation, and thus to the theoretical-political underpinnings that I've highlighted in that work. However, a plurality of visual registers indexing a situation but barely capacitating their own legibility, restores in the present the past situation's vibrant and overwhelming- thus cacophonous- potential. Without excluding the participants, the "documentarians", the spectator, or the unknowable others that may come across them at a later juncture. We later participants can at once associate ourselves with jubilantly documenting solidarity while also understanding another's act as radically distant. We can understand that our solidarity is messy, singular and perhaps too often elided, without for that being less important than spectacular acts that circumscribe situations and cast them forward in time by reducing them to a legible, archivable form.⁵⁹ Despite historical failings, the videos overflow any supplementary stabilizing role in their affective capacity's iterability; in their digital reproduction.

Further, this ability to be widely disseminated, due prior digital technology and social advances, allows them to exist in a space both precarious and resilient. Lacking the production and distribution of larger films, as well as institutionalized intellectual "property" protections that coappear with archivization, they thus lack some of the cultural durability attributable to conventional documentary. However, their incidental spectrality means that they can time and again reappear, as my commenting them years after and in a different situation bears witness to, permitting them a resilience and continuity beyond and otherwise than more staid persistence(s). While digital media's indexical permanence is in perpetual beta, the ability of the people that produced and propagated these videos, and others, to re-access them means they maintain their

cacophonous presence as a fleeting yet recurrent force for destabilization and plurality, despite any political actor's fixation or totalization of the past. The textured register that they (re)present persists beyond their emergent situation, constantly recontextualized as testifying to and complicating a singularly plural rebellion against capitalism's ebbs and flows.

And yet, as I emphasize, we are filtering this through the retrospective of history, of time, of the archive attempting to constitute itself. The contrast that I set up among examples of documentary and documentation signals what escapes that framework- the singular's sense, before and beyond common cause without, for that, ceasing in its ambivalent commonality. Seeing the massive manifestations that characterized the millennial moment in Argentina die down, it is difficult to prevent a certain sense of fatalism from creeping in- a sense of failure, regardless (or rather because) of the framework through which we appraise the moment. To escape this, we must understand that in the singular's indeterminate movement towards the to come, the common is never effaced. As the affective escapes repression as an incontrovertibly singular and embodied register, continuous only in its differential re-intensification, the singularity through which it enters the knowable is the only vessel through which any sense of persistence can be traced. Holding as much for bodies as for videos, this links the audio-visual to our embodied singular plurality and forms the core of my disagreement with the multitude, towards which I have gestured. Without grasping how a shared affective imagination, which is to say commonality, might be carried forward *with(in)* the singularity and *despite* common generativity's repression, thinking a rebellious continuity cannot but fall

into bourgeois historicity's fatalistic mode. But, as events emerging in 2016 made abundantly clear, we cannot, in good conscience and solidarity with Argentine lives, deny that commonality's persistence.

or the Failure of Violence

Since 2016, in Argentina (and across the globe) large-scale social movements have emerged, most notably women's mobilizations. One of the post-*saqueo* video groups, Ojo Obrero, has come out supporting them, releasing their first film after several years of mainly hosting workshops and talks in Buenos Aires. Moreover, in the last months of 2017 there was a massive, common uprising against Santiago Maldonado's disappearance by the *gendarmería* during a mobilization in solidarity with Mapuche communities- an uprising which joined movements denouncing the disappearance of indigenous activist Milagro Sala.⁶⁰ Both these instances and others function dispersedly and horizontally, manifesting a commons that traverses the walls of the State's social sphere, resisting even nominal capture by capitalist apparatuses. They avail themselves of all the current modes of communication- from graffiti to digital presences- and striate neoliberal sociality at its boundaries and in its contradictory unity. Seeing this, one may ask: *where* were these people and *doing what*, if not producing a visible, that is spectacular, commonality?

Again, the tensions between the *entre-muchos* and the multitude underscore our limitations. Multitudinous logic is inadequate when accounting for the common's persistence in the singularity, rather than the singularity's determination by the common's generation. To accept that the common is produced in and by the action of singularities,

we cannot efface the simultaneous inversion: the common must necessarily exist in its entirety within, as constitutive of, each singularity, regardless of the status of its (re)production. But with this inversion, the commonality that becomes, or has been, part of interiority's construction is inaccessible to systematized epistemic apparatuses *by virtue of interiorization*. Even amongst those engaging the co-constitutive ontological emergence (im)proper to collective being- e.g., Jean Luc Nancy's singularly plural- the action of representing, thematizing or *knowing* interiority is kept in suspense as impossible.⁶¹ Maintaining interiority beyond our knowledge systems, these authors (un)wittingly emphasize the politico-ontological juncture's core aporia: the singular experience of moving through ipseity towards collective action that, despite its commonality, always fails at adequation to excessive life and, thus, the common root of ipseity. This marks any project's limited ability to articulate or name what is central to discussing collective politics. One might suggest that therefore Negri turns to Spinoza- he wishes to refrain from transcendentalizing the singular in a knowable generality, texturing the multitude's surface but not subordinating it to the logic of sameness. Despite protestations, I would disagree. Just as Pierre Macherey notes a certain dialectical reading in *The Savage Anomaly*, I argue that despite, or because of, an insistence on the singularity's ample sense- a body composed of singular parts, allowing it to signal both multitude and human body- Negri still ends all but subsuming the *singular's power, particularly regarding the human body, to the common's necessity*.⁶² His philosophical gesture resembles, in this, *Corazón de fábrica's* audiovisual one.

Preferring the multitude's logical priority over the embodied, singular experience of a human working in common, Negri, too, proffers the legible subjectivity I highlighted in Ardito and Molina's film. In the final analysis, its collective contestation of common space and spatial practice is unavoidably saturated by state power, which translates capitalist modes of production into individuals constructed by the law around illusory privacy and self-constituting being. Without formally enacting generative, alternative relationality, nothing else is viable. Overdetermining singularities' actions by the common, not allowing for the conflictive constitutions of space over time that generate collective action, Negri's thought theoretically mirrors the assumption of archivable legibility driving production of and demand for contestatory documentaries. The film and Negri miss the opportunity to significantly challenge capitalist spatial articulations determinate of its relational modes. There is no *pre-existing place* for the cacophonous singularities' divergent potential emergent in *Argentina arde*, nor for the polyvocality of rebellion and persistence signaled, yet never totalized, by *Crónicas de libertad* and other Grupo Alavío videos. The videos comprehend the interweaving of singular subjective experiences as collectively constituting movement in common *from within and alongside* their cacophonous reality. Without presuming the movement's *telos* or consistency, nor the meaning and delimitation of *where* singularities come together. Neither they, nor I, pretend to negate the affective force and love generating common movements, nor presume their inevitability and constant generativity. Rather, they center the action and struggle of singularities as producing a commonality immanent to action, which may yet cease existing or shrivel before the violence of the law- *except* as it persists in the

singular subjects, logically prior to multitudinous expression. The videos (re)produce both their modes of commonality, allowing constantly differentiated movement outward from them as singularities, *and* each common emergence's unique spaces and spatial practices (whose representations become the videos). Much like the concert videos' cacophony signals an active coming together that preempts the documentary project's prioritization of a homogenized multitude and persists beyond both documentary and concert, the singularities Negri subsumes to the multitude are logically prior to it and persist beyond, perhaps despite, any repression it faces. Life is cacophonous, and the singularities emerging from it do nothing to diminish that- they rather adjust to the sounds around them, coming together and moving apart, without abandoning what is common within them.

While I cannot completely detail Negri's singular subordination, I will sketch its broad movements. Occurring throughout *Kairós*, *Alma Venus*, *Multitudo*, it is most extensive in *Multitudo*. The first key is during an exposition of "constellations productive of subjectivity", synonymous with *dispositifs* or assemblages, when he affirms the constellation's increased productivity relative to its co-operative singularities as the production of (communicative) surplus value. He asserts that "the singularities themselves would not exist without co-operation" and that the spontaneous multitude is "the power of the singularities that are brought together within co-operative constellations; *and the common precedes production*" (*Kairós*... 229 emphasis mine). His structure logically prioritizes the common's production before the singular's possibility and renders the productive cycle singularity-constellation-common circular; that is,

tautological. To reiterate, including my prior discussion- the common produced in co-operation *between* singularities is also productive *of* singularities, necessarily potentiating the productivity of the constellations *(re)producing it*. Here he also suggests *terms of the multitude's failure*, acknowledging possible impediments to its loving militancy: postmodern exploitation as deflation, or limiting the multitude's expansion. A problem that, as I've insisted, only exists when ontologically prioritizing constant common generation through a universal love that effaces its necessary singularity by relying overmuch on slippages in meaning, both of "singular" *and* of "love".

Repeating this circularity while discussing a micropolitics of bodies, Negri insists on bodies "as plurality and as relation" such that "the multitude reveals itself as an ensemble and an interweaving of corporeal singularities agitated in the teleological crucible of the common" (*Kairós...* 234). Several conceptual leaps necessitate the multitude's revelation in and by the common, forcing a processual subsumption of the *corporeal* singularity (i.e. human body) without acknowledging the process's multi-directionality. For him, the singular multitude is greater than its parts, without abandoning or homogenizing them, and yet, confusedly, cannot be thought as transcending them.⁶³ Because of this transvaluation, "[t]he political decision is always *solely* the decision *of the multitude*" which, while emphasizing the decision's singularity, still renders logically impossible any corporeal singularity's decisive difference by subsuming it to the multitudinous surplus produced by and yet determining it (*Kairós...* 236 emphasis mine). One might argue here for a certain similarity with Derrida's thought of the decision of the other in me, particularly as per my previous chapter, but this would

be to irremediably confuse the ontological and the political. While I agree that coming *into* being is as *collective being-* or as Nancy says, singularly plural- the decision's impossible passage is always a uniquely singular experience pertaining to the folding-back of/into ipseity. One cannot prioritize the decision of the multitude as common singularity because that presumes the corporeal singularity's constant, decisive passage into being. Born of the face-to-face encounter with the Other, this passage is *only experienced* in the folding of intersubjective space *prior to, yet determined as articulable in*, the common. Here is where his explication of love would enter, as Negri attempts to *retroactively* determine singularities' coming into being as an effect of the common; but his articulation of commonality presumes an event of naming that makes commonality's logical priority impossible. *I and the other* coemerge, coeval in singular plurality, before and so that it is possible to speak of a *we* which always presumes- destabilizes and yet potentiates- *I and Other*.

The final section, on the Decision, most effaces the singular as an impossible instance of responsibility. His reasoning's, and this effacement's, culmination is given thus: “[t]he decision is always multilateral, ‘impure’ and monstrous, because *the singular is always an immeasurable determination of bodies, of languages and of machines*” (*Kairós*... 244 emphasis mine). He proceeds by clarifying that the decision is “an event that involves the common, that decides *upon* the common. But every decision that the singularity takes *involves* the common in some way” (*Kairós*... 245). His savagely effaced inversion resurfaces in this logical plenitude, in the decision's force(s). There is a similarity to Derrida *here*, but only when the necessity of the singular human body's

experiential persistence is reasserted *against* the common's preeminence and *alongside* a refusal of the bourgeois individual's continued subjective functioning. The passive decision's heteronomy is thus complicated by the singularity's plural constitution in and by the common, because the decision *on* the common *in-volves* the common and renders its identity *within and without the singularity* impossible. Common production may, or must, occur but cannot be *known* as common given that *only within the singularity* does the common other decides *on itself*, beyond the singularity it has determined yet which decides upon and generates it in the singular decision. I do not reject the common and its tensions; rather, I force those tensions to re-assert the persistence of a singular corporeal experience containing the common's entirety *as* it decides, *as much as* it necessarily decides on, and with, the common itself, re-producing it. This is the core import of Fernández's inversion, key to understanding the common project's persistence, despite the diminished capacity for action engendered by a negative, affective exploitation of the communicative power produced in and producing the common. Without realizing the potential for radical persistence and for faithfulness to the loving friendship engendered in the mutually impossible responsibility of the face-to-face encounter, we wither in the face of death and exploitation, and the common withers with, *or* in us.

As mentioned, this is the theoretical equivalent of the audiovisual gestures. Both trace tensions between a common vision and the irreducible, singular ethico-political experience- which is at most a sensible, affective texture behind the cacophonous *defacement* of individual exteriority effected by *a common refusal of individualism in favor of a coming politics*. I have worked to trace alongside Argentine video and

documentary an *anarchistic* understanding of the singular's necessary role in common continuity, without assuming its formal legibility for the patriarchive. One must recognize that all that is common is common only in singularities, themselves in common and common in themselves. Subordinating or subsuming the singular to the multitudinous project (be it political, philosophical or epistemo-historicist), and effacing the site of love's and responsibility's affective experiences, only invites failure. This holds not just in theory, but also in the representations that we make of political rebellion. Audiovisual and academic, sociological or philosophical- any grasping at a moment that presumes a consistency of what it grasps at will fall apart, as the life that compose a moment slips through our fingers.

While Negri sets aside both Derrida and Levinas-in-Derrida as, respectively, too literary and too mystical, these objections seem to me, rather, strengths when approaching the multitude to recover something otherwise than Negri's mystical, pauline-inflected spinozian materialism.⁶⁴ He includes them amongst thinkers of love, solidarity and friendship, that lack a thinking of subjectivity- a charge that unfairly understands their works and those of the others included with them, a group that mostly does not pretend to think militant subjectivity, unlike Negri (and myself). As I aim to retain Negri for thinking what's to come through any situation or object, I must insist that love, art and solidarity necessarily rely upon the singular ethical experience as an indivisible part of the common's broader ethics- especially after the euphoric optimism of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, captured in these documentaries and videos. For this, the deconstruction of the bounded individual is, and pardon the term, essential for

investigating the singularity-in-common that fulfills, we might say, Walt Whitman's prophetic line: "(I am large, I contain multitudes)" (74). In my understanding, it corrects a tendency, ironic in Negri given his critique of Deleuze and Guattari's opposite tendency, to favor the common and leave the singular ethical-political experience for the to come, as though it had not been thought by others.⁶⁵

Having moved further toward, or into, the to come of the emergent post-*saqueo* subjectivities, if we are to persistent in our singularly plural solidarity with what has been, we must make it impossible to think of failure while reflecting on hopeful affections. While the deconstructive gesture might not strive toward militant subjectivity, no *textual* gesture can- only the realization of horizontal left praxis can construct rebellious subjects. So, these tensions must be thought and explicated for consistency and to avoid effacing horizontal politics' inherent ambivalence. For me, only in (the) common(s) can modelling singular action motivated by love and solidarity be thoroughly realized: it is struggle's continuity and, re-presenting it here, audio-visual materials that most effectively comprehend the cacophonously singular experiences of affective complexity, resituating it in our present mo(ve)ments. Functioning according to these currents of solidarity and love, while also representing them, the burst of audiovisual production encompassing *video rebelde* carries those lessons out, to recontextualize- that is, re-produce- their commonality, time and again, with greater and greater force and despite unforeseeable capitalist resistance.

To see what is to come

If my constant theme has been the persistence of radical thought and subjectivity through time, I have pursued its elaboration by discussing audio-visuality because of the *recent* resurgence of this rebellion against the State. During increasingly ubiquitous digitalization, these movements exceed purely presentist spatial practices of territorial occupation, overflowing the digital sphere, wherein writing and the audio-visual intermingle on equal terms. As I explored with Grupo Alavío's work and *Argentina arde*, these video forms don't simply facilitate (albeit incomplete) representations of emergent singularly plural subjectivities, without presuming to archive some impossible totality; they spectrally persist beyond long standing hegemonic left politics, which centered the assumption of State power. Indexing a continual resurgence of rebellion in Argentina, they are points amongst others, registering a persistent radical subjectivity common as long as the singular composes and contains our commonality, carrying it forward.

A conjunction of contestatory materials, they not only allow for a plurality of easily accessible documents indexing struggles past to facilitate those continued and those new; they also trace an anarchic drive that disassembles any attempted archivization of a life excessive to the State's individualizing subjectivation. Both legalistic political subjectivation and multitudinous discourses of paradoxically transcendentalizing singularization are inadequate to life. These videos' eternal (for now) return belies the political's predetermined fixities at the moment of their failure to contain excessive life's radical persistence, regardless of the State's attempts to overdetermine subjective existence. They are testament to, and participant in, the escape of alternative

forms of being (political) from the bounds of previously convenient categories, to which the left so often subsumes its cacophony of voices. And, although figures like Solanas may continue cleaving to national utopian imaginaries, these videos and the movements they participated in re-present alternative relational modes beyond state bounds, even when it seems we might be ever mired by them.

They also provide us with a strong sense of innovative continuity when approaching contemporary, lived rebellions. Particularly as regards Santiago Maldonado, disappeared while acting in solidarity with the Mapuche near the Chilean border (who are an originary threat to the colonial, capitalist State's spatial practices and territoriality), the ability to escape, exceed, or move otherwise than the literal and figurative boundaries of State sociality and politics is a precondition of common continuity. Situating rebellious video within a larger continuity of writing and acting in loving solidarity with the unnamable excess within and without statist political subjectivity allows us to better sense what is to come by proliferating singular expressions of these tendencies- uncountable voices speaking cacophonously beside and amongst one another. By preserving for the singular a role in common projects we also understand the limit case at which a common project might fail, particularly in being known but, more importantly, also as regards the question of its commonality.

That is, this discussion of commonality, expansive as it may be in theory, has so far obviated *certain* questions of recognition. To ask seems to contradict the thought I ask it of, but: which bodies can *be* in common, thus be singularly plural, in a *practical* sense? For instance, when we speak of ethical encounters in loving solidarity, but confine

ourselves to spatial practices more often than not urban, how does even *this* framework hold up *beyond* the urban? Does it function for subjects formed on the fringes of, but still central to, the neoliberal State, its changing mode of production and its relational modes? More importantly: to what extent does it account for impossibilities proper to a limitrophe experience of recognition, that of a subject continually but incompletely arriving to the common, cleaving to an arrival that cleaves them in turn and never permits the plenitude of singularity, as paradoxical as that may sound? As forms of being otherwise than state subjectivity flourish, further questioning the State's assumptions, the question of commonality itself must come upon the originary limit of any American state discourse- the indigenous communities that have long superseded hegemonic politics. But to pretend that they can be wholly excluded from it would also be an error, as that line can never, neither in theory nor practice, be firmly drawn. Indigenous subjects have often participated in or formed part of hegemonic political and cultural practices, as much as they can and do produce forms of radical action both legible and illegible to apparatuses of authorization and recognition. A constant tension pervades the figure of the indigenous/subject when discussing radical politics in Latin America, strung out over the bar between indigenous and subject- a gap impossible to bridge completely, the point of failure for many politics of solidarity and *any* attempt to decide a common subject to come. So, I close this chapter with this open note - to what extent do the Mapuche, who already undermine the territorial distinction between the Argentine and Chilean states, and the modern State form as such, bring to their limits the questions of solidarity, love, failure, academia and the order of the law that I have, up until this point, explored?

Endnotes

¹ Here and throughout, my usage of the term “patriarchive” refers to the work of Jacques Derrida, specifically his *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, Trans. Eric Prenowitz, (Chicago: Univ of Chicago Press, 1998).

² Antonio Prado, amongst others, distinguishes both Bruckman and Zanón for their horizontal organizational methods in his article “Anarchism and Counterinformation in Documentaries: From Civil War Spain to Post-2001 Argentina,” *Latin American Perspectives* (2013 40.1) 50-59, which also details the similarities between video groups such as Grupo Alavío and Spanish anarchist cinema, and their relation to the style of Russian cinematographer Dziga Vertov.

³ While there are countless sources attesting to this tendency, the following provide excellent overviews of the moment: Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, “The Crisis of 2001 and Argentine Democracy,” *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, Ed. Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006) 3-26; Guido Galafassi, “Para Una Relectura De Los Procesos De Conflicto y Movilización Social En La Argentina De Inicios Del Milenio (2001-2003),” *Revista Mexicana De Sociología* (2012 74.1) 69–98; Olga Onuch, “‘It’s the Economy, Stupid,’ or Is It? The Role of Political Crises in Mass Mobilization: The Case of Argentina in 2001,” *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014) 89-114; Christopher Wylde, “Continuity and Change in the Interpretation of Upheaval: Reexamining the Argentine Crisis of 2001-2,” *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014) 23-44; and Maristella Svampa, “Revisiting Argentina 2001-13: From “¡Que se vayan todos!” to the Peronist Decade,” *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014) 155-73.

⁴ This, in turn, complicates the observations of Jean-Louis Baudry in “Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus,” *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader*, Ed. Philip Rosen (New York: Columbia UP, 1986) 286-97. Michael Renov, in the Introduction to *Theorizing Documentary* makes the essential point, regarding any privileged representative authority, that the main distinguishing mark of documentary vis a vis fiction is the *historical status* of its referent. Yet, despite this, as he says “[e]very documentary representation depends upon its own detour from the real, through the defiles of the audio-visual signifier (via choices of language, lens, proximity, and sound environment). The itinerary of a truth’s passage (with ‘truth’ understood as propositional and provisional) for the documentary is, thus, qualitatively akin to that of

fiction” (7). In the following, exactly those detours, and their slight returns, are what will interest me in this, nominally, documentary material.

⁵ In this way, I respond to a similar demand as that of Paula Rabinowitz in her *They Must Be Represented: The Politics of Documentary* as concerns what subjective agency these texts seek to or might produce, but now in a moment beyond the centrality and assuredness of representation.

⁶ A tendency to play with indexicality in post-200 Argentine films forms a central thematic in Verónica Garibotto’s excellent recent book, *Rethinking Testimonial Cinema in Postdictatorship Argentina: Beyond Memory Fatigue*- see especially Chapter 2. While I am here interested in the indexicality of these videos and documentaries, I leave aside any strong stance on the ontological debate around the shift from film to digital. I am in general agreement with Frank Kessler, particularly his “What you get is what you see: Digital images and the claim on the real” in *Digital Material: Tracing New Media in Everyday Life and Technology*, wherein he highlights how much of this concern hinges on the inherent *manipulability* of digital images- which, as he says, has long obtained regarding all forms of images and does not by necessity diminish the digital’s capacity to materially attest to an event’s having been. Acknowledging new ontological implications of the digital, I would like to sustain its indexical functioning, with a caveat- as Kessler says, “the ‘claim on the real’ no longer depends on the indexical image but on the status a viewer ascribes to that discourse” wherein audiovisual and photographic materials are not merely documents *of*, but discourses *on* what they happen to index (192). Hence my later turn to the substances of expression and content, and the fantasies they enable, to determine these materials’ status and functioning- and how the contingency of any captured image affects this play. Moreover, I would here highlight a fundamental misunderstanding in critiques of digital indexicality, one I return to below- its implicit dematerialization performed in the eulogies for film. Digital files are also *profoundly* material- those famed 1s and 0s are *physically inscribed* on the hard-drive that stores them and, as anyone with rigorous digital hygiene is aware, are significantly more difficult to eliminate than, say, a photographic negative is to burn.

⁷ For a canonical exposition of the politics and place in global cinema history of classic argentine documentary, see Michael Chanan, *The Politics of Documentary*, (London: British Film Institute, 2007). Moira Fradinger, in her “Revisiting the Argentine Political Documentary of the Late 1950s and Early 1960s,” *Latin American Perspectives* (2013 40.1) 37-49, also offers a reflection on some classic documentaries through the lens of the contemporary resurgence of documentary and video.

⁸ While my usage of this term was originally a reference to a conversation I had long ago with a good friend about lingering massive ideological tendencies, Paul A. Schroeder Rodríguez, in “After New Latin American Cinema” also highlights its use in a talk by Paul Leduc and explicates it, in relation to the many “lizards” of today, as

opposed to and, in its death, signaling the emergence of the video forms that I explore in this chapter.

⁹ I owe this point to Alejandro Grimson's "Spatial Politics and Urban Borders: A Study of Buenos Aires," *The City is the Factory: New Solidarities and Spatial Strategies in an Urban Age*, Ed. Miriam Greenberg and Penny Lewis (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ Press, 2017) 178-96.

¹⁰ The chapters by Edward Epstein and Maristella Svampa & Damián Corral in *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, Ed. Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006) explicitly link MTD de Solano with Aníbal Verón.

¹¹ For a detailed exploration of these continuities, see the chapters by Christopher Wylde and Cecilia T. Lanata Briones & Rubén M. Lo Vuolo in *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014) and those by José Nun and Jorge Schvarzer in *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, Ed. Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006).

¹² I am referring to the work "Police, Politics, and Society in the Province of Buenos Aires," *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, Ed. Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006) 53-72.

¹³ My usage of the necro-political here is entirely indebted to Achille Mbembe's "Necropolitics," *Public Culture* (2003 15.1) 11-40.

¹⁴ I borrow the term from Sayak Valencia's *Gore Capitalism* but reject the paradoxically invisible spectacular visibility she ascribes to its role in contemporary capitalism. Despite its prominence, I see it as being a secondary function of contemporary capitalism and not a new form of primitive accumulation, as she intuits.

¹⁵ I refer the reader back to the Introduction.

¹⁶ As concerns the text's nature as performative documentary, I again refer the reader to Veronica Garibotto, *ibid*. But, where she sees a tendency in this moment towards an almost absurd parody of testimonial documentary, Solanas's performance here is decidedly overdetermined by his reasserting his authority in a testimonial mode associated with New Latin American Cinema- a movement he is strongly associated with. So, his performance is doubled, then- he is performing the conventions of performative documentary, while still falling back on a primary, mostly uninterrogated testimonial mode. More importantly, the emphasis I place here on the substance of expression and of content as facilitating fantastic identification and ideological construal are explicit

references to Paul Willemsen's "Idexicality, Fantasy and the Digital", which informs their usage throughout.

¹⁷ I owe this observation to Laura Podalsky's *The Politics of Affect and Emotion in Contemporary Latin American Cinema: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, and Mexico*, in Chapter 1 where she discusses NLAC tendencies. Also, this fits into what Philip Rosen says in "Document and Documentary: On the Persistence of Historical Concepts", about the earlier, Griersonian schema wherein "the Griersonian conceptualization of documentary film is a theory about the function and duties of elites with respect to the mass of the population, not just as political leaderships but as 'educators' who, among other things, are urged to work as productive agents of the media" (80). Yet, as he adds shortly, complicating that point and moving us towards the following note, "Intellectuals are said to construct the mass in order to have something to direct information toward, as an addressee that can be moved to the end of promoting the good (liberal or revolutionary) society. Any such version of the mass, whether as the potential site of social harmony or revolution, becomes a fantasmatic social unity and directionality because it now stands revealed as a product of the delusory self-identifications of the intellectuals" (82).

¹⁸ The purely negative version of this point is made most succinctly by María Belén Ciancio and Rachel Grace Newman in the article "Labyrinths and Lines of Memory in Documentary Film: *Memoria del saqueo* and *Los Rubios* from a Philosophical Perspective".

¹⁹ From now on, I will refer to them by their first names, as their comrades did, to not alienate their lives excessively in my writing.

²⁰ As Podalsky, *ibid.*, says: "Instead of examining how films organize or fix the spectator's visual apprehension of the profilmic space or how they deploy moral distinctions to align us with particular characters rather than others, we need to acknowledge and account for the myriad touch-points through which films and situated audiences encounter each other" (14).

²¹ Concerning the general structure and tendencies of the melodramatic as a mode, and not a genre as such, see Linda Williams's "Melodrama Revised" in *Refiguring American Film Genres: History and Theory*. As concerns the function of the melodramatic in driving active political radicalization, see Jane M. Gaines's "Documentary Radicality" (which will return later). Finally, as regards emotional response/closeness as grounding representative reality/real-ness, see Gabriel F. Giralt's "Realism and Realistic Representation in the Digital Age".

²² When I refer to the invisible or invisibilization, I am referring to Michael Chanan's piece "Filming 'the Invisible'", which was for him supplementary to the above *The Politics of Documentary*.

²³ In this way, the body is neatly fitted into the trifecta of corporeal representations that Bill Nichols highlights in the above cited chapter, "'Getting to know you...': Knowledge, Power, and the Body". To gloss, he sees the three orders as: 1) the social actor, subject of historical action and events, 2) the narrative character, object of actions and enigmas in the narrative and, finally, 3) a "mythical, ahistorical persona, type, icon, or fetish" (184). Here we clearly see Darío as construed visually within the third category- cast backward into the mythopoetic narrativization with which Solanas attempts to ground the Argentine people, and which he (perhaps ironically) shares with the Argentine state. This highlights the valence of the iconic, as opposed to solely symbolic or indexical, in Paul Willemen's piece, *ibid.*- its referentiality as being fundamentally retrospective. That is the functioning to which he subordinates indexicality- and I would argue that the symbolic is nigh entirely effaced, as any (interpretive) futurity proper to it is always already of a future *past*.

²⁴ Concerning Grupo Alavío participating in an act of anarchist counter-information, see Antonio Prado, *ibid.* While his exposition of stylistic similarities may present a weak linkage, based on the elevation of violent resistance to police repression and the politicized aesthetic decisions at play in the short, I am strongly inclined to agree. In another framework, Marita Sturken asserts that "independent video constitutes a field of cultural memory, one that contests and intervenes with official history" in a piece that opposes video memory to cinema as history (2).

²⁵ My preference here, and throughout, for the term "rebellion" or its variations is an explicit homage and reference to Albert Camus's *The Rebel*, Trad. Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage Books, 1959). This despite his distaste for violence and my support for it, in certain instances, as well as various other philosophical disjunctions.

²⁶ Derrida, *ibid.*, 10-11.

²⁷ This is, of course, referring to Bazin's beautiful "Death Every Afternoon", printed in translation in *Rites of Realism: Essays on Corporeal Cinema*. As he says, "Death is surely one of those rare events that justifies the term [...] *cinematic specificity*" (30).

²⁸ As before, I use symbols conforming to Willemen's, *ibid.*, understanding of the symbolic as invested with *futurity*.

²⁹ While this point is oft repeated, for an interesting, tensed articulation of it, see the cited works by Colectivo Situaciones and the later, collective work by MTD de Solano and Colectivo Situaciones, composed as a corrective to the first. This pairing,

particularly in the framing by Colective Situaciones provided at the beginning of the *La hipótesis 891*..., in the hiatus between the words of the militant intellectuals and the piqueteros themselves across which both reach, serves to set up both a sense of continuity as well as innovation in the autonomist piquetero groups, impossible to do justice to, whatever that means, in those, my, or any text.

³⁰ My understanding of the distinction between affection and affect in Spinoza is, much like Negri's, explicitly due to Gille Deleuze's work, in particular his *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*, Trad. Robert Hurley (San Francisco: City Lights, 1988).

³¹ For an excellent overview and discussion of Latin American thought concerning television and the screen, see Patrick Dove, *Literature and "Interregnum": Globalization, War, and the Crisis of Sovereignty in Latin America* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2016), predominately Chapter 2.

³² With *rostro*, I refer to Giorgio Agamben's writing on the face in *Means Without End*, but I have consciously chosen to maintain the Spanish translation for "face" in the title. The Spanish terms mirror what he does with "volto" and "visi" in the original Italian, and, aside from the Spanish term being subject appropriate, I prefer it to the rendering as "face" and "visage" in the English, which presents what I feel is the opposite of the terms' usages.

³³ In a certain sense, this video structures and produces the event of the archive's deconstruction, given that "the technical structure of the *archiving* archive also determines the structure of the *archivable* content even in its very coming into existence and in its relationship to the future. The archivization produces as much as it records the event" (Derrida, *ibid.*, 17).

³⁴ In a rather characteristic move, Derrida makes this point in a footnote near the beginning, conventionally understood, of *Archive Fever*, which I quote here at length, highlighting his assertion concerning measurement:

Of course, the question of a politics of the archive is our permanent orientation here, even if the time of a lecture does not permit us to treat this directly and with examples. This question will never be determined as one political question among others. It runs through the whole of the field and in truth determines politics from top to bottom as *res publica*. There is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory. *Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and the access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation.* (4)

³⁵ My thinking of the state of the university and its function in the (post-)modern moment is heavily indebted to Willy Thayer, *La crisis no moderna de la universidad*

moderna: Epílogo de El conflicto de las facultades (Santiago de Chile: Cuarto propio, 1996).

³⁶ The idea of a militant intellectual is most thoroughly explored at the beginning of the joint work by MTD de Solano and Colectivo Situaciones, *La hipótesis 891: Más allá de los piquetes* (Buenos Aires: ED Mano a Mano, 2002).

³⁷ I must admit here that, while my work and in many ways that of Fernández stresses autonomist elements of the moment, that is not to say that all assemblies and piquetero groups can be characterized as such. In fact, that very diversity and fragmentation plays a key role in the coming years' dissolution and diminution of the energies of this moment. For an excellent look at the composition of the masses in 2001 and 2002, see the chapters by Maristella Svampa & Damián Corral and Edward Epstein (2006), *ibid.*

³⁸ Concerning the literality of these -territorializations, see Galafassi, *ibid.*, Grimson, *ibid.*, and Svampa (2014), *ibid.*

³⁹ This point is particularly salient given the relevance that autonomist thought had in Argentina at the time, as noted by Scorer, *ibid.* It is worth noting that I, as will become apparent, am inclined to disagree with his heavy-handed application of autonomist concepts, at times without modification, to the Argentine situation, which leads to what I feel are mis-readings of several historical texts and overdetermined discussions of various events.

⁴⁰ These weren't new difficulties even then, as evident in the MTD de Solano and Colectivo Situaciones' *La hipótesis 891: Más allá de los piquetes*, which discusses them from the crisis's outset by recalling long standing left schisms, reinforcing continuity without effacing the moment's unique aspects, nor the specter of failure. While recalling to mind my discussion of the Montoneros and the left in the previous chapter, I would like to append a citation James McGuire's *Peronism Without Perón: Unions, Parties, and Democracy in Argentina* (Stanford: Stanford Univ Press, 1997). While this is not his goal, the machinations and infighting that he details, particularly amongst the various unions associated with Peronism, does an excellent job of demonstrating why the working classes that might otherwise rely on the unions found themselves somewhat abandoned to their fate, particularly in the two decades leading up to the 2001 crisis.

⁴¹ On Kirchner's policies/politics regarding the piqueteros, see the chapters by Epstein and Svampa & Corral, *ibid.*, as well as those by Svampa and Dinerstein in *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014).

⁴² These various conflicts offer one well tread disagreement with the multitude by complicating almost to the point of annulling Negri's universalizing assertions about real subsumption, destabilizing its temporality. For an excellent discussion of this and other debates concerning Marxist concepts and their use in Negri, in the context of a defense of Negri, see Kenneth Surin, "'Now Everything Must Be Reinvented': Negri and Revolution," *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, Ed. Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, Vol. 1 (Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto, 2005) 205-42. We could follow with a discussion of primitive accumulation and extractivism in Latin America, as he does in a 2011 interview with members of Colectivo Situaciones. The interview with these members can be found at <https://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/dialogos/21-208601-2012-11-26.html>

⁴³ In addition to the many previous cited works, see also Miguel A. Rivera-Quiñones's chapter "Macroeconomic Governance in Post-Neoliberal Argentina and the Relentless Power of TNCs: The Case of the Soy Complex" in *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014) 67-86. In it he provides a strong analysis of this rocky transition during the Kirchner years, using the role of Trans-National soy processing corporations as a case study.

⁴⁴ Concerning the political and economic machinations of Macri during this era, see the piece "Argentina's Main Opposition Figure Faces Multiple Legal Challenges" by Andrés Gaudín, as well as several previously cited works. In Marcos Novaro's *Historia de la Argentina contemporánea: de Perón a Kirchner* (Buenos Aires: Edhasa, 2006), a serpentine recounting of the political machinations over several decades in Argentina, the Macri family also receives special mention as one of few business groups favored by the dictatorship. Heike Schaumberg's thinking of the Kirchner years as a crisis intermezzo, or a break between crises, in "Argentina Since 2001: From Spontaneous Uprising to 'Transition,' or a Crisis Intermezzo?" *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, Ed. Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014) 135-54, becomes frighteningly prescient in the 2016/17 moment.

⁴⁵ He follows the logic: appetite as man's essence, pursuing perfection in an indefinite time-desire as appetite accompanied by its idea-joy as the passion through which mind passes to greater perfection-love as joy accompanied by an idea of external cause. See his *The Savage Anomaly* pp. 144-7.

⁴⁶ While Spinoza begins to set up his discussion in part IV of the *Ethics* (see, for example, IV P59, 147) it comes to a fuller articulation in part V, Of Human Freedom, principally between P7, 165 and P16, 169. Reading these propositions alongside Negri's thought of the multitude makes it immediately apparent that they are of principal necessity to his thinking of the affective state of said multitude, despite his hesitancy in

The Savage Anomaly to consider the fifth part finished, perhaps due to a certain dialectical tendency of his reading, to which we will return. But, to further support a key assertion of my own, one might understand his reticence before passages such as Proposition 9: “If an affect is related to more and different causes which the mind considers together with the affect itself, it is less harmful, we are less acted on by it, and we are affected less toward each cause, that is the case with another, equally great affect, which is related only to one cause, or to fewer causes” (166). Spinoza makes this point specifically to assert the diminution of harmful affects, but it also serves to emphasize the importance of maintaining a strong thought of the singular in discussions of the affective, as opposed to granting preeminence to the multitude or the common, to allow for continued action despite negative affections- something Negri does not do, as I will attempt to show as this chapter progresses.

⁴⁷ The centrality and importance of *pietas* is made most clear by Spinoza in Part V, Proposition 20 (170 in the cited text). Mutman makes these points in “Difference, Event, Subject: Antonio Negri’s Political Theory as Postmodern Metaphysics”.

⁴⁸ While this tension plays a central role in determining the discussion in the passages cited in the above note, it is played out mainly in part IV and is the driving force for his shift towards the preeminence of Reason, the nonetheless imperfect understanding of which man might have he states most clearly in the Scholium to Proposition 62 (149).

⁴⁹ Mutman makes this point most succinctly on pages 155-7.

⁵⁰ In this he contradicts a reading of Spinoza understanding the affects’ intensities and the in-dissociable imaginations they inspire, as Spinoza even suggests negative affects’ utility as a check to excessive love, despite love’s primacy. What interests *me* in Spinoza’s discussion begins in part IV at propositions 43 and 44 (139) and continues until proposition 58 (146), with the conjunction of proposition 47: “Affects of hope and fear cannot be good of themselves,” and the scholium to proposition 54, which presents how those affects, and others, may come to be good, being of particular interest to my disagreement with Negri.

⁵¹ While my most explicit engagement with Mor appears in this section, my thought on this period of audio-visual production in Argentina and its politics is more than heavily indebted to her work *Transition Cinema: Political Filmmaking and the Argentine Left since 1968*, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012). In truth, my work could not exist without hers, and for that I am deeply grateful.

⁵² Horacio Legras discusses similar issues of legibility as concerns the emergence and activities of these groups in Argentina in a piece entitled “Insurgencia popular e inscripción soberana en las movilizaciones populares del año 2001 en Argentina”, which he was kind enough to share with me and for which I am very thankful. While his

discussion centers the ways in which the physical occupation of urban space by these groups' manifestations, which took as their central referent(s) spaces established by and inscribed within the national imaginary, thus (re-)incorporating them into hegemonic political flows and lending a historical coherence to the moment, my centering of audio-visual material and archival questions is meant to underscore similar dilemmas in discussions of audiovisual representation and subjectivity.

⁵³ Some introductory discussion to this event can be found in the cited articles "Marcha en defensa del cine nacional: Los directores, contra el ajuste del Incaa" and "Más ajuste: el INCAA anunció que en 2018 no dará créditos al cine argentino" and several pieces discussing this can be found on Ojo Obrero's blog, available at <http://ojoobrero.org/wordpress/textos/>.

⁵⁴ This cinephilia is a strong presence in Doane's piece and debates around Willemen's work. For a lovely elaboration of these debates' theoretical kernel as they relate to indexicality, see André Habin's "Reel Changes: Post-mortem Cinephilia or the Resistance of Melancholia".

⁵⁵ As such, they embody something alluded to by Monica Frota in her "Taking Aim: The Video Technology of Cultural Resistance", that is, that the political efficacy of video as such can be processual, as opposed to product-oriented.

⁵⁶ This point comes almost directly from Gaines's excellent "Documentary Radicality", especially comments on p.13.

⁵⁷ In referencing the media's singular plurality, or plural singularity, I am referencing the excellent talk given by Samuel Weber at USC as part of the "Media, Form and Thought" lecture series on March 18th, 2019, entitled "The Mediacy of the Media: A Psychoanalytic Account". While the talk is unpublished, he was kind enough to provide me with the text afterwards, for which I am immensely grateful.

⁵⁸ And this pedagogical slant is not at all foreign to video. As Ron Burnett points out in his contribution to *Resolutions: Contemporary Video Practices*, entitled "Video: The Politics of Culture and Community", "perhaps the most important is that the electronic image can be an effective tool to *teach* and *inform* both practitioners and viewers. This is, in a sense, the philosophical and ideological basis upon which the video movement has built its credibility" (283).

⁵⁹ Although, we must always keep in mind that supplementing their indexicality has had and continues to have a stabilizing role in modernity. As Doane says in another piece, "[t]he isolation of contingency as embodying the pure form of an aspiration, a utopian desire, ignores the extent to which the structuring of contingency, as precisely

asystematic, became the paradoxical basis of social stability in modernity” (“The Object...” 87).

⁶⁰ For some introduction to and analysis of these different movements, see: Andrés Gaudín, “Argentina Riled by Case of Missing Activist,” *NotiSur*, 13 October 2017, ladb.unm.edu/notisur; Andrés Gaudín, “Calls for the Release of Jailed Activist Go Unheeded in Argentina,” *NotiSur*, 13 January 2017, ladb.unm.edu/notisur; Johanna Marris, “Mass Condemnation of Gender Violence Leads to Regional Protests on Unprecedented Scale,” *NotiSur*, 18 November 2016, ladb.unm.edu/notisur; Constanza Tabbush and Melina Gaona, “Gender, Race, and Politics in Contemporary Argentina: Understanding the Criminalization of Activist Milagro Sala, Leader of the Organización Barrial Tupac Amaru,” *Feminist Studies* (2017 43.2) pp. 314-47.

⁶¹ Here I restrict myself to commenting the ontological work of the titular essay in Jean-Luc Nancy, *ibid.*

⁶² I refer here to Pierre Macherey, “Negri's Spinoza: From Mediation to Constitution,” *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, Ed. Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, Vol. 2 (Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto, 2007) 7-27.

⁶³ On the confusedness of this gesture, see again Mutman, *ibid.*, p. 153-7. Doing nothing to help, Negri, on p. 240 of the text, negates the singularity’s negation in the common, insisting that therein it is somehow posited *again*- without difference- while the common is also always already constitutive of it.

⁶⁴ For Negri’s extended commentary on Derrida and the other thinkers, see Casarino and Negri, *ibid.* 86-9. Mutman, *ibid.*, also points to this assertion in *Kairós, Alma Venus, Multitudo* and succinctly points out its strange hypocrisy in note 17 of his piece (166).

⁶⁵ As concerns the elucidation of his divergences from and commonalities with Deleuze and Guattari’s thinking of multiplicity, and his passing commentary on their emphasis on the singular, which I am referencing here, see Casarino and Negri, *ibid.* 123-9.

Chapter 4

In the folds of a blue dream: Elicura Chihuailaf and his Impossible Place

*Power does not deprive or strip freedom from the person;
freedom establishes those categories of persons
who will be prohibited from the concerted exercise
which, alone, constitutes freedom.
-Judith Butler, Who sings the nation-state?*

I ended the prior chapter with a damning question; damning for my own work, surely, but also for the discourses of left politics I have engaged and that pervade the histories of the works I have chosen so far. And so, it's fitting that the question is reiterated here, to leave little doubt of my final inquiries' tone. Given that relations, or lack thereof, with the various peoples subsumed under the term "indigenous" are foundational to the development of the Latin American state, in the plenitude of the term foundational that brings in the threat, the promise, questions of hospitality and recognition, the economic bases for development and much more- to what extent can we speak of indigeneity using state language? Even when those terms emerge from thinking non- and anti-statist subjectivities, persisting in common as an escape from the capitalist State's apparatuses of economic and epistemic capture, can they ever truly arrive at a recognition and speaking of the Mapuche, who I will take as exemplary for this chapter, in Chile and Argentina? Or rather, to fold the problematic over itself, can they ever permit that the *Mapuche* arrive, completely, if I might foolhardily use that word, to the language of a politics determined by or in conflict with the (always already colonial) capitalist State and its law as inscribed in and inscribing its language? This problematic brings to bear everything I have explored up to this point: the patriarchal as determining

the legibility of subjectivities and aesthetic objects; the ethical experience of a responsibility engendered in the loving face to face encounter with the other, before the law, and carried out despite the comrade's absent presence; and the structures of recognition and authorization determining the limits at which one might, or must, act out (of) a solidarity without nomological pretense. That, instead, we must write only so that others may continuously be capacitated to bear loving solidarity forward in the iterability of a politics that refuses to capture the unknowable other by any given, or received, concept.

There is an immense temptation, constantly present when discussing Latin American leftism, to take for granted that the way left politics are formulated will equally well serve the colonized populations of the continents, who are, to date, undeniably ill served by all forms of dominant, State politics since European colonization. I share this temptation as I attempt to trace alternative ways to conceive of what, perhaps, straddles the limits of the political in Argentina and Chile, with an eye towards establishing a loving sense of friendship and solidarity amongst the cacophonous singularities that constantly emerge as an escape from the State's language. But, and I ended the last chapter with this qualification, even the most horizontal movements for singularly plural being are only just now, it seems, truly coming upon the originary limits of State thought; nay, the thought of Latin America as such. An encounter that can only reinforce that, best intentions aside (best being perhaps too generous), they did not yet include the indigenous peoples in their relational modes. At least, not in such a way as to allow that both parties acted and increased their capacity to act, mutually- something I consider an

effective baseline for measuring solidarity beyond any production of abjection or spectacular redemption on the part of whomsoever assumes it.¹ As such, this will tense in the utmost all thought of solidarity, love and unity that may arise *in* these encounters- or rather, may have arisen *beforehand*. Which is exactly the problem.

At the moment of writing this, in early 2018, beyond five centuries of colonial violence, there have been almost three decades of renewed resistance by the Mapuche in both Argentina and Chile, coinciding approximately with the end of their respective dictatorships. The incidents in Argentina have brought forth the recurrent cries of anarchy and lawlessness that characterize the capitalist State's response to challenges to its sovereign authority to dispose of all that falls within its bounds- lives and land alike. This has signaled a surprising resurgence in awareness of and debate concerning the Mapuche in Argentina. Chile, on the other hand, is at the point of closing a third decade of outspoken activism by Mapuche and non-Mapuche alike, against repressive state politics regarding the indigenous inhabitants of Chile, insofar as the State chooses to acknowledge their existence. Along with the unique history of persistent resistance by the Mapuche to Spanish colonial rule, this forceful continuity is why I focus principally on the Chilean context. But let it be stated without hesitation- these conflicts belie the very territorial distinctions upon which the two States attempt to geographically distinguish themselves and, moreover, deeply engage them as the re-emergence of a profoundly existential threat.

A geopolitical, territorial distinction with colonial roots, the name "Chile" also demarcates the region within which the most innovative and internationally recognized

Mapuche figures have been working to assure autonomy and pluricultural recognition for their people- many of whom are also poets and public figures.² The tensions within the work, both poetry and prose, of renowned Mapuche poet and activist Elicura Chihuailaf Nahuelpán will allow me to tentatively offer some answers to the questions with which I open this chapter. In short, I find that from between his prose and poetry emerges what I would call, following Jacques Derrida, a hypermnestic poetics that coextensively marks the success *and* failure of his articulatory project, meant to situate the Mapuche in dialogue with the Chilean people- although, we may ask, speaking whose language?³ This lingering question should unsettle, given my earlier exploration of how failure and success are overdetermined by the bourgeois State's language and history, in their contemporary colonial and capitalist forms.

Chihuailaf's project is articulated from within the bounds of its subject matter, which lends it both its possibility of success and the inevitability of failure- and is also what renders it an effective, legible act from which we might learn. In this sense, I re-emphasize the need for what I previously called an auto-didactic pedagogy, in this case in what could be fairly called a modality of subalternism- or, at least, a certain strain of it, retaining some aspects and eliding others. Two assertions, each concerning a different subalternist group, will clarify my situation regarding this mode of reading. Following Dipesh Chakrabarty, I would (re-)affirm that "subaltern is what fractures *from within* the signs that tell of the insertion of the historian (as speaking subject) into the global narratives of capital...for subaltern histories [or, and also, in my case, letters] *do not refer to a resistance prior and exterior to capital*" ("Marx after..." 1096 my emphasis). To this

remark I would conjoin Alberto Moreiras's metacritical observation, concerning explicitly latinamericanist subalternism, that "debería hablarse *de un retrazamiento de fronteras epistémicas* más que de un cambio paradigmático radical en el modelo subalternista" ("Elementos..." 879 my emphasis). The tensions and encounters between these two observations of the always already extant inclusion of the subaltern in the functioning and epistemologies of capitalism, and thus the nation-state, trace the problematic that Chihuailaf forces recognition of by exposing, within his work, his own incomplete positionality.⁴ To pose this tension within the terms of his project, when at the end of *De sueños azules y contrasueños* he destabilizes any faulty hermeneutics of solidarity by subverting the presumptions of origin and target languages- such that "Caminata en el Bosque" which reads "Ebrio de Azul voy / entre el follaje / de la taberna sagrada" precedes and thus is posited on the verso as the original form of the Mapudungun text "TREKAYAWVN MAWIZA MEW" which reads "Amulen ñi gollin̄gen Kallfylelu mew / rāgi pu row / gollipeyem gillatuwe mew", on the recto (*De sueños...* 130-1)- we are also made to reject any simplistic establishment of the I/Other distinction which would abject him by virtual incorporation to an academic, thus capitalist and colonial, framework. That is his work's call- a demand that we constantly, almost programmatically, do away with *our* presumptively transparent and bounded positionality and, thus, the presumed accessibility of *his* as determined by colonial, capitalist discursive frameworks. This chapter's question, and thus work, will be to trace that call in the two works I have chosen- *Recado confidencial a los chilenos* and *De sueños azules y contrasueños*.

So, moving away from the hasty presumptions of dominant analytic tendencies, and toward the ambivalent duality of Chihuailaf's *oeuvre*, will allow me to demonstrate how it is marked by a constancy of (incomplete) arrival, in place of positional fixity. That is, being composed entirely of languages of arrival, subjective plenitude in both the colonial language *and* the colonial vision of a nostalgic mother tongue being for him interdicted, it demands an interrogation of the limits of even anti-capitalist discourses, at least in their more traditional mode. Of course, this bears such weight specifically because it is at this limit that we must, therefore, *act* in solidarity. Tracing these tensions in his work, I will demonstrate that, in the final analysis, there is nothing that even the most *common* sense of emergent subjectivity can say about the Mapuche who, for all their apparent and self-shown plenitude of existence and thought, exist in the colonial, capitalist discourse that overdetermines even my work *only in their historically determined, virtual incorporation to and by the same*. They are to any *winka* discourse arrogant enough to try naming, therefore fixing, them, only specters returning time and again as an anarchic force within state memory. One that can say nothing about the lived experience of the Mapuche themselves. Specters that only speak a colonial memory's failings, infinitely distant as they are from lived Mapuche reality. This chapter, picking up where the prior left off, will not so much be about Mapuche activism more broadly, which would require far more space than I can devote to it here. Rather, I will emphasize how *one* Mapuche poet-activist's work teaches the *winka* (wherever we may be) our own failings from within the system that produces them, so that we might stand in solidarity from our failure, to recognize and speak alongside him without presuming to

(re)capture the sundered singularity that he is, as we are.⁵ That is, how Chihuailaf formulates his project not as attesting to some outside, and thus not as *testimonio*, but rather as a formal reproduction of the subjective excision performed on the Mapuche by the capitalist State to found and reproduce the same/different divide necessary to its functioning, thus making opaque the presumed transparency of *winka* positionality that is the epistemo-ontological blockage in the capitalist knowledge structure.⁶

Selecting for the same

Given that one of my work's binding themes has been the spectral influences of non-statist left politics on emergent subjectivities and their manifestation as acts for the to come, selecting Chihuailaf as point of inflection for my conclusion may seem doubly in error. He is a prominent Mapuche spokesperson, or in Mapudungun *werken* (messenger), navigating an endlessly complex relationship with the Chilean state and its politics, epistemologies and ontologies; and amongst the political mapuche poets, although they are all in greater or lesser measure political, he seems less militantly aligned with disjunctive autonomist projects that more closely parallel the type I explored before. In terms of content and subject position, David Aníñir, or perhaps even Jaime Huenún, would seem significantly more in line with radically exodic movements that distance themselves from the overdetermined apparatuses of state law, and thus more readily dialogued with concerning those themes.⁷ But that, as is oft said, makes all the difference. As I will examine further when we discuss literary criticism's fondness for narratives of hybridity and resistance, which I reject for various reasons, the contestatory mode still serves in many ways to engage and reinforce the structures that it legitimately opposes,

albeit by serving as vessel for and target of a negative identification. We saw this before, with the modes of contestatory documentary still circumscribed by the law and state power, despite not being less valuable for that fact.

Rather than those poets, I chose Chihuailaf because as regards the Mapuche's engagement by the State's authoritarian and authorizing apparatuses, that is, by state recognition via repressive and aesthetic mechanisms, he fills a role similar to Parra and Gelman for those who hope to better think solidarity with Mapuche struggle. Chihuailaf offers a recognizable figure with whom to dialogue- acknowledging his own singularity within a people of which he is a well-known member, he still writes such that the walls of the Chilean state bear the marks to be read of what lives beyond them.⁸ He constantly challenges the Chileans to act out of loving solidarity with a group rendered impossibly inarticulate within institutional language. As he says, he strives to establish "puntos comunes de conversación, en la dualidad del acuerdo y del disentimiento" (*Recado* 10). Transiting that duality, he traces the duality of his own gesture's continuance as both success and failure, coetaneous with each other in a certain measure. In his anti-capitalist and anti-state writings on Mapuche history and actuality, as well as his more personal, but not less political, poetry, he highlights the Mapuche plight before global capital's rapaciousness and, moreover, evidences the impossibility of a significant and sensible incorporation of Mapuche life to the Chilean state's epistemo-ontological functioning. This ambivalence is key to my reading. He simultaneously inscribes the Mapuche's current, and historical, plight within a public discourse marked by a complete erasure of their being, while also forcefully signaling to the Chileans that when they speak of the

Mapuche in the State's language, they only ever speak to the spectacular incorporation of colonialism's displaced violence, in a distorted return. The State cannot speak the vibrant Mapuche culture of which he writes, as it is inaccessible to its knowledge systems and language. This sets Chihuailaf apart from other poets and activists, for better and for worse.⁹ My assertions about the spectacular, and thus spectral, incorporation of the Mapuche figure to the Chilean state's founding narrative(s) present a strong break from tendencies to view them as an anachronistic colonial relic *or* as a backward rural population, despite or perhaps because of their periodic participation in State efforts, so a brief historical exposition is overdue. I will also elaborate the first sense of Chihuailaf's work, specifically his prose- that of success- before moving on to his poetry.

Pretending to make a totalizing gesture that summarizes the historical encounters between the Mapuche and the colonizers would be absurd and, in my case, profoundly contradictory. Not to mention that, as is oft insisted upon by Mapuche and *winka* academics, while they may be broadly subsumed under the name Mapuche, the reality is heavily marked by geographic distinctions within the larger community.¹⁰ Historically and into the present day it has incorporated several different toponymic groups- *Lafkenche*, *Pewenche*, and the newer *Warriache* being three examples of many (the suffix -che means "people" and the preceding word indicates, to a greater or lesser extent, region).¹¹ While they currently broadly conceive of themselves a unitary but differentiated *pueblo*, that, of course, does not preclude conflicts and tensions among the groups. Here I'll broadly sketch their unique history as an indigenous *pueblo* not conquered by the Spanish. The point is not to write a consistent history, or even to

genealogically link the indicated points, beyond statist historicity. Rather, I offer the following observations as referents for my analysis and conception of Mapuche-Chilean (non)relations- both concerning the quantifiable history and, further, historical methodology.

Colonial encounters

When Spaniards arrived to what is now South America, the *Wallmapu* (Mapuche lands) extended from the river Copiapó to the Island of Chiloe and included broad swaths of what we now understand as Argentina.¹² Primarily an agricultural society, it was nonetheless split into several distinct social and spatial organizations which, as Pablo Marimán explains, included functions, functionaries and spaces for politics, religion, education, health and the many other things we currently associate with established social and political environments. Of its general tendencies, he says “generó unidades territoriales (*Wichan mapu*) que se entendieron para una gobernabilidad más extendida que concentrada, que los terminó haciendo actuar como un cuerpo, aunque sin presentar una cabeza aparente” (*Escucha* 66). What we now call the Mapuche *people*, as far back as we may understand, operated without either a sovereign or, as Marimán puts it, a “pyramidal” state organization determining distribution of power and resources. This general mode of organization held during Spanish colonial presence due to a successful and hearty series of ongoing conflicts that included, early on, the defeats and deaths of two governors (Pedro de Valdivia and Martín García Oñez de Loyola) and later encompassed a series of *parlamentos*, the first being held in Quilin in 1641 and the final in Negrete, in 1803. That’s not to say that incursions, attacks and horrors were not

concomitant features of Spanish presence but, rather, the Mapuche beat them back so consistently that the boundary established at Quilin, the river Bío-Bío, was fairly stable.

But here we are due a first caveat. As I implied in the previous chapter, armed conflict's ups and downs provide some of the finer material for a bourgeois mythopoetic narrative of the people. Thoroughly appropriated, structurally, by the capitalist nation-state's self-narrativization, it should inspire caution when it appears in narratives divergent from the State's. Regarding the Mapuche, despite prominent, epic retellings of their bellicose heroism in, for example, Alonso de Ercilla's *La Arucana*, this always only *past* "heroism" is a product of colonial contact and a burgeoning *chileneidad*.¹³ Not to claim Mapuche insularity or anterior passivity, baseless given the evidence of intergroup contact; rather, I wish to highlight the problematic universalization of a particular history.¹⁴ Lucía Guerra-Cunningham refers to this pervasive post-colonization militarism as a "bellicose *contagion* [*contagio bélico*]", a useful phrase for thinking the spread of social re-organizations seen in the work of Guillaume Boccara and Luis Cárcamo that details how colonial contact- for instance, the introduction of the horse- altered Mapuche society.¹⁵ Epic histories, then, are the late colonial discourse's incorporation of its own distorted tendencies, reflected back by a people that it construed as a mirror for itself. When *winka* history speaks of the Mapuche, it is legible only as speaking of a colonial desire's spectral (re)incorporation, a desire projected onto the Mapuche by colonizers to ground and define themselves as a consistent culture. As the alternate histories that inform me emerge, they make (re)emerge the obviated figure of the Mapuche's spectacular incorporation/construction by and to State language and law.

Accumulating independence

Keeping that caveat in mind, the early Chilean state's relations with the Mapuche grew ever tenser while it, simultaneously, waged war against its new neighbors. This was due to a variety of factors, including immigration, internal migration, and a re-organizing of the frontier administration along the border with Mapuche lands.¹⁶ After victory in the War of the Pacific in 1879, the government used new coastal railroads to shift soldiers southward, culminating in the campaign of Lonkimay in 1884, precipitating Mapuche capitulation before independent Chile. Virtual incorporation of the mythopoetic, warlike "*araucanos*" became necessary for the burgeoning capitalist nation-state's historical narrative- which further demanded the literal and figurative elimination of the Mapuche from the space and spatial practices of the new nation, a demand motivated by a second spectral incorporation of the Mapuche as indigent *campesinos*. Aside from these dual specters, the process took a variety of forms over the next several decades (all tantamount to slow-motion genocide). These included: parceling up of land to facilitate re-settling European farmers and destabilizing, to later deny, communal Mapuche organizations; forced relocation of the Mapuche onto *reducciones*, furthering the prior point; and various legal maneuvers and behind-closed-doors business deals, dispossessing them of what little remained. All of which paralleled several concurrent global efforts, prominently in the United States and Argentina. Coetaneous, then, with the mythopoetic incorporation facilitating an ongoing disavowal of alternative histories, the State required the Mapuche's physical dispersal or outright elimination to make possible the primitive accumulation of the nascent bourgeois State's capitalist project.¹⁷ Any remnants of the

Mapuche *pueblo*'s society represented an existential, if not properly ontological, threat to the Chilean nation-state, so the Mapuche are relegated to a geographic feature to be levelled. Ceaseless violence is wrought unto the *pueblo*'s body(s) while, and because, their image is virtually incorporated to the State's public discourse. And yet their constant presence belies that spectacle, embodying specters that have long haunted the national myth of whiteness and uniformity, forcing the aporia at the heart of Chilean (and Argentine) national identity that carries over to and problematizes their economic systems' functioning.

Twentieth century ghosts

A deceptive Mapuche spectrality, then. This specter, the paranoid imagination of Chile's disavowed other reflected back on its discursive apparatuses upon encountering their other's very much living body by their side, motivates many a twentieth century conjuration- often captured by the left-right political paradigm. The mainstream left attempted to bring them into the fold as proletarian allies (none too gracefully) and the right, best exemplified by the Pinochet dictatorship, denied their existence outright and/or attempted to violently finalize their conversion into small property owners and good, obedient bourgeois individuals.¹⁸ Following the 1988 plebiscite, these policies are effectively folded into one another, as the explosive articulations of previously verboten identities flourish within the bounds of capital's ideology of "multiculturalism". They manifest as a series of tensions around race/ethnicity/subcultures and the definitions and place allowed *one* within global capital's hegemonic framework(s), tensions deserving brief comment. While the racialized character of many Chileans' engagement, when they

engage indigenous presence at all, is undeniable, one must again remember that that is also a colonial discourse and, therefore, still results an imposition on, and thus an impediment to, a study of the *Mapuche* as opposed to *Chilean racism towards the Mapuche*.¹⁹ Subordinating an entire people to the category of an “ethnicity” within the law’s individuating archival structures serves a similar function- it makes logically prior the assumption that the Mapuche have always already been a part of “Chile” and now they might more openly express themselves within the new multicultural paradigm. This strain of thought is common, or rather, dominant, in criticism of Mapuche poetry- which does not make the claims any less absurd nor less characteristic of a bourgeois liberal mindset functional to capitalism, as its forefather was to colonialism.²⁰ An absent Mapuche legality accompanies this, such that when they, or the State’s imagination of them, are to be legislated, the process is absent memory or consistency of laws and lawmakers.²¹ As if to say, “I’ve seen this ghost before, but I can’t for the life of it recall where I put my notes from last time.”

The unthinkable now

I will return to these themes below. For now, I again highlight the insuperable hiatus and duality signaled in the excessive work done by the word Mapuche within state institutionality, now as in the past. The preceding historical sketch is meant to signal the extent to which the State developed around an elision of another *pueblo* within and beside it. An elision that has formed an epistemo-ontologic blockage delimiting attempts to speak to and of the Mapuche within and for capital’s knowledge systems, bound by state historicity- my own work being somewhat included in this recrimination. “Chile as

nation-state” is an auto-referential discourse, speaking to the inverted projection of its desires and failings, which return each time its archives attempt to account for the Mapuche. The State has made nigh impossible not only its own attempts to speak *of* the Mapuche, but also its attempts to speak *to* them, or even to speak *to itself about their lives*, when those are nominally the subject at hand. As it stands, there can be no *authorized* recognition of the responsibility engendered in an encounter with a Mapuche singularity, and thus no speaking of a Mapuche subject as such within the law. Which is not to say that there is no encounter- recognition’s refusal is always posterior to an ineluctable encounter with the Other and, therefore, does not retroactively efface it or the hope it might generate. Rather, the internalized social conceptualization of the Mapuche interposes itself in the instantaneity of the folding of intersubjective social space, rendering impossible the (re)formulation of a hospitality that would extend itself to the Mapuche. This process doubles again in the encounter between Mapuche and state functionaries, who embody the face of the State itself- an internalized prohibition, externalized. A recent example from repression of Mapuche activists will clarify this, allowing me to segue to Chihuailaf’s success before this faceless presence.

While the preceding seemed to establish two periods, and at least three problematics, they are both coetaneous and sequential, in various combinations and together. To give a sense of the recent repressive juncture, I draw from the proceedings around Mapuche resistance to the illegal, and yet unimpeded, logging across southern Chile.²² Since at least the late 1990s, transnational logging interests have taken advantage of the Chilean state’s lax or absent enforcement of territorial delimitations, at all levels.

This has involved prolonged violence by both state and private forces and open or barely concealed complicity between them. So blatantly flaunting any pretenses of separation, the actions signal a flourishing of the State as translation machine between global and domestic capital. Further, this point is not mine alone- it is widely understood and asserted by Mapuche activists, as well as actors in solidarity with them.²³ As one might expect, the Mapuche have engaged in various forms of resistance against these incursions by ouroboros capital, so intent on consuming itself along with the world.

Well understood by sources outside of the Chilean state and its associated media, the standard method for persecuting Mapuche who attempt to prevent the extrajudicial incursions on their land- violently or nonviolently, it does not matter- is to pursue cases against them according to the country's antiterrorist law. Again unsurprisingly, the charges brought against them and the proceedings themselves, when they arrive before a judge, are so farcical as to even draw the attention of international human rights organizations (duly ignored by the decidedly uninterested Chilean authorities). But rather than pursue a problematic discussion of human rights decrees, of more interest is one of the prosecutors' preferred tactics: the "*testigos sin rostro*", i.e. faceless or anonymous witnesses. Allowed for by other legal measures, these witnesses are consistently called to testify against the Mapuche and, even when they offer blatantly false or uncorroborated testimony, are, ironically, taken at face value.²⁴ As Paula Vial Reina describes in an article for *Le Monde Diplomatique* entitled, appropriately, "Juicio a mapuches desnuda las deudas de la justicia":

Los testigos sin rostro, personas fantasmas que no se hacen responsables de sus dichos y que, con la excusa de su protección, reciben incluso en algunos casos

emolumentos y apoyos económicos, no sólo persisten en la ley sino que se refuerzan. Su existencia ya no se discute, ni durante la investigación ni en el juicio mismo. Y no pueden ser conainterrogados para determinar su idoneidad, como ya ocurrió en el juicio de Cañete. (*Rebelión...* 40)

Bold faced, or rather faceless, this tactic and its effect of distancing and negation manifest at the neoliberal State's center, at the limit where it might be expected to come upon the face of its Other *per necessity*. They are the fullest implication of the epistemo-ontological impediment I have traced. As the title of the article aptly states, it denudes the law for what it is, generally and particularly when facing the Mapuche- a faceless manifestation of the needs and desires of the conjunction State/international capitalism, interceding in the proceedings by way of a faceless body. A complete absence of singularity, the faceless witness loses all functional communicability that would pertain to the encounter between two, from whence spring the infinite ethical responsibility and the possibility of a politics to-come. Become an absent presence- but inverting the phrase's common usage, such that the witness's presence is effaced by forceful intercession, rendering the body without face infinitely distant- it is through a *farcical* singular that neoliberal capitalism's totalizing pretensions are translated into situated struggle. Where before I examined the effacement of exteriority (the *rostro*) by exteriority (the mask) *in* an exteriority (the video) as a method through which a common rebellion might speak *and* the singularity's unspeakable affectivity might be traced, this is entirely other. Judicial processes as state interiority become the scene of the neoliberal state's prime role in navigating its place in global capital's order. Again, the state as a translating machine that might at any moment, in any situation, sequester the body of the bourgeois individual to bring forth unto its pseudo-exteriority the core truth it holds within: that it

always only speaks the State's language and merely awaits a venue in which to be heard, as it is effaced, rather de-faced, to reinforce the internal and external bounds and bounding of statist reason.

That it be brought forth in the process of a "judgment", in brackets because the State's judgment was determined beforehand and so deserves not the name, adds a second, crucial layer. As I have insisted, at the heart of Chilean national identity and its narrativization there exists the foundational impossibility of establishing a face-to-face encounter with and recognition of the Mapuche as legitimate subjects of the law- for all it may claim otherwise. A state of facelessness, or better, defaced-ness, aptly describes the way the law as mediating force intercedes via interdiction in the encounter- be it collective or singular. Within the judicial system's justifications and labyrinthine mechanisms, the state paints an astounding metonym for the greater discursive process that has accompanied hundreds of years of *winka* presence- the multiply effected effacement of the Mapuche within the law's order of legibility. In this painting, we see the Chilean state and its capitalist appendages *speaking only to themselves*. Hence the lack of any cross-examination or efforts at establishing these faceless witnesses' aptitude, defaced as the *nth* face of this discourse as it speaks to itself, of itself, before the law. Ironically, the tool used by state and capitalist forces against people that are an existential and functional threat to them both unmasks the individual citizen-subject's incapacity for recognizing the face of the other. Unmasked *in media res*, seen as they are- swaddled, as in the father's arms, by statist reason. The literal law answers the unasked question of the law's actual being, bringing it(self) forth to be interrogated. Thus, the insistence by

Mapuche activists upon their recognition by the Chileans is of an imperative mood- it demands that the bourgeois subject steps out from this swaddling and climbs the walls around them, or at least reads the writing therein etched. Already constructed by other efforts, this is the stage from which Chihuailaf speaks in his prose and activism, encapsulated in *Recado confidencial a los chilenos*, which I read as his success.

Success, on the face of it

I say that I read the *Recado* as a success in a double sense: it inscribes within the Chilean national archive what was previously illegible, a Mapuche voice (albeit, and necessarily, in translation) speaking to and from the historical and the situated Mapuche perspective(s); and, in doing so, accomplishes goals that it sets for itself. Now, those two conditions must be understood in their full ambivalence- as I have asserted, Chihuailaf's hypermnestic project inscribes both success *and* failure, and so each success brings with it its corresponding failure, a point which I will elaborate below. For the moment, the case for its success. Since its publication in 1999, comfortably after the so-called transition to democracy, the book has become a widespread and recognized reference, both within Chile and without, that places into a productive dialogue Mapuche and Chilean cultures. Although, as the title suggests, the dialogue's directionality is from former to latter, and delivered in the latter's language and style (as written text) such that it may be heard. Awarded the award for best literary work in the category of essay by the Consejo Nacional del Libro it was, after various reprintings, republished in 2015 in an augmented version that itself was reprinted in 2017. A wide sampling of works make reference to it, including, amongst many, the notable *winka* historian of State-Mapuche relations, José

Bengoa; the collected Mapuche historians who authored ...*¡Escucha, winka!*..., despite their more oppositional stance towards their named interlocutor; and the Mapuche historian and activist Fernando Pairican does not hesitate to reference it.²⁵ But beyond the intelligentsia on both sides of the overarching encounter, even Mapuche students in Chilean schools, where it is oft taught, have found in its inscription in Castilian of a Mapuche voice a way of (re-)situating themselves vis a vis Chilean society- as attested to by the letter of a young Mapuche student and activist, Ailyn Lucía Ludueña Collinao, entitled “Recado confidencial a Elicura Chihuilaf”, included in the extra sections of the augmented second edition.²⁶

More than an emergent legibility of a Mapuche voice in Castilian, the *Recado*'s own terms establish conditions for success, which its ubiquity can be said to have accomplished. The entire text is, according to its explanation, structured as a *werkv*, approximately translated as (oral) message, delivered by a *Werken*, or messenger, who is invited to another space and in the process of delivering the message follows certain consistent practices, all reproduced in it.²⁷ So then, the immediate goal would seem to be the delivery to another *pueblo* of a message that contains within it, as a crucial formal aspect, the state of the messenger and the *pueblo* from which he is arriving. And yet, beyond the given form, the message's content bears forth several salient points meant to be carried to this other *pueblo*. Not simply Chihuilaf's understanding of the Mapuche cosmovision but, further, a re-situation, from within the culture that the *Recado* makes legible, of the ongoing deterritorialization to facilitate extractivist economic models so harmful to that same culture.

Two moments seem most relevant for his, and my, overarching projects. First, while discussing the *Itrofil Mogen*, which he says can be approximately translated in “el mundo contemporáneo y científico” as “biodiversity”, he asserts that “se refiere al conjunto del mundo viviente, *comprendiendo e insistiendo en su unidad*”. Moreover, concerning development in Mapuche territory, he conveys the words of the Mapuche *lafkenche*, who teach us that the *Itrofil Mogen* as a concept insists that “el motor de la sociedad no es la búsqueda de un crecimiento económico o rentabilidad extrema, sino el equilibrio que solo puede entregar *una interacción de reciprocidad económica, cultural y social*” (*Recado 50* emphasis mine). Articulating at once how the Mapuche see nature *and* how both humanity *and human interaction* are complementarily situated within a unitary whole, this selection succinctly presents one of the message’s core points- how Chihuailaf’s lessons can, from within *winka* discourse, re-think our relationship to the earth and each other, in a forward minded vision of a dialogic future relationality (amongst not only peoples, but also nature’s many aspects).²⁸

As to this vision’s futurity, and how it may be shared, he is no less clear and direct. After taking to task any who might consider writing a mark and measure of Mapuche acculturation- affirming that if that is so than it will have been so for all societies, everywhere, ever since the Phoenicians invented written text, and is thus a non-point- he directs himself toward the future, in which a set of hypothetical students comes to inquire after the Mapuche’s future. Reaffirming the previous citation’s implications, he clarifies that the future is part of the Earth’s, and thus humanity’s, totality and that “se completa de manera dinámica con el pasado, pero desde un esencial estar (continuar) en

el presente, del que depende lo que podamos desear y lo que nos sea posible hacer en este mundo” (*Recado* 60-1). Combined with later, explicit statements asserting a necessity that Mapuche movements be anti-capitalist, anti-State and globally minded, as well as repeated statements acknowledging and advocating for regional autonomy, this seems to clearly situate Chihuailaf’s understanding of Mapuche futurity within a constellation that includes the autonomist and anarchist perspectives I have examined throughout my work—despite the fact that this vision might be contentious for other Mapuche.²⁹ Chihuailaf seems to share a vision of a loving, generative common to come that exceeds and escapes the bounds of a global capitalism regionally mediated by state institutionality, in which autonomy and cooperation in solidarity are guiding social mandates. There are necessarily serious disjunctions between the perspectives—aside from originating in distinct cosmovisions, they are at odds over the formation of a *pueblo* (wherein the autonomists reject its ties to the Sovereign form and the Mapuche, who formed and persisted as *pueblo* without a sovereign, claim it for debate and resistance) and the utility of the nation (there are many debates about the validity or utility of the term in anarchist thought whereas, again, the Mapuche see it as a crucial point in articulating their struggle against the Chilean state). Despite these missed encounters, there is a case to be made for this message as a form of bringing together Mapuche and Chilean perspectives, against a common foe. But it is at this perceived convergence that I pause, as it is here that the failure behind this success begins to emerge, upon closer inspection of the text. *What* it says and, more importantly, *how* and *where* it says it forcefully remind us of the patriarchal’s operations of consignment. This inscription’s legibility within that archive

does not, necessarily, over-write the interdiction against actual Mapuche presence, as opposed to its virtual double, in the Chilean state's language.

The question is not so much whether Chihuailaf is heard- he obviously is, to great effect- but rather, *what is spoken, and to whom, when he speaks?* What is the status of Chihuailaf as speaker when he chooses to translate his lived experience into written Castilian and how does that affect, if not determine, the deeper message he conveys as *Werken?* What is he saying when, through this book, he addresses us? In various ways and at various points, throughout this text and his hypermnesic project, he is consciously and clearly communicating the limits of the presumptively universal *winka* episteme, regardless of the more immediate content of any particular work. While his personal history entails various literal, physical displacements, for an equally varied number of reasons, this text and his broader project are further inscribed under the sign of displacement, physical as well as epistemo-ontological- it is from interminable displacement that it speaks.

The text proper opens with a bipartite exergue that establishes its position and mission. The latter being the communication of the Mapuche experience as indicating potential points for dialogue, within Chilean Castilian and according to Chihuailaf's understanding; the former lays in and between the lines of these exergues. The first is written as though it were spoken to the reader. It establishes both what prompted his interrogations and what to do about them, while it also registers the text's main subjects: *usted, Yo, nosotros* and *los chilenos*. The singularity that is Chihuailaf has departed from the common we of the Mapuche to, perhaps, arrive at such a point in which he might

speak to a singular reader, perhaps Chilean and perhaps not, about the Mapuche and the state of things in Chile. All four terms are isolated as distinct, despite the text retaining the singular/collective link between him and the Mapuche while allowing for a more ambivalent relationship to obtain between the reader and the Chileans; he also marks himself as equally apart from his subject matter, both in writing and as *Werken*.³⁰

Displacement and distinction *from*, a *having left*, are fundamental to the text's articulation. Were his dual displacement not immediately clear from the first exergue's positioning, in the second he begins by repeating a lesson he gave to students concerning the Mapuche country of "yesteryear", and then rhetorically turns to address the Mapuche people whose presence authorizes his speaking in the first-person plural. In plain sight, as it were, he has turned and made clear that he occupies authority in both worlds- he speaks fluently of them both, and can cite Jaime Valdivieso and Gabriela Mistral to the Mapuche as easily as he shares the words of the Mapuche *lafkenche* to the Chileans, techniques he employs regularly throughout. Chihuailaf has departed from the land of yesteryear by speaking to the Chileans, without for that having truly arrived in the Castilian that they speak, within the order of their law. He displaces himself within language to speak of that from which he draws the authority to speak of displacement as such, and he does this in the language of the interdiction issued against the infinite responsibility before the Mapuche, at a remove wherein his words are already caught within the law that makes representations of Mapuche being impossible. More clearly, again: when he speaks of himself and, moreover, the Mapuche, within the Chilean state's legible order, the only thing he can be understood to be speaking of is the impossibility that he speaks- doubly,

as a Mapuche and as someone speaking of them. A realization that pervades the entire text, beginning with the first section following the exergues, entitled *Sueño Azul*. This is a transcription of a poem from *De sueños azules y contraseños* and while I will comment below the poetic functioning of its repetition in relation to criticism of his poetry, it's worth mentioning here the main point I will elaborate. This work, while often read as a nostalgic reflection on the Mapuche's idyllic past, can only in that way be *misread*. The piece's sequence, and the temporal transitions within it, clarify that the speaker and Chihuailaf are eminently aware of the distance from his dream- in the word's dual sense, strung out between Castilian and Mapudungun- and the constant arrivals characterizing his current reality. Ending with a displaced address, from Amsterdam to all Chihuailaf's comrades elsewhere than Chile or the *Ad Mapu* (Mapuche territory), to open a book that folds the addressee's language back on itself, Chihuailaf immediately belies pretensions of reading or writing this text from anywhere but a state of constantly deferred arrival; complete displacement.

All of this is not to say that Chihuailaf is at any point speaking only one language; rather, he is caught speaking at least two, and both bi-directionally, having left his own to speak of and in another to which he can never entirely arrive and which, in turn, interdicts his return and arrival (anew- or for the first time?) to his so-called mother tongue.

Rodrigo Rojas has, referring to his work translating fragments of Neruda into Mapudungun, framed Chihuailaf's as translator-*cum*-resistant facilitating an inversion of the esteem allotted within a colonially instituted cultural hierarchy, from what Homi Bhabha refers to as a third space.³¹ But while I do see a certain utility for discussing

translation in Chihuailaf's greater project, I find Rojas's unquestioning usage of the third space to be entirely too direct and misleading. His situating of a third space neither colonial nor colonized too easily fixes the points of arrival from which one is, in that conception, translating to and fro. Moreover, in the same gesture, it comprehends the two languages, be they target or original, as determinable and essential in a way that separates them entirely, facilitating an economy of translation that would be fitting to his particular assertions concerning inverted hierarchies- effectively *reproducing* in place of *escaping* the spectacular relations between the Chilean discourse and its saying "Mapuche". To borrow a reminder from Jacques Derrida, "[d]esde el momento en que se renuncia a esta equivalencia económica, por otra parte estrictamente imposible, puede traducirse todo, pero en una traducción laxa en el sentido laxo de la palabra 'traducción'" such that "[e]n un sentido, nada es intraducible, pero *en otro sentido* todo lo es, la traducción es otro nombre de lo imposible" (80).

So, everything, even a culture, can be translated, but only in the sense that it is an entirely new inscription, in the Borgesian mode (of which Derrida was, of course, so fond). Seen from this angle, as it passes us by, this *recado* is translation only inasmuch as it is an inscription in Chilean law of its foundational lack, done in the law's own language. Its articulation marks therein the question that went unasked before the letter was sent- what does "Mapuche" mean to say when we say it in Castilian? Chihuailaf inscribes a knowledge meant to super-impose itself over what was presumed already there, albeit without a concomitant effacement: a re-writing of the word that, in the best of cases, should (re)embody it and open a space for Mapuche to speak, and be spoken of,

in a reciprocal play of recognition generative of an ethical responsibility and a political subjectivity. Yet this act of writing- cultural translation, (re)inscription, or whatever you might call it- reveals the cacophonous singularity that he *would* be as multiple and uncontainable by the institutionality determinate of what, how, and from where he writes, and to which his writing must ever and only return. He may approach, and in his approach give his word, but only barred by an interdiction against his word ever but belonging to the very order from and to which he directs himself, regardless of what he may say with it.

But before I be accused of the same misreading of others that take it upon themselves to write on Chihuailaf, and the Mapuche in general, it is worth seeing exactly what the poet has to say concerning what I refer to as the patriarchal's apparatuses of authorization. In a longer section of the *Recado* criticizing the "dead letter" of the law, while reflecting on the growing facility of Mapuche self-identification in Chile, he closes by bluntly taking the neoliberal university structure to task for its role in Mapuche territory. As he says,

...han sido las universidades las que han permitido el empobrecimiento del territorio mapuche, porque han sido ellas las que han hecho estudios de factibilidad y de implementación de que en estas regiones es posible reconvertir la economía agrícola, ganadera, en economía de forestación- con pino y eucaliptos, ahora-. Son estudios encargados (el autofinanciamiento universitario) por la empresa privada, y para sus beneficios, desde luego. (*Recado* 163)

Now, while he is clearly discussing the university's function structuring the knowledge production required to advance foreign capital's extractivist economic plans, I would assert that it's more than fair to read an extension of that to the university model as a whole. To reserve a special place, or special treatment, for other disciplines would

assume of Chihuailaf an incredible naivete, thoroughly belied by his collected works.

And, as I've insisted on throughout, the functioning of the various disciplines within, and beyond, the neoliberal university are an integral part of the reproduction of both the State and the mode of production of which it is part. As he asserts elsewhere, concerning the possibility of intercultural dialogue within literary criticism,

[e]l que esto sea posible en el plano literario implica también una mutual compulsación crítica. Tendrán que aparecer... traductores y críticos mapuche que no se ocupen únicamente de los textos escritos en mapuzungun, sino también de aquellos que surgen de las vivencias de nuestros hermanos que han desarrollado su escritura comiendo su 'obligado pan en castellano', en las ciudades y campos de nuestra y otras regiones y en el exilio. (*Crítica* 243)

That is, the critical literary apparatuses that developed to discuss Mapuche literary production are inadequate to the dialogic task, unless they are expanded to include a broader, and broader minded, spectrum of Mapuche critics of Mapuche works. Barring that, the university (as part of the capitalist State's ideological system), can only rhetorically reproduce the Mapuche's historical treatment and, thus, constrain any production within its purportedly sovereign bounds. On this note, Derrida, in another passage of the previously cited text, adds a pertinent reminder concerning the apparent monolingualism that Chihuailaf must navigate:

[e]l monolingüismo del otro sería *en primer lugar* esa soberanía, esa ley llegada de otra parte, sin duda, pero también y en principio la lengua misma de la Ley. Y la Ley como Lengua. Su experiencia sería aparentemente *autónoma*, porque debo hablar esta ley y adueñarme de ella para entenderla *como si* me la diera a mí mismo. (58)

The State's false univocity is constructed in and as the law with the support of the Mapuche's virtual incorporation, which denies their autonomy or persistence apart from *and* within the territory Chile usurped from them- and it is this language that Chihuailaf

enters, albeit adversarially. Using his words as he tells the story- “[l]uego, llegamos a las ciudades, el exilio...en nuestro propio territorio” (*Recado* 81).

As he discusses how one might begin to reclaim a space in this “desert”, he makes one of his more often misunderstood gestures- one that establishes the counterpoint to his project’s success, the failure thematized most explicitly in his poetry. I would argue that this is his most often miscited assertion, almost always in a mercenary way- that concerning the importance of Mapuche identity for (re)establishing their place. In the *Recado* he posits its importance as such: “la identidad, me parece, determina qué es lo que se ama- con sus aspectos positivos y negativos- y cuánto se ama. Por lo tanto, determina la aceptación que se pueda tener del sí mismo y, en consecuencia, la caloración y el respeto que se tenga del ‘otro’”, a point that refers not only to the Mapuche but- perhaps more so- to the Chileans that elide their identity’s complexity (83). Already in the ambiguous double tension he establishes by asserting its importance, it would seem clear, or at least implicit, that the concept he is working with can be distinguished from the bourgeois liberal usage of the term. But, should doubt remain, in the other piece I cited above, he asserts that

Cuando nuestra Gente levanta las banderas de nuestras respectivas identidades, los Estados- a través de sus medios de comunicación y de sus estructuras educacionales y legisladoras excluyentes- intentan moverlas según sus intereses. Surge de este modo un nuevo dogma: el de la identidad. *La identidad confeccionada como un traje talla única que ajusta nada más a sus inexistentes elegidos.* (*Crítica* 235 my emphasis)

While these citations and the, rather writerly, ambiguity within them (which Carmen Godoy highlights as one of Chihuailaf’s strengths and sign of his conceptual subtlety) are more than enough to support Joanna Crow’s scathing critique of the various, and

seemingly willful, essentialist misreadings of Chihualaf's project by many of his Chilean critics, it is worth maintaining another of Crow's points.³² She warns that his alacrity in managing Mapuche identitarian tropes within an order of legibility facilitated by the law allows the State, and its "critical" proxies, to further the above incorporative discursive gestures, this time under the aegis of multiculturalism. This being opposed to a pluriculturalist position that acknowledges and respects the autonomy of the cohabitant *pueblos* within the territory deceptively known as "Chile", for which Chihualaf advocates. Nothing about this potential danger can excuse the various, again one must assume willfully, selective and reductive readings of this project, but it bears underlining as bringing to light the functioning of his work on which I have insisted. Articulated within, and using, the language of the State, that is, the law, it is bound primarily to make legible the law's lapses by inscribing within it the structurally prohibited being of its other.

My understanding of Chihualaf's project as a hypermnesic one springs from these conditions. As Derrida says of displacement's effect on writing,

[l]a ruptura con la tradición, el desarraigo, la inaccesibilidad de las historias, la amnesia, la indescifrabilidad, etcétera, todo esto desencadena la pulsión genealógica, el deseo del idioma, el movimiento compulsivo hacia la anamnesis, el amor destructor de la interdicción. (100)

One could think of few better descriptions for what seems to motivate Chihualaf's project in the face of the history I trace. But one must account for *where* this project is undertaken (as Derrida himself does, elsewhere), in order to understand its goals and limitations. Because this is not being done in Mapudungun, and is directed as a confidential letter *to the Chileans*, not knowing if it should ever arrive, nor to where, one

cannot but understand this project of inscribing the Mapuche's past, present and future within the archive heretofore overdetermined by *winka* epistemologies and ontologies as simultaneously *inside and outside* of them. Hence its deeper gesture of addressing not a localizable error, but rather a structural absence- but also its ambivalent status as both success *and* failure. For such a project, success is as I've shown: a growing awareness of another *pueblo*'s, another culture's, recognizable face, thriving alongside and within *winka* culture. And moreover, the tentatively asked questions within that culture of what it means when it says, and to what extent the saying is possible, "Mapuche". The project's failure is here, as well- by making legible for, perhaps, the first time, the foundational lapses in the ongoing colonial project of sensibly grounding the colonizers' culture and identity, it also reinforces the insuperability of the hiatus that yet exists between colonizer and any ethical encounter with the colonized other, concealed by the perversely reflected image that the colonizers projected onto the Mapuche to negatively establish themselves *as being*. Regardless of political affiliation or good intentions. To better understand this point, we ought to turn to the other form of Chihuailaf's work, which more thoroughly thematizes its obverse aspect- his poetry.

A mirror that reflects nothing

By now it should be clear that my usage of success and failure are, as before, heavily qualified, for being overdetermined by the totalizing arche-narrative of bourgeois historicity. Following this, insomuch as I say failure, that word is entirely determined by the bounds of the colonial, capitalist State and its law. The only failure of the project was an impossibility from the start, given the language required for it to be carried out. It

could never truly hope to make a place for a dissident Mapuche identity within a State predicated on the simultaneous invisibilization of that life and the incorporation of its spectral form to the mythopoetic narrativization of the Chilean nation-state's past. Still, I feel that this point is more clearly made in his project's poetics, whose themes and role as poetry cannot but fail within the State's language, until the State ceases to be; in the to come, when it ceases to overdetermine these marks' iterability. By its nature as a written work and, further, because Chihuailaf himself cannot be completely established in subjective plenitude by Chilean law, it both thematizes his displacement and constant arrival *and* refuses to foreclose the future and present as sources of rebellious hope. I will approach this topic through his 1995 text *De sueños azules y contrasueños* for several reasons, all of which destabilize official state and critical narratives about the Mapuche and Chihuailaf, respectively. The following are important to my project: its distance from his first widely known text, *En el país de la memoria*, allows that it speak to a more developed aesthetic and social project; its intimate and explicit linkage to the *Recado* through an act of auto-citation as auto-translation demystifies the relationship and tensions between his poetic and prosodic pieces; and, through formal experimentation, it eschews an unidirectional perspectival authorization that would allow us to essentialize either of the perceived "mother tongues"/target languages. To clarify these points, I will proceed through a close reading of oft-cited portions of the text, accompanied by a critique of the main strains of criticism on Mapuche poetry and Chihuailaf, in particular.

Immediately apparent upon even a superficial reading of the text is how it, too, is thoroughly inscribed under the sign of displacement, deterritorialization, *desterramiento-*

which is not to say that it's a simply superficial theme. What remains less clear are the speaker's status and the perceived, or inherited, purpose that he assumes in displacement. Picking a few examples to illustrate the point should suffice to convey the overarching presence of absence and distance. Ending "El río que suena, sueña", a poem rife with images of blue and water so central to Chihuailaf's Mapuche cosmovision, the speaker conveys "Mi corazón sediento sueña / con las aguas del arroyo / pero mi espíritu perdido / no puede callar la angustia / de su lecho" (51). Interlinking references to thirst and misdirection, soul and land, the final ambiguous genitive reveals a "bed" that could be both that of the river or of the soul- and, in keeping with Chihuailaf's explanations of the Mapuche cosmovision, would in truth be both. But that association allows us to note two distinct phenomenon that, when articulated together, posit a third. First, the speaker is insuperably distanced from the land and the water, wandering lost and far from its bed, wherein it may both rest and be at home. The world is, to this figure, fundamentally inhospitable and foreign- and he wanders thirsty and without a space to lay his head. Moreover, the ambivalent duality of the final line allows us to read an anguish *of the river*- which brings to mind the leeching off of waters in Mapuche territory by foreign originating coniferous trees that international, extractivist capital interests imported to the *Ad Mapu*. Read together, then, they propose the third reading in their conjunction- the solution to both the anguish of the speaker and the river is the re-placement of said speaker in the lost territory. But in its very proposition, that possibility is foreclosed as impossible- and the poem ends.

The poem immediately following the former, “Gran Tigre Nahuelbuta”, both reinforces and complicates this sense of displacement and directionless-ness. It opens in a straight forward enough way, establishing distance and a directionality that only leads to greater distance from the speaker’s land- “Me encuentro lejos de mis / padres y de mis hijas / y no sé aún cuando volveré” (53). The first few words- *me encuentro lejos*- hide a rather elaborate set of possible meanings: the simple meaning of localization, being no longer lost, but also the paired meaning that signals the coming to oneself of self-discovery in an ontological, rather than pseudo-psychological, register. And building on the second meaning, the fact that that sentiment is articulated in Castilian and, perhaps, a perhaps whose resolution is barred to a large portion of his readership, is less than faithful to the Mapudungun. The self speaking of finding itself can speak the self only in the language that is, literally and figuratively, far from his family- Castilian. But rather than dwell on that distance, the poem then has the titular tiger remind the poet of what, exactly, he is (doing) so far away- “Por nuestra gente estás ahí / hablando en esa tierra lejana” (53). A fairly uncomplicated statement, it nonetheless carries all of the weight, in two lines, of the points I’ve elaborated so far- his speech’s duality, his role as *Werken* and its relationship to the *pueblo*, and the impossible fold that separates the two registers in which he speaks. These lines and more, throughout the book, lend sense to several others in his famous rewriting of a Jorge Teillier poem, “La llave que nadie ha perdido”, in which he says: “La poesía es el hondo susurro / de los asesinados / el rumor de hojas en el otoño / la tristeza por el muchacho / que conserva la lengua / pero ha perdido el alma” (59). But the very ubiquity of this piece also allows me to highlight one of the erroneous

critical junctures, mentioned above when discussing the legibility of Chihuailaf's work- the possibility of its incorporation, through misreadings of its nostalgic elements, into a neoliberal identitarian matrix in which, as Joanna Crow again asserts, he could be read as an "indio permitido".³³ But, as she notes, that *would* always only ever be a *misreading*, and the same poem offers up disagreement, in the titular lines. "Y no digo más, porque nadie / encontrará / la llave que nadie ha perdido" (59-61)- to read those lines, knowing of the explicit intertext with Teillier (Chihuailaf is never shy about his respect for the Chilean), and not understand from their citational nature and negation of a loss a further negation of an essentialist, solely nostalgic understanding of Mapuche identity, seems to me a willfully foolish error. But, nonetheless, the forces behind it merit further, explicit comment.

Joanna Crow, in her excellent article "Mapuche Poetry in Post-Dictatorship Chile: Confronting the Dilemmas of Neoliberal Multiculturalism", which I have already referenced several times, is explicit in ascertaining the principle critics responsible for these readings. Linking both the assertion of an inherent "culture of resistance" and the quest for an, always vaguely defined, ancestral memory to Hugo and Iván Carrasco (and implicitly, those who followed in their wake), she then summarily dismisses both approaches. The first for fundamentally obviating the central role of state action in fostering said resistance- the historical basis for which I explored above- and the second for similar reasons but, further, also as being a way of de-politicizing the explicitly political Mapuche poetry such as to reify a (neo)liberal identitarian position (Crow 227). While her analysis suffices to clearly elaborate the points, and thoroughly aligns with my

own, I would like to further highlight how these particular critical gestures serve to, in the sphere of literature and literary criticism, re-create the same incorporative mythopoetic excision that separates the lived experience of the Mapuche from their virtual incorporation within the nation-state's self-narration. Further, she later explicitly contradicts assertions, again by a Carrasco, of some inherently European-ness of writing that would taint Mapuche culture- using statements by Chihuailaf that center the importance of writing as a tool in political struggle, no less (230). This brings forth an important point for my work- the rejection of any supposed naivete on the part of Chihuailaf (or other Mapuche writers) that would essentialize his work as "ethnoliterature" or presume to exclude it from the more rigorous political analysis that it demands. As she points out, the oral/written divide, central to much argumentation in favor of "ethnoliterature", is hardly unique to indigenous cultures (a point that arose in a citation from Chihuailaf, above), and while she centers the ambivalence inherent in a troping of this divide, I find it to be much less grey.³⁴ The temporal placement of orality versus writing that Chihuailaf establishes in an interview leaves little room for doubt:

...me asumo como un oralitor, porque *viví* mi infancia en la oralidad, *pero despues salí* al exilio de la ciudad y entré al mundo de la escritura y de la literatura (el grafema, el artificio del artificio)...[e]scribo a orillas de la oralidad de mis Mayores, intentando dialogar con sus cadencias y con sus relatos, desde la visión de mundo mapuche en la que nací y que dialoga constantemente con la visión de mundo occidental (chilena) que nos impusieron. (Sebastián 128 my emphasis)

Far from unaware of his positioning vis a vis both languages, and their respective principal mnemonic modes, he states very explicitly here what I've been highlighting. He

has left one, but not arrived to the other- in addressing both, he never completely arrives at either, but this displacement is of fundamental importance to his project.

But my recourse to an interview raises both another common critical trope and a problematic, which will allow us to return to *De sueños*.... In the same interview with Teresa Sebastián, Chihuailaf makes a revealing statement about his poetry and its connection to his politics, seeming to lend reason to the discourse of nostalgia above rejected. If I may be permitted a second long quote,

...mi poesía es sobre todo una conversación conmigo mismo, mas también con mis hijas y mis hijos y con sus hijas e hijos, y así sucesivamente. [...] Pero mi Conversación, *a mi pesar*, es -en gran medida- nostálgica, así cuando quiero protestar, manifestar mi enojo y mi impotencia por los atropellos que sufre mi Gente de parte del Estado chileno y la prepotencia de los latifundistas y comerciantes y sus leguleyos, sólo se me aparecen los esteros, los ríos, los bosques, las nubes, las flores, las aves, etc. de mi comunidad. *Pero el nombrar reivindica y devuelve el brillo, su sentido, me digo.* (135 my emphasis)

A selective reading of this will all too easily focus on the centrality of the nostalgic affirmation of his poetry's role, as opposed to his prose, but that would too easily elide the way in which he situates it at the cusp of a political desire that remains frustrated, it would seem, in the poetry. But immediately he contradicts that- reserving for poetry the role of naming the violated natural to restore sense to it- something undeniably political in the context of Mapuche struggle in Chile. The question is, instead, to what extent the tensions between the two forms of writing allow the realization of a political desire shared between them, while refusing to establish one as a metalanguage separate from, but key to the interpretation of, the other.³⁵ The citational coupling of *Recado confidencial a los chilenos* and *De sueños azules y contrasueños* through the poem, and later prose piece, "Sueño azul", further illustrates the unfolding of this political desire and

return us to the poetry as its originary index- and addresses the nostalgia discourse's inadequacy for capturing Chihuailaf's project.

While "Sueño azul" is oft cited within analyses that center the nostalgic longing that the aforementioned critics read in Chihuailaf's work, the connection with its later prose citation is, to my knowledge, never highlighted; moreover, the poem makes that reading inadequate, if not impossible. While its preterite situating of his reminiscences lends a certain touch of the nostalgic, an ambiguity in line with what Crow highlights about his appropriation by the Chilean neoliberal multiculturalist discourse, from the second stanza, Chihuailaf states plainly: "Hablo de la memoria de mi niñez / y no de una sociedad idílica" (25). While that point alone may not suffice to conjure away the nostalgic specter that the poet himself has recognized in his poetry, the tendency to select only from the sections that reflect on said childhood obviates the poem's fuller workings. That interjection of a present tense qualification to the poem's preterite content, interrupting the reflections always already under way, is buttressed by a continued usage of the present perfect throughout the poem (and his larger body of work- it seems a tense he favors). Functioning to re-place the past in relation to the present, befitting the inscription of Mapuche thought, which allows for a temporal folding of past, present and future that establishes them as coterminous, the present perfect belies any undue emphasis on a totalizing sense of loss required for a metadiscursive reading of these poems through a lens dependent on the nostalgic. But again, throughout, he emphasizes his distance and separation from that upon which he reflects, and from which he continues to learn; as he avers parenthetically, regarding his apprenticeship with the land,

“(en eso ando aún)” (37). It is with the “aún”, the *still*, the present perfect condensed in a word, that he jumps to the present and, in doing so, reveals the poem’s double register, contained in the title, the word “sueño”.

As he says later, in the poem “El canto triste de la separación”, “Ya canta mi sombra en sus orillas / el triste canto de la separación: / *Me voy mamá; me voy papá / Hermanos, hermanas: Si vengo otra vez / nos veremos*” (121). I have insisted on exactly this displacement, distancing, and impossible return (or arrival) to the too-glibly referred mother tongue; a distance inscribed in his work and emphasized in the latter part of “Sueño azul”. He dedicates the last two stanzas to the unequivocally present, directing his words to his friends and family scattered across the world- Italy, France, Sweden, Germany all appear, as does Amsterdam, from where he writes. Just as these toponyms interrupt as Castilian in the Mapudungun, forcing us to account for the impossibility of translating his new location into a language past, it in turn requires us to account for the dream’s double register in this poem and throughout his bilingual *oeuvre*. While, as Chihuailaf explains of Mapuche cosmology, the Blue Dream accounts for the totality of existence- spatial and temporal- at play in our present lives, in Castilian the phrase most strongly indexes the emergence in sleep of the unobtainable unconscious. The poem, then, in a bilingual reading, is recounting the already past childhood *and* registering its repressed status within the state language inscribed in and by the usage of Castilian- and its interruption by geopolitical markers, the toponyms locating the Mapuche diaspora. But as he makes apparent in two later poems, both referencing his distance and leaving, one cannot set aside the impossibility of either arrival when approaching his work,

especially from Castilian. In “La luna puede tener tu nombre”, which analogizes his pain in the Castilian with a reference to Hiroshima that does *not* appear in the Mapudungun, speaking to himself by staging a conversation with the moon, he plainly states that “[t]al vez nunca podré hablar / de tus visiones / *al otro lado del oeste*” (65 my emphasis).

Paired with the entirety of the following, “Podría ser inmensamente feliz”, which reads “Podría ser inmensamente feliz / me digo / Pero cómo, si tú- lejana- estás / llorando?”, the implication is clear: while he masterfully manages the language he heads towards, that language impedes any total return to Mapudungun, just as the tearful distance from the latter impedes any total arrival to Castilian and the State’s law (69). However, this state of constant arrival without the arrival-event is better materialized in a later poem in this text.

That poem, which I would argue is both the hinge and the highest accomplishment of his text as marker of his hypermnestic project’s dual status within the state language that determines its legibility, is “Es otro el invierno que en mis ojos llora”. The poem begins by invoking a ceremony in which Genechen, a prominent Mapuche spirit, speaks to the poet, recounting the language and knowledge of the Mapuche people- another apparently essentializing reference to the nostalgic version of Mapuche culture and mythology. But after a stanza break, marking the insuperable hiatus, the title arrives to insinuate the fundamental dislocation of the poet who hears from where the spirit speaks. It reads, “[l]lueve, afuera seguramente llueve / pero es otro el invierno que / en mis ojos llora / Hacia los días venideros vuelvo / entonces la mirada” (93). Without hesitation or ambiguity, the poem’s text performs a double gesture- it breaks any

definitive link between enunciatory and memorial spaces and, more positively, indicates the forward-facing futurity of Chihuailaf's work, realized as action in his prose and advocacy. Neither the winter past nor the winter lived by the speaker holds his eye; instead, he looks towards the future he works for and a day that may not, perhaps, be so rainy. But the actual content of the poem is the lesser aspect of its functioning- far more significant is the formal experimentation of its presentation on the page. While throughout the text, the verso presents the Mapudungun and the recto Castilian, in this poem the verso rejects this formatting to instead re-present a mirror-image of the Castilian text- each page with its own modification. On the first page, the mirrored text intertwines a series of capitalized words in Mapudungun unaccounted for in the Castilian, so as to render the two languages almost illegible where they overlap, with the Castilian words "el espíritu" and "el agua" oriented vertically near the page's edge. On the second, the text overlays a pencil sketch of a Mapuche resembling Chihuailaf (which is replaced in the second edition with a photograph of him) and includes the Mapuche terms "ñi ko" and "ñi Pvlly" in a vertical orientation, corresponding approximately to "agua" and "espíritu" in Castilian, but in reverse order from the latter's appearance on the prior page. Both the Mapudungun and the image of the Mapuche man appear behind and yet intercalated with the inverted Castilian, denying the possibility of any translation of one to the other *and* the accessibility of the Mapuche to the colonial reader who, as I do, approaches this text as a legible object through the colonial, capitalist state language that simultaneously strives to efface the real of the Mapuche while still maintaining a permissible image of them within the order of its law.

But, as may be expected, I would like to highlight a more radical gesture within this poem. Reflecting on the assumption of the subject's capacity to say "I" necessary for any identitarian discourse, Derrida reminds us that first

[e]s preciso [...] que esté resuelta la cuestión de la unidad de la lengua, y dado el Uno de la lengua en sentido estricto o amplio, un sentido amplio que se extenderá hasta incluir todos los modelos y todas las modalidades identificatorias, todos los polos de proyección imaginaria de la cultura social. (46)

Given that the Chilean multiculturalist discourse demands the identitarian locatability, that is, legibility, of the Mapuche subject, Chihuailaf's poem destabilizes the law's presumed unity by forcing from between its lines the presence of the disavowed, unknowable other. So, coupled with the content's affirmation of the speaker's fundamental displacement from his childhood land and mother tongue, the formal presentation of this poem denies the possibility of a true arrival of the Mapuche as subject to the State's law by forcing the dissonant absence of contact between the two languages that the poet, and this book, manage. Here, on these pages, Chihuailaf announces his state of constant arrival without arrival, without an event that would allow him to be accounted for and counted on, fixed within the language with which he addresses his other. He speaks only languages of arrival, both for him under interdiction, and blurs the presumptive tidiness of any differentiation or categorization of himself, his work, or any other Mapuche that the State, or any political discourse derived from or in dialogue with it, seeks to incorporate.

Finally, as the book's last poem and as a closing point for my analysis, his poem "*Caminata en el bosque*" drives home the ambiguity, if not impossibility, of any attempt to pursue a "real" Mapuche identity through this text. While the content speaks of an

inebriation in the blue so sacred to the Mapuche, the presentation again signals the radical necessity of a continuous rereading of the poet's work. Rather than simply denying the possibility of translation between the two languages, it inverts the entire assumption of destination languages that drives it- on the verso, where the "original" is expected, appears the Castilian and on the recto, the "translation" is to Mapudungun. This book closes with a demand that is also an aperture toward a measureless future- a demand that we reread the entire text again, in reverse, reflecting on our assumptions of essentiality, legibility and linguistic hierarchy, by confusing simple presumptions about its directionality from its end- which is also, therefore, its beginning. The tools of poetry and translation undo the stability and unity of the State's language, which so many of us abuse to speak of something it can never contain, and render always already failed any project that seeks, through this medium, to derive an essential identity in its attempts to found a (neo)liberal capitalist subject.

Herein, at the frustrated end of my analysis, arises again the Janus-esque specter of Chihuailaf's hypermnestic project- both failed and successful, but only insofar as it is by necessity inscribed within the archives of the State to and of which it speaks. If, as I have been exploring, what we might say of this poetry's politics is that it is a dialogue, a recognition, unaccomplished and impossible in the poetic form due to tensions arisen in the ample sense of its translation; then in the prose we see the successful realization of that desire as articulating the plurivocal reality of the contested territory we refer to as Chile and Argentina. But, again, those are terms that can be grounded only under the aegis of the colonial, capitalist state's patriarchal and, as such, leave off any pretenses of

articulating a “true” Mapuche subject both differentiated in and legible to the law. By rendering *more* legible, embodying, the Mapuche for the law, beginning an ongoing process of destabilizing the spectacular virtuality of that incomplete signifier within the state’s order, this project accomplishes not a true pluriculturality but, rather, marks the still extant insufficiency of the language *through* which it is articulated, without ever completely arriving *in* it. Despite its apparent content, not for this being less important, its most significant work lays in the way that it highlights the colonial necessity of establishing the fixity of an other against, and through, which the colonial can claim for itself univocity. I can only hope that that work finds fertile ground upon which to grow into the future.

Our bounds and theirs

As a final chapter, my analysis of Chihuailaf is meant as a coda in much the same way that he uses the final poem of *De sueños azules y contrasueños*- closing it, but re-opening it, as well. I opened this chapter by averring the similarities that Chihuailaf has with my readings of both Parra and Gelman, while also insisting that his project puts mine and those I have been analyzing into crisis- and I will close by insisting that we return to constantly reread the very terms in which we posit divergent and anti-state movements in Latin America and abroad. Our goal *cannot* be to simply produce an idealized knowledge around subjects we choose as worthy- and thus limiting *their* capacity to be and act by constricting them with(in) *our* overdetermined expectations. Rather, we must understand a fundamentally imperative note rung in every reading in solidarity, such that we act, in the sphere within which we are given to act, in such a way

as to increase the affective and ontological capacity of not only ourselves, but also those we act beside, with, and for. While Chihuailaf does allow for what I have called an auto-didact's pedagogy of love and solidarity, we must understand the inverted directionality that his project assumes. If Parra teaches us to work in solidarity from the limits of the State's language, we can also realize that even the most autonomist or anarchist inflected social or political project, insofar as political remains an appropriate term, still exists both in dialogue with the State and bound by the language through which the State articulates its laws and history. As we enter a moment of neoliberal politicking and the transition of the State to a role as translating machine for the movements of global capital, and thus see the concomitant divergences from statist politics that seek an alternative form of life characterized by an exodic movement beside and away from colonial, statist spatial practices, we are bound to encounter the presence(s) that have long existed in a mode of formal displacement from the apparatuses of epistemic capture that found nation-state discourses' ontological presumptions. By signaling from within this language the fractious nature that the State attempts to veil through totalizing narrativizations of history and identity, Chihuailaf provides apertures toward a to-come in which singularly plural subjectivities- subject only to their co-emergent state of infinite responsibility- might radically distance themselves from the law, such that they effect a rupture with the foundational terms of epistemo-ontological plenitude based, in the final analysis, on deception and intellectual dishonesty. He signals, to even the most sympathetic *winka*, that there is still much work to be done before the discourses that underpin radical propositions for autonomy allow that conjunction of terms its fullest articulation.

I wish to say this in another way, but my tongue holds me in thrall. We *must* undo the knowledge systems and power structures that the various modulations of the capitalist mode of production have overdetermined, such that they in turn overdetermine the subjective *we* of which *I* speak. To work from a position of solidarity and love is to recognize the limits and permeability of the narratives through and around which the spectacle (historicity, the law, neoliberalism- however you may say it) has constructed a *we* composed of alienated individuals. Fundamental to the process of coming to a (re)realization of our singularly plural emergence in the uncountable ethical encounters with other embodied lives is the requirement that we interrogate the terms through which even the left, in its manifold forms, has allowed for the determination of freedom and the lives that deserve and may embody it. Chihuailaf, although he may have yet to arrive in our order, so masterfully speaks its language that we cannot be deaf to what he reveals to us- the questions unasked for which he provides answers, the narratives unacknowledged that determine who might be friend, and who foe. We must return, *I* must return, to the uninterrogated terms of a debate that, even as it attempts a divergence from, is bound by the State's language. An inheritance which can only be that of violence, coloniality, metaphysics, and capitalism. For all the work already done, there is ever more to come. And that is a lesson we might all approve.

Endnotes

¹ I borrow the final two terms and their elaboration from Alberto Moreiras's chapter "The Aura of Testimonio" and Gareth Williams's further usage of them in his chapter "The Fantasies of Cultural Exchange in Latin American Subaltern Studies", both of which are included in the book *The Real Thing: Testimonial Discourse and Latin America*, edited by Georg M. Gugelberger. Their discussion of subalternist work and solidarity in Latinamericanism, particularly as practiced in the US, will haunt my work in this chapter much as it has throughout this dissertation.

² While this is not the space for an exhaustive list, key authors whose works I will be referencing or have influenced me directly and indirectly include: poets Lionel Lienlaf and Jaime Huenún, and historian-activists Luis Cárcamo-Huechante, Pablo Mariman Quemano, Héctor Nahuelpan Moreno, José Millalen Paillal and Fernando Pairican Padilla.

³ When referring to this project as hypermnestic, I am borrowing the term from its usage by Jacques Derrida in his *The Monolingualism of the Other: Or, a Prosthesis of Origin*, in which he identifies it as one variety of memory deployed by the colonized- one marked by an anamnesis that borders on genealogical, and strives to inscribe this excessive remembering in the (colonial) language of the (colonial) state, the law, with an eye towards a possible arrival to subjective plenitude by the colonial subject, using his life as a Franco-Maghrebi as example. The version I cite is in Spanish and, as such, so is the listed bibliographical reference.

⁴ It would be accurate to say, then, that I am attempting to take up the call of a deconstructive tendency within subalternist readings, specifically as Gayatri Spivak identifies it in her engagement with the work of the initial subaltern group in "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing History". That is, I wish to situate my work as setting out from a recognition of the double movement of the subaltern as supplementary to the hegemonic system- supplementing a lack but always marking, and marked as, failure, due to operating within the system of alienation inscribed in the work of "reason" proper to history and literary studies as fields derived from western traditions. My question would be, then, to what extent can we work from, through and past failure to persist in a generative practice of reading that effects change from where we, the hegemonic reader, are situated, thus destabilizing that same situation/situatedness?

⁵ In this sense, I would again echo Chakrabarty, or one Chakrabarty. In "The Death of History?: Historical Consciousness and the Culture of Late Capitalism" he says of Guha's "methodological innovations" that they "are not so much aimed at renovating 'history' as they are at critiquing the hermeneutic aspects of the practices that constitute 'doing history' in the academic context...as a deliberate work of 'reading' [and thus, teaching and learning] the archives on which his narratives are based" (53)- and I cannot, as my aside implies, but understand that project as a pedagogical one that demands of its

student-readers that they be teachers, in turn, and that its process be endless. That seems to me the same lesson Chihuailaf offers, in different terms- one of the impossibility, at least in the present, of any hermeneutics or archival consignment, both necessarily predicated on epistemic centrality of critical apparatuses that demand and/or create the I/Other distinction to (re)authorize themselves. Or, as Chakrabarty avers shortly thereafter, that we register “the inadequacy of both the categories as well as the rhetoric of all emancipatory political philosophies in satisfactorily conveying the texture and the specificities of the different and often contradictory that are entailed in processes through which relationships of power, i.e., domination subordination and resistance, are produced and experienced” (54).

⁶ I wish here to preempt any hasty association of his work with the extensive discourse on *testimonio* in latinamericanism as practiced, at least, in the US, for both stylistic and teleological reasons. Stylistically, it conforms strongly to aesthetic standards associated with more “traditional” literary endeavors and, as such, does not exhibit what Moreiras, in the previously cited article on *testimonio*, refers to as a “subdued sublime”- that is, it does not enact a liminal experience of the literary that gestures towards any possibility of the real attained through lived experience. Moreover, while it does share some affinity with what Gareth Williams says of Rigoberta Menchu in “Translation and Mourning: The Cultural Challenge of Latin American Testimonial Autobiography”, in that it manifests oral/written tensions, Chihuailaf’s paradoxically doubly singular role as auto-translator between and because of his modal mastery of both styles, and thus embodied/virtual subjective split, complicates to the point of nullity any attempt to apply to his work Williams’s assertion that *testimonio* “effectively insert[s] its enemy- the metropolitan notion of ‘progress’-into itself” (87). Chihuailaf himself is already always arriving to his own insertion into metropolitan notional progressiveness, not as lesser but as a, albeit incomplete, constitutive element. This is a strength and a weakness, as we will see, but it nonetheless distances his enunciatory position from those common to *testimonio*. For further reading on *testimonio*, see the cited volume that includes the chapter by both Moreiras and Williams.

⁷ David Aníñir Guilitraro is a Santiago-born Mapuche poet, artist and activist, and coined the term “mapurbe” made famous by his poetry collection *Mapurbe: venganza a raíz*. Jaime Luis Huenún is a Valdivia-born Mapuche-huilliche poet and activist, author of several books of poetry, many translated into various European languages, and editor of poetry collections that include *Epu mari ñlkatufe to fachantü/20 poetas Mapuche contemporáneos*.

⁸ In this sense, he fills a similar role to that that Luis E. Cárcamo-Huechante identifies in the poetry of Lionel Lienlaf, in his article “No + *Wingka* Word: Sounds of Mapuche Resurgence in the Poetry of Lionel Lienlaf” (2016).

⁹ When I here, and throughout, refer to spectacular incorporability or the spectacle in general, it is an explicit reference to the work of the situationist Guy Debord. While the citation may seem anachronistic, given Debord's periodization, I insert it in a logic of the specter that itself references Jacques Derrida as a way to assert that, despite our association of the spectacle with tele-technologization, it's logic has long held sway over all cultural representations- historical, poetic, narrative, painting, etcetera- insofar as they deal with any subject barred from the dominant social structures of their period. Thus, as the Mapuche have, for the most part, been so barred from *all* colonial modes of production and cultural forms since the arrival of the Spanish, they have long prefigured the post-modern tele-technics of the contemporary spectacle.

¹⁰ For a long elaboration of the ontological implications of this situation, and an attempt at synthesizing the broad strokes of a Mapuche ontology, see Marcelo González Gálvez's *Los Mapuche y sus otros: persona, alteridad y sociedad en el sur de Chile*. While it reproduces some of the translational problematics key to my criticism of *winka* work on the Mapuche, it is a compassionate and respectful work in collaboration with Mapuche communities, and its elaboration of what he calls a *singularismo radical* sheds a fascinating light on the difficulties of any attempts both to define the term "Mapuche" from the Mapuche perspective and generalize about the Mapuche *pueblo*, from any perspective.

¹¹ As the following sketch is not exhaustive, I will not be discussing texts at length. Nonetheless, I'd like to include here a list of works that have been useful to me, the full citations included in my bibliography, to which one may refer themselves for further elaboration of these points. In history, see: the collected works in both *Ta iñ fijke xipa rakizuameluwün: Historia, colonialismo y resistencia desde el país Mapuche* and *Awükan ka kuxankan zugu wajmapu mew: Violencias coloniales en Wajmapu*; José Bengoa's *Historia del pueblo Mapuche* and *Mapuche, colonos y el Estado nacional*; Adrian Moyano's *De mar a mar: El Wallmapu sin fronteras*; Alejandro Saavedra Pleáez's *Los Mapuche en la sociedad chilena actual*; ¡...Escucha, Winka...! by Sergio Caniuqueo, Rodrigo Levil, Pablo Marimán and José Millalén, as well as each contributor's own works; Florencia Mallon's *Courage Tastes of Blood: The Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailío and the Chilean State, 1906-2001*; Joanna Crow's article "Debates about Ethnicity, Class and Nation in Allende's Chile (1970-1973)"; José A. Mariman's "Transición democrática en Chile ¿Nuevo ciclo reivindicativo mapuche?"; Sergio Silva Jaramillo's "Estado y empresas privadas en la realidad mapuche"; and Pablo-Raúl Arreola's "Reorganization of Chile's Frontier Administration and the Origins of the Mapuche Revolt of 1865". For works from other fields, see: Diane Haughney's *Neoliberal Economics, Democratic Transition, and Mapuche Demands for Rights in Chile*; Patricia Richard's *Race and the Chilean Miracle: Neoliberalism, Democracy, and Indigenous Rights*; Lucía Guerra-Cunningham's *La Ciudad Ajena: Subjetividades de origen Mapuche en el espacio urbano*; Gerardo Azócar, Rodrigo Sanhueza, Mauricio Aguayo, Hugo Romero and María D. Muñoz's "Conflicts for Control of Mapuche-

Pehuenche land and natural resources in the Bío-Bío highlands, Chile”; Anna Maria Kowalczyk’s “Indigenous Peoples and Modernity: Mapuche Mobilizations in Chile”; and Guillaume Boccara’s “The Mapuche People in Post-Dictatorship Chile”. I will further mention specific texts from this list in following notes, as they are immediately relevant.

¹² Specifically concerning Mapuche presence in what is now Argentina, I would refer the reader to Adrian Moyano, *ibid.*

¹³ Regarding the various epic poems about the “War of Arauco” and their stylistic relations to Greek and Roman epics, as well as their importance for the burgeoning Chilean nation, see María Gabriela Huidobro Salazar’s *El imaginario de la Guerra de Arauco: mundo épico y tradición clásica*.

¹⁴ In fact, as Carlos Ruíz Rodríguez notes in his contribution to *Rebelión en Wallmapu: Resistencia en el pueblo-nación Mapuche*, the very term *winka* used to refer to colonizers and their descendents finds its origins in “*we ingka*”, or “new Inca”. So even the concept of a foreign, centralized power with which they had at least strained relations, was not itself foreign to them.

¹⁵ Here I refer to Guerra-Cunningham, *ibid.*, Boccara, *ibid.*, and Luis Cárcamo-Huechante’s brief note “The Long History of Indigenous Textual Cultures: A Response”.

¹⁶ See in particular Pablo-Raúl Arreola, *ibid.*

¹⁷ It is worth noting that Gabriel Salazar, in his *La enervante levedad histórica de la clase política civil (Chile, 1900-1973)*, avers that the sought-after consolidation of the bourgeoisie as a political class never saw fruition in Chile, which he maintains has been dominated by an oligarchic form of government since its inception. This observation, should we choose to uphold it, would lend sense to the ongoing processes of primitive accumulation and territorial conflict that have characterized relations between the Mapuche and Chile ever since independence. One can also refer to his *Historia de la acumulación capitalista en Chile (Apuntes de clase)* for further elaboration of this point. Regarding primitive accumulation, all major thought of it bears strong resemblance to the Chilean situation vis a vis the Mapuche: from Rosa Luxemburg’s *The Accumulation of Capital*; David Harvey’s work, summarized in “The ‘New’ Imperialism: Accumulation by Dispossession”; and Marx’s strikingly similar portrait of Scotland at the end of *Capital, Volume I*. Here I mention them only in passing- not to say that any one can completely contain the nature of these processes, but rather to indicate that at various points, and in various ways, the relation(s) that obtains between the Mapuche and the State are strongly marked by post-independence capital projects. Regrettably, I cannot further analyze these processes here.

¹⁸ This point- on the varying relations between the Mapuche and the Chilean left and right- is somewhat contentious amongst historians. It is the source of a debate and of mutual recriminations between Pablo Marimán and José Bengoa, wherein the former claims that the Mapuche allied with whomsoever it seemed most advantageous at any given moment, and Bengoa relies on archival work to stake a claim to a strong tendency within the broader Mapuche to ally themselves with the Left (while not denying the plurality of positions within the Mapuche, which include the opposite assertion). Alina Rodenkirchen's chapter in *Violencias colonials en Wajmapu* does an excellent job of complicating any univocal position in this debate and presents a Mapuche perspective on the Pinochet dictatorship. Florencia Mallon's *Courage Tastes of Blood* also teases out the complexities of the Left/Mapuche relation, escaping somewhat from the polemic of the other two. Joanna Crow (2007) explicates well the Allende government's policies towards and attempts to include the Mapuche. While I will maintain an ambivalent position, merely signaling the debate, I would like to underline its existence- it reinforces that any attempt at establishing a single historical framework for *any* relations between the Mapuche and the Chileans is apt to be fraught.

¹⁹ Patricia Richards's *Race and the Chilean Miracle: Neoliberalism, Democracy, and Indigenous Rights* does an excellent job of archiving and categorizing the various manifestations of this racism throughout the latter half of the twentieth century and into the present. However, the reliance on testimonies from and observations of the *Chilean* perpetrators of this systemic pattern, while illustrative of its pervasiveness, only further reinforces the directionality inherent in the framing of the studies I am broadly referring to throughout this chapter. We must find a way to formulate, or reformulate, these studies such that they begin from beside the Mapuche and grow outward not simply in their conception, but even in their execution. This is not to impugn Richards, who I don't doubt would agree with this, but rather to comment how even a study of her rigor and framing is restricted by its author's social and professional positionality.

²⁰ Much of these observations, particularly concerning multiculturalism's attempts at (re-)appropriating the Mapuche figure, are due to Joanna Crow's article "Mapuche Poetry in Post-Dictatorship Chile: Confronting the Dilemmas of Neoliberal Multiculturalism", which I will comment more fully below.

²¹ This is a principle take away from Diane Haughney's *Neoliberal Economics, Democratic Transition, and Mapuche Demands for Rights in Chile*, which does an excellent job in detailing the slipshod and hasty attempts at writing or emending legislation which refers to the Mapuche.

²² For an excellent explication of this logging and other extractivist policies, see Gerardo Azócar, et al. *ibid.*

²³ In fact, these events appear in the vast majority, if not all, of the previously noted works, as well as being a constant, explicit theme in the poetry and advocacy of Mapuche poets and public figures.

²⁴ Haughney, *ibid.*, provides an excellent exploration of the law and politics entangled in this issue.

²⁵ Alongside the already cited references, I have included bibliographical information for a short piece by Pairican in the works cited.

²⁶ In this sense, it tracks similar effects of Mapuche radio shows that Luis Cárcamo-Huechante (2010) documents.

²⁷ For the explicit explanation of the *werkv*, see pages 95-6 in the cited edition. Chihuailaf, in his role as *werken*, presents an interesting reversal of the ideational pilgrimage that Gareth Williams (1996) analyzes regarding *testimonios*. That is, instead of facilitating *our* going *to* the other to find *ourselves*, this text is such that that other, Chihuailaf, comes *to us* to teach us *to stay where we are* and work on ourselves, rather than seeking ourselves in our imagination of the other.

²⁸ In this sense, it is worth noting here the similarities that this conceptualization presents with Spinoza's elaboration of Nature/God in his *Ethics*. There may be here a productive point of contact with my work in the previous chapter- but it would need fuller elaboration that I cannot offer here.

²⁹ Concerning these assertions, see pages 92-4 of the cited edition.

³⁰ Carmen Gloria Godoy R., in her article "En El Bosque De La Memoria: Identidad Mapuche y Escritura En Dos Obras De Elicura Chihuailaf", explores and explicates at greater length Chihuailaf's navigation of the singular/collective tension that I briefly signal here, using similar referents to my own to demonstrate how he maintains authority to speak of Mapuche experiences while not pretending to have the final word on them.

³¹ Rojas explores this in his text *La lengua escorada: La traducción como estrategia de resistencia en cuatro poetas mapuche*.

³² For a sampling of these sorts of readings, including many by the more prominent critics, see *Crítica Situada: El Estado Actual Del Arte y La Poesía Mapuche*, which somewhat ironically includes a text by Chihuailaf that is miscited by at least two contributors, particularly concerning issues of identity. The article by Joanna Crow I am referring to is "Mapuche Poetry in Post-Dictatorship Chile: Confronting the Dilemmas of Neoliberal Multiculturalism" and will reappear later in more detail.

³³ Crow, *ibid.*, draws this terminology of the “indio permitido” from Charles Hale.

³⁴ While it should go without mentioning, the obvious theoretical referent here is Derrida’s *Of Grammatology*, which centers this debate within a framework that marks it as entirely colonial, from as early as its introduction. For an example of this usage in criticism of Mapuche poetry, see Hugo Carrasco’s “Poesía Mapuche Actual: De La Apropiación Hacia La Innovación Cultural”.

³⁵ Assertions around prose and interviews as a metalanguage that explicates the poetry come principally from the Carrascos, and can be found in the contribution to *La crítica situada...* by Ivan Carrasco, “Metalenguas de poetas mapuches etnoculturales” and Juan Manuel Fierro’s contribution “Un proceso de metalectura: entrevistas a Elicura Chihuailaf”.

Bibliography

- Abrams, Phillip. "Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State." *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, edited by Aradhana Sharma and Akhil Gupta, Blackwell Pub., 2006, pp. 112–130.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*. Translated by Michael Hardt, 8th ed., University of Minnesota, 2013.
- , -. *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Form-of-Life*. Translated by Adam Kotsko, Stanford UP, 2013.
- , -. *Infancy and History: On the Destruction of Experience*. Trans. Liz Heron, Verso, 2007.
- , -. *Medios sin fin: Notas sobre la política*. Translated by Antonio Jimeno Cuspiner, 2nd ed., Pre-textos, 2010.
- Altamirano, Carlos. *Peronismo y cultura de izquierda*. Temas Grupo, 2001.
- Althusser, Louis. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Translated by G.M. Goshgarian, Verso, 2014.
- Althusser, Louis, and Renato Parascandolo. "The Crisis of Marxism: An Interview with Louis Althusser." Translated by Ron Salaj, Multimedia Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences, Italian Radio Television, Apr. 1980, <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/3312-the-crisis-of-marxism-an-interview-with-louis-althusser>
- Ardito, Ernesto and Virna Molina, directors. *Corazón De Fábrica*. 2008.
- Argentina Arde*. Argentina Arde, N.a.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. "Global Shift: A New Capitalist State?" *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, University of Minnesota, 2002, pp. 268-86.
- Arreola, Pablo-Raúl. "Reorganization of Chile's Frontier Administration and the Origins of the Mapuche Revolt of 1865." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, vol. 25, no. 50, 2000, pp. 131-167.
- Auyero, Javier. "Protest and Politics in Contemporary Argentina." *Argentine Democracy: The Politics of Institutional Weakness*, edited by Steven Levitsky and María Victoria Murillo, Pennsylvania State UP, 2005, pp. 250-68.

- Avelar, Idelber. *The Untimely Present*. Duke UP, 1999.
- Azócar, Gerardo, et. al. "Conflicts for Control of Mapuche-Pehuenche land and natural resources in the BíoBío highlands, Chile." *Journal of Latin American Geography*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2005, pp.57-76.
- Badiou, Alain. *Conditions*. Translated by Steven Corcoran, Continuum, 2008.
- Badiou, Alain, and Nicolas Truong. *In Praise of Love*. Translated by Peter Bush, New Press, 2012.
- Baeza, Enrique Antileo, and Claudio Alvarado Lincopi, editors. *Awükan Ka Kuxankan Zugu Wajmapu Mew. Violencias coloniales en Wajmapu*. Ediciones Comunidad de Historia Mapuche, 2015.
- Barrow, Clyde W. "The Miliband-Poulantzas Debate: An Intellectual History." *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, University of Minnesota, 2002, pp. 3-52.
- Bataille, Georges. *The Absence of Myth: Writings on Surrealism*. Translated by Michael Richardson, Verso, 1994.
- Baudry, Jean-Louis. "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus." *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader*, edited by Philip Rosen, Columbia UP, 1986, pp. 286-97.
- Bazin, André. "Death Every Afternoon." Translated by Mark A. Cohen, *Rites of Realism: Essays on Corporeal Cinema*, edited by Ivone Margulies, Duke UP, 2003, pp. 27-31.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Translated by Harry Zohn, edited by Hannah Arendt, Schocken, 1969.
- . *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*. Translated by Edmund Jeffcot, edited by Peter Demetz, Schocken, 1978.
- Benasayag, Miguel and Diego Sztulwark. *Política y situación: de la potencia al contrapoder*. Ediciones de mano en mano, 2000.
- Bengoa, José. *Historia del pueblo mapuche*. Ediciones Sur, 1985.
- ,-. *Mapuche, Colonos y El Estado Nación*. Catalonia, 2014.

- Boccaro, Guillaume. "The Mapuche People in Post-Dictatorship Chile." *Études rurales*, no. 163/164, Terre Territoire Appartenances, Jul.-Dec. 2002, pp. 283-303.
- Breton, André. *What is Surrealism?: Selected Writings*. Edited by Franklin Rosemont, Pathfinder, 1978.
- Brunner, José Joaquín. *América Latina: cultura y modernidad*. Grijalbo, 1992.
- Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-garde*. Translated by Michael Shaw, U Minnesota P, 1984.
- Burnett, Ron. "Video: The Politics of Culture and Community." *Resolutions: Contemporary Video Practices*, edited by Michael Renov and Erika Suderburg, University of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 283-303.
- Butler, Judith. *Senses of the Subject*. Fordham U, 2015.
- Butler, Judith, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Who Sings the Nation-State?: Language, Politics, Belonging*. Seagull, 2011.
- "Cacophony." Merriam-Webster, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cacophony.
- Calvo, Ernesto and María Victoria Murillo. "The New Iron Law of Argentine Politics? Partisanship, Clientelism, and Governability in Contemporary Argentina." *Argentine Democracy: The Politics of Institutional Weakness*, edited by Steven Levitsky and María Victoria Murillo, Pennsylvania State UP, 2005, pp. 207-26.
- Camus, Albert. *The Rebel*. Translated by Anthony Bower, Vintage Books, 1959.
- Caniuqueo, Sergio, et al. *¡...Escucha, Winka...!: Cuatro Ensayos De Historia Nacional Mapuche y Un Epílogo Sobre El Futuro*. LOM Ediciones, 2006.
- Cárcamo-Huechante, Luis E. "A Long History of Indigenous Textual Cultures: A Response." *Textual Cultures*, vol. 6, no. 2, Autumn 2011, pp. 142-6.
- , -. "No + Wingka Word: Sounds of Mapuche Resurgence in the Poetry of Lionel Lienlaf." *Radical History Review*, 124, January 2016, pp. 102-16.
- , -. "Wixage anai! Mapuche Voices on the Air." *CR: The New Centennial Review*, vol. 10, no. 1, Spring 2010, pp. 155-68.
- Carrasco Muñoz, Hugo. "Poesía Mapuche Actual: De La Apropiación Hacia La

- Innovación Cultural.” *Revista Chilena De Literatura*, vol. 43, Nov. 1993, pp. 75–87.
- Carrasco Muñoz, Iván. “El antipoema de Parra: una escritura transgresora.” *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, Edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993. 115-129.
- Casarino, Cesare and Antonio Negri. *in praise of the common: a conversation on philosophy and politics*. University of Minnesota, 2008.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. “The Death of History?: Historical Consciousness and the Culture of Late Capitalism.” *Public Culture*, vol. 4, no. 2, Spring 1992, pp. 47-65.
- ,-. “Marx After Marxism: A Subaltern Historian’s Perspective.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 28, no. 22, May 29, 1993, pp. 1094-6.
- Chanan, Michael. “Filming the Invisible.” *Rethinking Documentary: New Perspectives, New Practices*. Edited by Thomas Austin and Wilma de Jong, Open UP, 2008. pp. 121-32.
- ,-. *The Politics of Documentary*. British Film Institute, 2007.
- Chihuailaf Nahuelpán, Elicura. *De Sueños Azules y Contrasueños*. Ed. Universitaria, 1995.
- ,-. “Mongoley Mapu Ñi Püllü Chew Ñi Llewmuñiñ.” *Crítica Situada: El Estado Actual Del Arte y La Poesía Mapuche*, edited by Mabel García Barrera et al., Editorial Florencia, 2005, pp. 233–246.
- ,-. *Recado Confidencial a Los Chilenos*. LOM, 2015.
- Ciancio, María Belén and Rachel Grace Newman. “Labyrinths and Lines of Memory in Documentary Film: Memoria del saqueo and Los rubios from a Philosophical Perspective.” *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2013, pp. 101-13.
- Colectivo Situaciones. *19 & 20: Apuntes para el nuevo protagonismo social*. Ediciones de mano a mano, 2002.
- Cortés, Victor Muñoz. *Sin dios ni patronos: Historia, diversidad y conflictos del anarquismo en la región chilena (1890-1990)*. Mar y Tierra, 2013.
- Critchley, Simon. "The Other's Decision in Me (What Are the Politics of Friendship?)." *Ethics, Politics, Subjectivity: Essays on Derrida, Levinas and Contemporary French Thought*, Verso, 1999, pp. 254-86.

- Crites, Elsa. "Gelman: Endurance, Despair and Love." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 82, no. 4, 2005, pp. 491-500.
- Crow, Joanna. "Debates about Ethnicity, Class and Nation in Allende's Chile (1970-1973)." *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol. 26, no. 3, July 2007, pp. 319-338.
- , -. "Mapuche Poetry in Post-Dictatorship Chile: Confronting the Dilemmas of Neoliberal Multiculturalism." *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2008, pp. 221-240., doi:10.1080/13569320802228062.
- Dalmaroni, Miguel Angel. "Juan Gelman : Cronología 1930-2000." *Orbis Tertius*, vol. 4, no. 8, 2001.
- , -. "Juan Gelman: Del poeta-legislador a una lengua sin estado". *Orbis Tertius*, vol. 4, no. 8, 2001.
- De Costa, René. "Introduction." *Poemas Y Antipoemas: (1954)*, Nicanor Parra, edited by René De Costa, Cátedra, 1988, 9-40.
- Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. Black and Red, 1983.
- del Barco, Óscar. "No matarás."
<https://lectoresdeheidegger.wordpress.com/2011/09/22/oscar-del-barco-no-mataras-carta-a-schmucler/>.
- Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October*, no. 59, Winter, 1992, pp. 3-7.
- , -. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Translated by Robert Hurley, City Lights, 1988.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Translated by Eric Prenowitz, U Chicago, 1998.
- , -. *Dissemination*. Translated by Barbara Johnson, U Chicago P, 1981.
- , -. "Force of Law: The "Mystical Foundation of Authority"" Translated by Mary Quaintance, *Cardozo Law Review*, no. 11, 1989-90, pp. 920-1045.
- , -. *The Gift of Death*. Translated by David Wills, U Chicago P, 1995.
- , -. *El Monolingüismo Del Otro: o La Prótesis De Origen*. Translated by Horacio Pons, Manantial, 1997.

- ,-. *Pasiones*. Translated by Horacio Pons, Amorrortu, 2011.
- ,-. *Politics of Friendship*. Translated by George Collins, Verso, 2005.
- ,-. "Signature Event Context." *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by Alan Bass, U Chicago P, 1982, pp. 307-30.
- ,-. *Specters of Marx*. Translated by Peggy Kamuf, Routledge, 1994.
- ,-. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." *Writing and Difference*, translated by Alan Bass, U Chicago P, 1978, pp. 278-94.
- ,-. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass, University of Chicago, 1978.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. "Disagreement and Hope: The Hidden Transcripts in the Grammar of Political Recovery in Postcrisis Argentina." *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014, pp. 115-34.
- Doane, Mary Ann. *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, The Archive*. Harvard UP, 2002.
- ,-. "The Object of Theory." *Rites of Realism: Essays on Corporeal Cinema*, edited by Ivone Margulies, Duke UP, 2003, pp. 80-9.
- Dove, Patrick. *Literature and "Interregnum": Globalization, War, and the Crisis of Sovereignty in Latin America*. SUNY Press, 2016.
- ,-. "Memory Between Politics and Ethics: Del Barco's Letter." *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2008, pp. 279-97.
- Eaton, Kent. "Menem and the Governors: Intergovernmental Relations in the 1990s." *Argentine Democracy: The Politics of Institutional Weakness*, edited by Steven Levitsky and María Victoria Murillo, Pennsylvania State UP, 2005, pp. 88-112.
- Elisondo, Guillermina. "Shantytown Dwellers: From Long-Term Employees to City Scavengers." NAAAS Conference Proceedings, **Scarborough**, 2008, National Association of African American Studies, pp. 92-111.
- Epstein, Edward. "The Piquetero Movement in Greater Buenos Aires: Political Protests by the Unemployed Poor During the Crisis." *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, edited by Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, Lexington Books, 2006, pp. 97-118.

- Epstein, Edward and David Pion-Berlin. "The Crisis of 2001 and Argentine Democracy." *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, edited by Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, Lexington Books, 2006, pp. 3-26.
- Fabry, Geneviève. "Palabra testimonial y valor ontológico del amor en los últimos poemarios de Juan Gelman." *Memorias en tinta: Ensayos sobre la representación de la violencia política en Argentina, Chile y Perú*, edited by Lucero de Vivanco Roca Rey, U Alberto Hurtado P, 2013 pp. 149-163
- Fernández, Ana María y Colaboradorxs. *Política y subjetividad: Asambleas barriales y fábricas recuperadas*. Tinta Limón, 2006.
- Fradinger, Moira. "Revisiting the Argentine Political Documentary of the Late 1950s and Early 1960s." *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2013, pp. 37-49.
- Forster, Ricardo. *La anomalía kirchnerista: la política, el conflict y la invención democrática*, Planeta, 2013.
- , -. *La repetición argentina: del kirchnerismo a la nueva derecha*. Marea, 2016.
- Frota, Monica. "Taking Aim: The Video Technology of Cultural Resistance." *Resolutions: Contemporary Video Practices*, edited by Michael Renov and Erika Suderburg, University of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 258-82.
- Gaines, Jane M. "Documentary Radicality." *Revue Canadienne d'Études cinématographiques/ Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, vol. 16, no. 1, Special Issue on Updating Documentary Historiography, 2007, pp. 5-24.
- Gago, Verónica, Diego Sztulwark and Antonio Negri. "'Este Es Un Momento Maquiavélico Puro.'" *Página/12*, 26 Nov. 2012. <https://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/dialogos/21-208601-2012-11-26.html>
- Galafassi, Guido. "Para Una Relectura De Los Procesos De Conflicto y Movilización Social En La Argentina De Inicios Del Milenio (2001-2003)." *Revista Mexicana De Sociología*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2012, pp. 69–98.
- García Barrera, Mabel. "El Discurso Poético Mapuche Y Su Vinculación Con Los 'Temas De Resistencia Cultural.'" *Revista Chilena De Literatura*, no. 68, 2006, pp. 169–197.
- , -. "La Narrativa De La Nación En El Discurso Poético Mapuche: Prolegómenos De Una Literatura Nacional." *Revista Chilena De Literatura*, no. 90, 2015, pp. 79–104.

- García Barrera, Mabel, et al., editors. *Crítica Situada: El Estado Actual Del Arte y La Poesía Mapuche*. Editorial Florencia, 2005.
- Garibotto, Verónica. *Rethinking Testimonial Cinema in Postdictatorship Argentina: Beyond Memory Fatigue*. Indiana UP, 2019.
- Garretón, Manuel Antonio. *The Chilean Political Process*. Translated by Sharon Kellum with Gilbert W. Merx, Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- , -. *Dictaduras y democratización*. Ediciones Minga, 1984.
- , -. *Política y Sociedad entre dos épocas: América Latina en el cambio del siglo*. Homo Sapiens, 2000.
- Garretón, Manuel Antonio, et al. *Latin America in the 21st Century: Toward a New Sociopolitical Matrix*. North South Center, 2003.
- Gasparini, Juan. *Montoneros: Final de cuentas*. Puntosur, 1988.
- Gaudín, Andrés. "Argentina's Main Opposition Figure Faces Multiple Legal Challenges." NotiSur, 20 July 2012, ladb.unm.edu/notisur.
- , -. "Argentina Riled by Case of Missing Activist." NotiSur, 13 October 2017, ladb.unm.edu/notisur.
- , -. "Calls for the Release of Jailed Activist Go Unheeded in Argentina." NotiSur, 13 January 2017, ladb.unm.edu/notisur.
- Gelman, Juan. *Poesía Reunida*. Vol. 1, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2014.
- Gillespie, Richard. *Soldiers of Perón: Argentina's Montoneros*. Clarendon, 1982.
- Gilly, Adolfo. *Por todos los caminos/ 1: escritos sobre América Latina 1956-1982*. Nueva Imagen, 1983.
- Giralt, Gabriel F. "Realism and Realistic Representation in the Digital Age." *Journal of Film and Video*, vol. 62, no. 3, 2010, pp. 3-16.
- Godoy R., Carmen Gloria. "En El Bosque De La Memoria: Identidad Mapuche y Escritura En Dos Obras De Elicura Chihuaif." *Estudios Atacameños*, no. 26, 2003, pp. 81–87.
- Goldman, Emma. *Living My Life*. Knopf, NY 1934.

- González Gálvez, Marcelo. *Los mapuche y sus otros: persona, alteridad y sociedad en el sur de Chile*. Editorial Universitaria, 2016.
- Goñi, Uti. "When Nature Says 'Enough!': The River That Appeared Overnight in Argentina." *The Guardian*,
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/apr/01/argentina-new-river-soya-beans>
- Gottlieb, Marlene. "La depuración del antipoema: artefactos y murales." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 77-98.
- Grimson, Alejandro. "Spatial Politics and Urban Borders: A Study of Buenos Aires." *The City is the Factory: New Solidarities and Spatial Strategies in an Urban Age*, edited by Miriam Greenberg and Penny Lewis, Cornell UP, 2017, pp. 178-96.
- Grupo Alavío. *Crónicas De Libertad*.
www.revolutionvideo.org/agorativ/secciones/movimientos_sociales/cronicas_de_libertad.html.
- Guerra-Cunningham, Lucía. *La Ciudad Ajena: Subjetividades De Origen Mapuche En El Espacio Urbano*. Ceibo Ediciones, 2014.
- Habib, André. "Reel Changes: Post-mortem Cinephilia of the Resistance of Melancholia." *Technology and Film Scholarship: Experience, Study, Theory*, edited by Santiago Hidalgo, Amsterdam UP, 2018, pp. 79-99.
- Hardt, Michael. *The Procedures of Love/Die Verfahren Der Liebe*. 100 Notes- 100 Thoughts / 100 Notizen- 100 Gedanken, Vol. 68, Erschienen Im Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2012.
- Harvey, David. "The 'New' Imperialism: Accumulation by Dispossession." *Socialist Register*, vol. 40, 2004, pp. 63-88.
- Haughney, Diane. *Neoliberal Economics, Democratic Transition, and Mapuche Demands for Rights in Chile*. University Press of Florida, 2006.
- Huidobro Salazar, María Gabriela. *El imaginario de la guerra de Arauco: mundo épico y tradición clásica*. Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2017.
- Hupert, Pablo. *El estado posnacional: más allá de kirchnerismo y antikirchnerismo*. 2011.
- Jenckes, Kate. "Juan Gelman's Open Letters: Mourning and Mundo Beyond Militancy." *CR: The New Centennial Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2014, pp. 153-74.

- Jessop, Bob. "Globalization and the National State." *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, University of Minnesota, 2002, pp. 185-220.
- Kalyvas, Andreas. "The Stateless Theory: Poulantzas's Challenge to Postmodernism." *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, University of Minnesota, 2002, pp. 105-42.
- Kessler, Frank. "What you get is what you see: Digital images and the claim on the real." *Digital Material: Tracing New Media in Everyday Life and Technology*, edited by Marianne van den Boomen, Sybille Lammes, Ann-Sophie Lehmann, Joost Raessens, Mirko Tobias Schäfer, Amsterdam UP, 2009, pp. 187-97.
- Kowalczyk, Anna Maria. "Indigenous Peoples and Modernity: Mapuche Mobilizations in Chile." *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 40, no. 4, Reinventing the Lefts in Latin America: Critical Perspectives from Below, July 2013, pp. 121-35.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Stabat Mater." Translated by Arthur Goldhammer, *Poetics Today*, vol. 6, no. 1-2, 1985, pp. 133-52.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso, 1985.
- Lanata Briones, Cecilia T. and Rubén M. Lo Vuolo. "Post-Convertibility Growth in Argentina: Long-Term Dynamics and Limits, 1960-2008." *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014, pp. 45-66.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of Everyday Life*. Translated by John Moore, Verso, 2014.
- , -. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell, 1991.
- Legras, Horacio. "Insurgencia popular e inscripción soberana en las movilizaciones populares del año 2001 en Argentina." N.d., TS., provided by author.
- Lerzundi, Patricio. "Introducción." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 69-76.
- Lerzundi, Patricio and Nicanor Parra. "ENE PE sometido a interrogatorio." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 383-99.
- Letelier, Lili and Tomás Moulian. "Sectores populares, autoritarismo y democracia en

- Chile." *Clases populares, crisis y democracia en América Latina*, edited by Julio Cotler, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1989, pp. 83-102.
- Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise than Being, Or, Beyond Essence*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis, Duquesne UP, 1998.
- ,-. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis, 25th Ed, Duquesne UP, 2013.
- Lihn, Enrique. *Álbum de toda especie de poemas*. Lumen, 1989.
- Lloyd, David and Paul Thomas. *Culture and the State*. Routledge, 1998.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. *The Accumulation of Capital*. Routledge, 2003.
- Macherey, Pierre. "Negri's Spinoza: From Mediation to Constitution." *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, vol. 2., Pluto, 2007, pp. 7-27.
- Malatesta, Errico. "A Little Theory." The Anarchist Library, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/errico-malatesta-a-little-theory>
- Mallon, Florencia. *Courage Tastes of Blood: The Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailío and the Chilean State, 1906-2001*. Duke UP, 2004.
- "Marcha en defense del cine nacional: Los directores, contra el ajuste del Incaa." *Página/12*, 28 Sept. 2017. <https://www.pagina12.com.ar/65711-los-directores-contra-el-ajuste-del-incaa>.
- Marcuse, Herbert. "The Affirmative Character of Culture." *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*, translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro, Beacon, 1968, pp. 88-133.
- Mariman, José. "Transición democrática en Chile ¿Nuevo ciclo reivindicativo mapuche?" *Caravelle (1988-)*, no. 3, 501 Ans Plus Tard: Amérique Indienne 93, 1994, pp. 91-118.
- Mariñán, José Huenchunao. "Resistencia y Reconstrucción Del Pueblo-Nación Mapuche." *Rebelión En Wallmapu: Resistencia Del Pueblo-Nación Mapuche*, edited by José Bengoa, Aún Creemos En Los Sueños, pp. 27-32.
- Marris, Johanna. "Mass Condemnation of Gender Violence Leads to Regional Protests on Unprecedented Scale." *NotiSur*, 18 November 2016, ladb.unm.edu/notisur.
- Martínez, Javier and Alvaro Díaz. *Chile: The Great Transformation*. UNRISD, 1996.

- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Collected Works. Capital, Volume 1*. Lawrence & Wishart, 1996.
- “Más ajuste: el INCAA anunció que en 2018 no dará créditos al cine argentino.” *La voz*, 12 Oct. 2017, http://www.lavoz901.com/despachos.asp?cod_des=284568&ID_Seccion=70&fecemi=10/12/2017&Titular=mas-ajuste-el-incaa-anuncio-que-en-2018-no-dara-creditos-al-cine-argentino.html.
- Mbembe, Achille. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2003, pp. 11-40.
- McGuire, James W. *Peronism Without Perón: Unions, Parties, and Democracy in Argentina*. Stanford UP, 1997.
- Miliband, Ralph. *Class Power & State Power*, Verso, 1983.
- , -. *The State in Capitalist Society*. Basic Books, 1969.
- Miliband, Ralph, and Nicos Poulantzas. "The Problem of the Capitalist State." *Ideology in Social Science: Readings in Critical Social Theory*, edited by Robin Blackburn, Fontana/Collins, 1972, pp. 238–262.
- Mitchell, Timothy. "Society, Economy, and the State Effect." *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, edited by Aradhana Sharma and Akhil Gupta, Blackwell, 2006, pp. 169-86.
- Mor, Jessica Stites. *Transition Cinema: Political Filmmaking and the Argentine Left since 1968*. Pittsburgh UP, 2012.
- Morales, Leonidas. "Conversaciones con Nicanor Parra." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 313-372.
- Moreiras, Alberto. "The Aura of Testimonio." *The Real Thing: Testimonial Discourse and Latin America*, edited by Georg M. Gugelberger, Duke UP, 1996, pp. 192-224.
- , -. "Elementos de articulación teórica para el subalternismo latinoamericano: Candido y Borges." *Revista Iberoamericana*, vol. 62, no. 176-177, July-December 1996, pp. 875-91.
- , -. *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies*. Duke UP, 2001.

- Moreno, Héctor Nahuelpan, editor. *Ta ñ Fijke Xipa rakizuameluwün. Historia, colonialismo y resistencia desde el país Mapuche*. Ediciones Comunidad de Historia Mapuche, 2013.
- Moulian, Tomás. *Chile actual: Anatomía de un mito*. LOM, 2002.
- , -. *Deseo de otro Chile*. LOM, 2010.
- Moyano, Adrián. *De Mar a Mar: El Wallmapu Sin Fronteras*. LOM Ediciones, 2016.
- MTD de Solano y Colectivo Situaciones. *La hipótesis 891: Más allá de los piquetes*. Ediciones de mano a mano, 2002.
- Mutman, Mahmut. "Difference, Event, Subject: Antonio Negri's Political Theory as Post-Modern Metaphysics." *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, vol. 2, Pluto, 2007, pp. 143-68.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Translated by Robert D. Richardson and Anne E. O'Byrne, Stanford UP, 2000.
- Navarros, Desiderio. "In Media Res Publicas: On Intellectuals and Social Criticism in the Cuban Public Sphere." Translated by Alessandro Fornazzari and Desiderio Navarro, *Nepanthia; Views from South*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2001, pp. 355-71.
- Negri, Antonio. *The Savage Anomaly: The Power of Spinoza's Metaphysics and Politics*. Translated by Michael Hardt, University of Minnesota, 2008.
- , -. *Time for Revolution*. Translated by Matteo Mandarini, Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Nichols, Bill. "'Getting to know you...': Knowledge, Power, and the Body." *Theorizing Documentary*, edited by Michael Renov, Routledge, 1993, pp. 174-91.
- Novaro, Marcos. *Historia de la Argentina contemporánea: de Perón a Kirchner*. Buenos Aires: Edhasa, 2006.
- Nun, José. "Argentina: informe preliminar acerca de la situación de los sectores populares en el proceso de transición democrática." *Clases populares, crisis y democracia en América Latina*, edited by Julio Cotler, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1989, pp. 15-52.
- , -. "The Democratic Process in Argentina." *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, edited by Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, Lexington Books, 2006, pp. 29-52.

- ,-. "La teoría política y la transición democrática." *Ensayos sobre la transición democrática en la Argentina*, edited by José Nun and Juan Carlos Portantiero, Puntosur, 1987, pp. 15-56.
- ,-. "Vaivenes de un regimen social de acumulación en decadencia." *Ensayos sobre la transición democrática en la Argentina*, edited by José Nun and Juan Carlos Portantiero, Puntosur, 1987, pp. 83-116.
- Núñez, Víctor Rodríguez. "Relaciones y Hechos De Juan Gelman: 'Disparos De La Belleza Incesante'." *Revista Iberoamericana*, vol. 67, no.194, 2001, pp. 145-59.
- "Ojo Obrero - Textos." Ojo Obrero, ojobrero.org/wordpress/textos/.
- Onuch, Olga. "'It's the Economy, Stupid,' or Is It? The Role of Political Crises in Mass Mobilization: The Case of Argentina in 2001." *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014, pp. 89-114.
- Oyarzún, Pablo. "Arte en Chile de veinte, treinta años." *Georgia Series on Hispanic Thought*, vol. 22-25, 1987, pp. 291-324.
- Pairican, Fernando. "Rebelión En Wallmapu." *Rebelión En Wallmapu: Resistencia Del Pueblo-Nación Mapuche*, edited by José Bengoa, Aún Creemos En Los Sueños, pp. 21–26.
- Parra, Nicanor. *Chistes Para Desorientar a La Poesía*. Edited by María Nieves Alonso and Gilberto Triviños, Visor, 1989.
- . *La Cueca Larga Y Otros Poemas*. Edited by Margarita Aguirre, Editorial Universitaria De Buenos Aires, 1964.
- . *Obra Gruesa*. Editorial Universitaria, 1971.
- . *Poemas para combatir la calvicie*. Edited by Julio Ortega, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013.
- . *Poemas Y Antipoemas: (1954)*. Edited by René De Costa, Cátedra, 1988.
- Peruzzotti, Enrique. "Demanding Accountable Government: Citizens, Politicians, and the Perils of Representative Democracy in Argentina." *Argentine Democracy: The Politics of Institutional Weakness*, edited by Steven Levitsky and María Victoria Murillo, Pennsylvania State UP, 2005, pp. 229- 49.

- Podalksy, Laura. *The Politics of Affect and Emotion in Contemporary Latin American Cinema*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- Portantiero, Juan Carlos. “La concertación que no fue: de la ley Mucci al plan Austral.” *Ensayos sobre la transición democrática en la Argentina*, edited by José Nun and Juan Carlos Portantiero, Puntosur, 1987, pp. 139-74.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. *Political Power and Social Classes*. Translated by Timothy O’Hagan, David McLellan, Anna de Casparis and Brian Grogan, NLB and S&W, 1973.
- ,-. *State, Power, Socialism*. Translated by Patrick Camiller, Verso, 2000.
- Pessoa, Fernando. *Páginas Escogidas*. 2nd ed., Grupo Editorial Tomo, 2009.
- Prado, Antonio. “Anarchism and Counterinformation in Documentaries: From Civil War Spain to Post-2001 Argentina.” *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2013, pp. 50-59.
- Rabinowitz, Paula. *They Must Be Represented: The Politics of Documentary*. Verso, 1994.
- Reato, Ceferino. “Gelman- ni dos demonios, ni ángeles y demonios”. *La nación*, 20 January 2014, <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1656847-gelman-ni-dos-demonios-ni-angeles-y-demonios>.
- Reina, Paula Vial. “Juicio a Mapuches Desnuda Las Deudas De La Justicia.” *Rebelión En Wallmapu: Resistencia Del Pueblo-Nación Mapuche*, edited by José Bengoa, Aún Creemos En Los Sueños, 2013, pp. 37–42.
- Renov, Michael. “Introduction.” *Theorizing Documentary*, edited by Michael Renov, Routledge, 1993, pp. 1-11.
- Richard, Nelly. *The Insubordination of Signs*. Translated by Alice A. Nelson and Silvia R. Tandeciarz, Duke UP, 2004.
- Richards, Patricia. *Race and the Chilean Miracle: Neoliberalism, Democracy, and Indigenous Rights*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013.
- Rivera-Quñones, Miguel A. “Macroeconomic Governance in Post-Neoliberal Argentina and the Relentless Power of TNCs: The Case of the Soy Complex.” *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014. Pp. 67-86.

- Rodríguez, Amalia. "Nicanor Parra o la poesía como subversión." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 51-68.
- Rodríguez, Carlos Ruiz. "Síntesis Histórica Del Pueblo Mapuche." *Rebelión En Wallmapu: Resistencia Del Pueblo-Nación Mapuche*, edited by José Bengoa, Editorial Aún Creemos En Los Sueños, 2013, pp. 49-58.
- Rojas, Rodrigo. *La Lengua Escorada: La Traducción Como Estrategia De Resistencia En Cuatro Poetas Mapuche*. Pehuén Editores, 2009.
- Rosen, Philip. "Document and Documentary: On the Persistence of Historical Concepts." *Theorizing Documentary*, edited by Michael Renov, Routledge, 1993, pp. 58-89.
- Rozitchner, León. *Freud y los límites del individualismo burgués*. Siglo XXI, 1988.
- Saavedra Pleáez, Alejandro. *Los Mapuche en la sociedad chilena actual*. LOM, 2002.
- Sain, Marcelo Fabián. "Police, Politics, and Society in the Province of Buenos Aires." *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, edited by Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, Lexington Books, 2006, pp. 53-72.
- Salazar Vergara, Gabriel. *Dolencias históricas de la memoria ciudadana (Chile, 1810-2018)*. Editorial Universitaria, 2011.
- , -. *La enervante levedad histórica de la clase política civil (Chile, 1900-1973)*. Penguin Random House, 2015.
- , -. *Historia de la acumulación capitalista en Chile (Apuntes de clase)*. LOM, 2003.
- Schaumberg, Heike. "Argentina Since 2001: From Spontaneous Uprising to "Transition," or a Crisis Intermezzo?" *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014, pp. 135-54.
- Schopf, Federico. *Del Vanguardismo a La Antipoesía*. Bulzoni, 1986.
- . "La antipoesía y el vanguardismo." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 131-184.
- Schroeder Rodríguez, Paul A. "After New Latin American Cinema." *Cinema Journal*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2012, pp. 87-112.
- Schvarzer, Jorge. "The Costs of the Convertibility Plan: The Economic and Social Effects

- of Financial Hegemony.” *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, edited by Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, Lexington Books, 2006, pp. 73-91.
- Scorer, James. *City in Common: Culture and Community in Buenos Aires*. SUNY Press, 2017.
- Sebastián, Teresa. “Elicura Chihuilaf: La Voz y El Lugar.” *Cuadernos Hispano-Americanos*, Sept. 2009, pp. 125–136.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Penguin Books, 1996.
- Shulman, Alix Kates. “Dances with Feminists.” *Women's Review of Books*, Vol. IX, no. 3, Dec 1991.
<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/goldman/Features/danceswithfeminists.html>.
- Silva Jaramillo, Sergio. “Estado y empresas privadas en la realidad mapuche.” *Historia, Antropología y Fuentes Orales*, no. 26, Denuncia Social, 2001, pp. 139-52.
- Solanas, Fernando, director. *La Dignidad De Los Nadies: Historias y Relatos De Esperanza*. 2005.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. *Ethics*. Penguin, 1996.
- Spivak, Gayatri. “Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing History.” *The Spivak Reader*, edited by Donna Landry and Gerald Maclean, Routledge, 1996, pp. 203-35.
- Sturken, Marita. “The Politics of Video Memory: Electronic Erasures and Inscriptions.” *Resolutions: Contemporary Video Practices*, edited by Michael Renov and Erika Suderburg, University of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 1-12.
- Surin, Kenneth. “‘Now Everything Must Be Reinvented’: Negri and Revolution.” *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, Vol. 1, Pluto, 2005, pp. 205-42.
- Svampa, Maristella. “Revisting Argentina 2001-13: From “¡Que se vayan todos!” to the Peronist Decade.” *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wyld, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014, pp. 155-73.
- Svampa, Maristella and Damián Corral. “Political Mobilization in the Neighborhood Assemblies: The Cases of Villa Crespo and Palermo.” *Broken Promises; The Argentine Crisis and Argentine Democracy*, edited by Edward Epstein and David Pion-Berlin, Lexington Books, 2006, pp. 119-42.

- Tabbush, Constanza and Melina Gaona. "Gender, Race, and Politics in Contemporary Argentina: Understanding the Criminalization of Activist Milagro Sala, Leader of the Organización Barrial Tupac Amaru." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2017, pp. 314-47.
- Tedesco, Laura. *Democracy in Argentina: Hope and Disillusion*. Frank Cass, 1999.
- Thayer, Willy. *La crisis no moderna de la universidad moderna: Epílogo de El conflicto de las facultades*. Cuarto propio, 1996.
- , -. *El fragment repetido: Escritos en estado de excepción*. metales pesados, 2006, pp. 15-46.
- Thomas, Paul. "Bringing Poulantzas Back In." *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, University of Minnesota, 2002, pp. 73-85.
- Torre, Juan Carlos. "Citizens Versus Political Class: The Crisis of Partisan Representation." *Argentine Democracy: The Politics of Institutional Weakness*, edited by Steven Levitsky and María Victoria Murillo, Pennsylvania State UP, 2005, pp. 165-80.
- Trímboli, Javier, editor. *La izquierda en Argentina*. Manantial, 1998.
- Tsoukalas, Constantine. "Relative Autonomy and Its Changing Forms." *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, University of Minnesota, 2002, pp. 221-44.
- Uribe-Echevarría, Juan. *Tipos Y Cuadros De Costumbres En La Poesía Popular Del Siglo XIX*. Pineda Libros, 1973.
- Valencia, Sayak. *Gore Capitalism*. Trans. John Pluecker, semiotext(e), 2018.
- Virno, Paolo. *Déjà Vu and the End of History*. Translated by David Broder, Verso, 2015.
- , -. *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Translated by Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito, and Andrea Casson, Semiotext(e), 2003.
- . *Multitude: Between Innovation and Negation*. Translated by Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito, and Andrea Casson, Semiotext(e), 2008.
- Weber, Samuel. "The Mediacy of the Media: a Psychoanalytic Approach." *Media, Form*

and Thought Lecture Series. 18 Mar. 2019, Los Angeles, University of Southern California, Taper Hall.

Whitman, Walt. *Leaves of Grass and Selected Prose*. Random House, 1950.

Willemsen, Paul. "Indexicality, fantasy and the digital." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2013, pp. 110-35.

Williams, Gareth. "The Fantasies of Cultural Exchange in Latin American Subaltern Studies." *The Real Thing: Testimonial Discourse and Latin America*, edited by Georg M. Gugelberger, Duke UP, 1996, pp. 225-53.

-, -. *The Mexican Exception: Sovereignty, Police, and Democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

-, -. "Translation and Mourning: The Cultural Challenge of Latin American Testimonial Autobiography." *Latin American Literary Review*, vol. 21, no. 41, January-June 1993, pp. 79-99.

Williams, Linda. "Melodrama Revise." *Refiguring American film genres: history and theory*, edited by Nick Browne, University of California Press, 1998, pp. 42-88.

Wylde, Christopher. "Continuity and Change in the Interpretation of Upheaval: Reexamining the Argentine Crisis of 2001-2." *Argentina Since the 2001 Crisis: Recovering the Past, Reclaiming the Future*, edited by Cara Levey, Daniel Ozarow, & Christopher Wylde, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014, pp. 23-44.

Yamal, Ricardo. "La antipoesía de Nicanor Parra y su deuda con el surrealismo." *Nicanor Parra: Antes y después de Jesucristo*, edited by Marlene Gottlieb, Linden Lane, 1993, pp. 185-200.