

“GUIDED BY A GREAT FEELING OF LOVE:”  
TOWARD AN ETYMOLOGY FOR THE MOVEMENT OF MOVEMENTS IN CRITICAL  
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR THE PERMANENT-REVOLUTION-OF-THE-COMMON

By  
MICHAEL ROWLEY

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2010

© 2010 Michael Rowley

To *Ctenocephalides felis*, the common flea,  
who, for years, has silently been teaching me about persistence, swarm intelligence, the  
protection and importance of the milieu, networks of symbiotic parasitism and coalition,  
clandestine operations, and the inner urge of survival. Quite often, I stand bitten with  
sheer respect and admiration. The cock-roach is a Johnny-come-lately in comparison  
to this machine.

To Michael (February 24, 1951-December 31, 1980)

“It’s true I don’t want to join the Army or turn lathes in precision parts  
factories, I’m near-sighted and psychopathic anyway.”

– Allen Ginsberg, “America” (1956)

For young Michael,

who died over a thousand days,  
who breathed fumes—at a factory corp.  
that, for fear of a lawsuit, remains un-named—  
with carcinogens in oil made  
from arsenic that ascended lathes’ sides  
below the catwalks where he loomed,  
who supervised machines, who fixed  
precision parts, who turned lathes  
that rendered metal into screws.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I met Phil Wegner, my dissertation committee chair, in 2002 at the MRG conference; the conference and Phil's participation in it were a large part of the reason that I matriculated at UF. Since 2004, I have benefited from his guidance and direction in a wide range of settings and for a broad set of projects. I have learned much from his insight in two seminars, in an independent study, and from his conference presentations. But most of all, I have benefited greatly from the two-hour and sometimes three-hour meetings over coffee, lunch, or at his office. Phil was generous with his time, enthusiasm, and framing of the over-determined problems produced by the ideologies of global capitalism. He has read my work for the dissertation and has meticulously edited it. He has read much of my work outside of the dissertation as well. In recent years, Phil has spent many hours helping me with job-related material, with the exams and prospectus, and with the sweeping gestures of this project. I want to express my gratitude for the many meetings through which Phil was able to help me reorganize much of my thinking about this project and about my future contributions to the field and beyond.

My dissertation committee member, Tace Hedrick, has helped me to grasp the finer workings of the scholarly-reviewed journal article and the world of public academic discourse. She has read papers of mine that figure outside of the dissertation and has helped me immensely with my writing style and clarity and with recognition of the larger significance in my writing and its potential broader audience. She has also helped me to hone my craft as a scholar in Latin American and Chicana Theory. Tace allowed me to accompany her to the major Latin American conference and to learn from her about professional development in the field. She has observed my teaching and given me

notes as well as written on my behalf. Her work on biological sex and race has informed my work in labor and helped me to diversify my thinking on the engage critical projects. It is this diversity, the commitment to those singularities, that are at the heart of the ethics of the subject of this dissertation, the Movement of Movements and its multitudinous subjectivity. Above all, Tace has supported my confidence and has helped me to recognize the value in what I am doing.

In addition to reading the entirety of the dissertation, my dissertation committee member, Susan Hegeman, has helped me with grasping the discourses of modernity in seminar, with her generosity in helping me with my own seminar teaching and in allowing me to observe hers, and with the relationship between our own field and cultural anthropology. Susan's navigation of the discourses of late modernity inform the theoretical underpinnings of the introductory and concluding chapters. The intellectual rigor that she brings to the critique of master narratives and ideological interpellation in top-down lenses has kept my work from the totalizing gestures to which I am prone. Susan's rigor and organization are essential to a project like this and I have benefited from the modeling of behavior that she has provided as a dedicated and rigorous scholar. I would like to thank Phil and Susan for their hospitality over the years and for their great taste in food.

I would also like to thank my dissertation outside reader, Efrain Barradas, who brought insight and rigor to my work, especially in Latin American Studies and in Cuban-Flat painting and in visual culture. It was Efrain who helped me to situate the difficult over-determined space of the border murals within the context of a larger twentieth century Latin American revolutionary tradition. His kindness has been a great

help to me. Efrain's kindness and general approach are a model for me of how to be toward students. Tace and Efrain offered especially vital insight that inform Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Aron Pease has greatly helped me to clarify my thinking about this project for its larger significance beyond the dissertation. Aron has meticulously read the dissertation and copiously commented on it for style, clarity, and most importantly for the larger gestures that would help to shape this project as a contribution to the field. Over the years, Aron and I have developed a series of ideas for seminar and teaching, for contemporary political philosophy and economic theory, and for navigating graduate school. He has been the factory in which I think through some of my best ideas. He is a patient, dedicated, and persistent scholar whose project addresses, among other things, no less than the significance of the labor theory of value in our own global moment. And he is a good friend.

I would like to thank scholars at the University of Texas, particularly Ann Perry who helped me to develop Chapter 3. It was Cynthia Farah's photograph of one of the border murals that interested me in the material in Chapter 3. Emma Perez informed my Latin American Historiography, helped me to think like a scholar, and helped me to recognize the importance of Queer Theory in my work. Meredith Abarca helped me with my work in Chicana Theory. It was Elaine Fredericksen who first helped me to conceive of myself as able to work subversively within larger institutions and to offer critique of them from the inside. It was with her guidance that I began the project on corporatization.

In 1998, I began the theoretical underpinnings for this project with the guidance of Saree Makdisi who introduced me to the field of Critical Theory and contemporary Materialism. Herman Sinaiko read early material from this project and introduced me to aesthetics and philosophy and helped me to think in interdisciplinary modes.

Two bosses acted as mentors as well. Raul Sanchez, the director of writing programs, helped me with the scope of the second project, with my clarity, with my editing, and with my teaching. Raul has continued to help me to think of my work at the level of the book. Raul's advice always came from a place of calm benevolence, which I greatly respect and try to emulate.

Sid Dobrin, the former director of writing programs, helped my writing style and helped me to attain the professionalism that I needed for publication. I never asked Sid to serve on the committee and yet he worked with a diligence and care that improved my writing style and helped me to begin to see myself as a rhetorician. He helped me greatly with my teaching and with systems thinking. I will not forget how he engaged me in long discussions about rhetoric and helped me to feel that I was contributing. No boss had ever made me feel like a colleague before Sid. Finally Sid read a great deal of another project, which addresses rhetoric and corporatization in the university, and that informs this one. Sid first helped me to think of my work at the level of the book.

Several intellectuals and writers helped me with my thinking through many of these problems. I would like to thank John Leavey, Julian Wolfreys, Mic Lemon, Paul Martinez-Pompa, Mauricio Rodriguez, Javier Huerta, Aron Pease, Roberto E. Villarreal, Daniel Chacon, Benjamin Alire Saenz, Gil Herdt, and Emmet Larkin.

I would like to thank two people from my childhood and adolescence whose inspiration helped to make it possible. The first is a teacher who supported me for six years from the age of six, who fostered my curiosity and intellect, and who still inquires about how I am doing today—Sharon Malito. She taught me that I could. The second is a cadre who passed on to me that knowledge which has been passed on in the West since at least the English Civil War, if not since the revolt of Spartacus and who, for reasons that are well-known to those in that work, must remain known professionally only by pseudonym – Guy.

Finally, I would like to thank Carla Blount, Loretta Dampier, Melissa Davis, Pamela Gilbert, Kenneth Kidd, John Leavey, Janet Moore, Jeri White, and Kathy Williams. These are the people who keep or have kept the UF English offices running while I was at UF and whose work makes all other work in our department possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	11
CHAPTER	
1 THE ETYMOLOGY OF REVOLUTIONARY LOVE AFTER GUEVARA.....	13
“Go to the End and We Have a Name for This – It’s Called ‘Love’” .....	16
Neoliberalism Today and the New Creation of New Needs .....	22
The Figure of Trainer in Communiqués, Manifiestos, and Polemics .....	29
Chapter Outline.....	34
2 DIRTY PROTEST: THE BLANKET MEN OF THE SECOND HUNGER STRIKE ...	40
Ghostly Dialogic with Bobby Sands, M.P.: Contextualizing the Vertical Audience ..	43
Contextualizing Sentiment and Sentimentality .....	43
Vertical and Horizontal Audiences .....	47
On Long-Term Hope, an Outside Cause, and Tradition.....	48
On Belief in Socialism and the Organic Intellectual.....	51
Incorporeal Prison Machines: The Working-Class Body in Long Kesh Prison.....	53
“What Small Things Came:” Masculine Rituals of Boyhood .....	60
Conclusion .....	66
3 DRAWING LA LÍNEA: BORDER IN THE <i>TODOS SOMOS</i> MURALS.....	72
Mexican Muralism and Chicana/o Art: A Retrospective .....	75
The “Todos Somos [...]” Series.....	80
“Todos Somos Ilegales” .....	80
“El Puente Negro” .....	85
A New Generation: “El Respeto Al Derecho Ajeno Es La Paz” .....	89
Reproducibility and Situation in the Mural Form .....	94
Radicalism in the Mural Form.....	105
4 “ACCIDENTALLY ARMED”: DIRECT ACTION OF THE ZAPATISTAS.....	110
Going Public: The Struggle, 1993-1994.....	111
Introduction to the First Declaration .....	111
Modification After the War: Second Declaration Epigraph in the words of Zapata	123
Continuance: Desire for Transition and Three Points of the Third Manifiesto .....	131
Memory: The Tradition .....	135
The Flower of the World .....	137
Five Hundred Years .....	139

5	“A RIEGO DE PARECER RIDÍCULO”: PORTO ALEGRE .....	142
	Introduction .....	142
	Twelve Proposals for Another Possible World .....	144
	Debt Cancellation.....	144
	Tobin Tax.....	147
	Tax Havens .....	149
	Right to Full Employment.....	151
	Fair Trade .....	154
	Food Security .....	155
	Patenting .....	157
	Public Policy to Fight Discrimination .....	159
	Environment .....	162
	Foreign Military Bases .....	164
	Corporate and Alternative Media.....	165
	Reform the International Institutions.....	168
	Conclusion .....	169
6	“MONOPOLY ON THE LEGITIMATE USE OF PHYSICAL FORCE”: TACTICS... ..	170
	Tactics of Defense .....	177
	Tactics of Anonymity.....	187
7	CONCLUSION .....	193
	LIST OF REFERENCES .....	203
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	208

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

“GUIDED BY A GREAT FEELING OF LOVE:”  
TOWARD AN ETYMOLOGY FOR THE MOVEMENT OF MOVEMENTS IN CRITICAL  
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR THE PERMANENT-REVOLUTION-OF-THE-COMMON

By

Michael Rowley

August 2010

Chair: Phillip Wegner  
Major: English

This dissertation explores the rhetoric and ideology that surround political action and organizing in the years between 1981 and 2005. I examine how rhetoric under the current global economic and political sovereignty, which we call “Empire,” has helped to transform the ways in which we grasp revolution and commonality now that the information phase of the industrial age has changed information labor and emotional work. My project intervenes in the current discussions of Empire by closely analyzing the rhetorical figurations of the Movement of Movements and its antecedents. My study argues that seminal manifestos and communiqués produced by activists during the 1980s and 1990s provide some of the ideas and momentum that has helped shape the movement’s early emergence. I am thus interested in representations of organization and solidarity in transnational writing, and, more specifically, in the philosophical concept of the common and its role in revolutionary activity.

The project commences with two events that occurred near the end of the last millennium. First, it addresses a fast-emerging alter-globalization movement that began in 1999 in London, Eugene, and Cologne, and later, and more publicly, in Seattle. This

Movement of Movements quickly spread to Genoa, Porto Alegre, Mumbai, and elsewhere. On November 30, 1999, the television networks displayed a protest, which the activist left used to organize today's alter-globalization movement. Second, the dissertation addresses the intellectual breakthrough within political and cultural theory represented by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire*, published in 2000 and written in the middle of the 1990s.

As an intervention, the project examines a rich and diverse set of texts – poems, murals, manifestos, and other documents – that surround three earlier political events. These earlier events prefigure the emergence of the alter-globalization movement. This project explores resistance to the ideologies of current capitalism. It seeks to delineate some of the alternatives that these movements have produced, and it provides a genealogy of these movements' revolutionary characteristics.

CHAPTER 1  
THE ETYMOLOGY OF REVOLUTIONARY LOVE AFTER GUEVARA

If an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, it falls out of the dialogue.

– Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*

Several political events occurred during the summer of 1999 in London, Eugene, and Cologne. Then, on November 30, major television networks displayed a protest in Seattle, which the activist left used to organize today's imprecisely-named anti-globalization protests, or alter-globalization movement – which I will refer to as the Movement of Movements.<sup>1</sup> I have attempted to locate the Movement of Movements and its resemblance to the concept of the multitude, which Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri have explored in their three volumes, *Empire*, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, and *Commonwealth*. Hardt and Negri argue that multitude is neither a mob, nor the masses, nor a party, but rather a singularity that opposes an imperial sovereign structure they name “Empire.” Empire encompasses all of space and rules over the entire “civilized” world. Empire suspends history and presents itself as eschatology. Empire operates socially as well as politically, regulates human interactions as well as human nature, and seeks to rule over social life in its entirety. Empire does these things in the name of peace:

The concept of Empire is characterized fundamentally by a lack of boundaries: Empire's rule has no limits. First and foremost, then, the concept of Empire posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or reality that rules over the entire “civilized” world. No territorial boundaries limit its reign. Second, the concept of Empire presents itself not as a historical regime originating in conquest, but rather as an order that effectively suspends history and thereby fixes the existing state of affairs for

---

<sup>1</sup> For the term, “Movement of Movements” see Tom Muertes *A Movement of Movements: Is Another World Possible*, London: Verso, 2004.

eternity. From the perspective of Empire, this is the way things will always be and the way they were always meant to be. In other words, Empire presents its rule not as a transitory moment in the movement of history, but as a regime with no temporal boundaries and in this sense outside of history or at the end of history. Third, the rule of Empire operates on all registers of the social order extending down to the depths of the social world. Empire not only manages a territory and a population but also creates the very world it inhabits. It not only regulates human interactions but also seeks directly to rule over human nature. The object of its rule is social life in its entirety, and thus Empire presents the paradigmatic form of biopower. Finally, although the practice of Empire is continually bathed in blood, the concept of Empire is always dedicated to peace – a perpetual and universal peace outside of history. (*Empire* xiv-xv)

In *Empire*, Hardt and Negri define the multitude as “the other head of the imperial eagle,” or the “productive, creative subjectivities of globalization that have learned to sail on this enormous sea.” In this dissertation, I explore the rhetoric, ideology, historiography, and philosophy that surround the idea of a multitude, and the new forms of political action and organizing that emerge between 1981 and 2005 that made such rhetoric and ideology possible.

I pair the historiography of the Movement of Movements with the current writings on multitude. In this way we gain a perspective on how such a movement produces discourses that spread and then become common themselves. Hardt and Negri have updated the seventeenth century conception of the commons by linking the phrase to the adjective “common,” thus creating a new noun phrase, “the common.” In *Empire*, and *Multitude*, they represent the common as that subset of human production that we can locate in all elements of humanity.

In order to gain a perspective on how twenty-first century rhetoric differs from late twentieth century rhetoric, I pair objects of protest – the IMF, World Bank, WTO and so forth – with a history of changes in political economy that brought the Movement of Movements and globalization into such auspicious relief. From this perspective, we can

begin to recognize how the Movement of Movements has emerged – especially, if we consider the active movements that had challenged neoliberalism earlier. Neoliberalism seeks to limit the extent to which government can intervene in the local economy. It emphasizes property rights, de-regulated markets and de-regulated business practices. In foreign policy, neoliberalism seeks to allow capital to infiltrate foreign markets. Capital may flow through political and diplomatic maneuvers, military intervention, or economic pressure. This project seeks to locate some of the common elements in these struggles against neoliberalism and the struggles of the recent past that made the Movement of Movements possible.

My dissertation shows how the first glimmers of a future appear in a diverse array of radical documents. These documents partially represent three events that create a partial genealogy for the Movement of Movements. These events include the 1981 Hunger Strike, the *Todos Somos* event of 1987-1989, and the EZLN struggle since 1994. But the multitude remains, as of yet, not-mappable. And the struggles in which the Movement of Movements and its predecessors participate today or participated in during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s are not wholly communicable. In part, this explains why we must understand that these documents are separately and sometimes collectively involved in the play of figuration that performs the function of cognitive mapping in the face of complex realities of globalism.

In part, the concept of the “becoming-prince” of the multitude will mean the institutionalization of several historically new gains. The genealogy includes the contours of several trends in social forces which I trace in the following chapters: first, the struggles tend to democratize during the second and third decades moving from

hierarchy toward network struggles. Second, each of these struggles maintains a dialectic between two techniques of political organization. On the one hand, these movements participate, to some degree, in clandestine operations that protect an organization during times of relatively strong state repression; on the other, these movements also seek, again to some degree, to widen public discourse, which leads to the broadening of rights during times of relatively little state repression. Third, each of these struggles participates in a horizontal milieu and a vertical audience that surpasses distinctions between hierarchy and network, narrower clandestine organization and wider democratic goals, public relations strategy and military tactics, and even Marx's mole or Hardt and Negri's snake. Fourth, these struggles each challenge traditional definitions of the human by using technologies that have emerged in our moment and helping to produce the condition of the simian-cyborg. In this sense, we must contextualize the problem of communicability of struggles in our own moment within the strategy of a vertical audience—the audience of historical interpellation and future interpellated subject.

**“Go to the End and We Have a Name for This – It's Called ‘Love’”**

The word “corporate” gets attached in almost a pejorative sense to and gets married with the word, “agenda.” And one hears a lot about the “corporate agenda” as though it is evil, as though it is an agenda which is trying to take over the world. Personally, I don't use the word, “corporation.” I use the word, “business.” I will use the word, “company.” I use the words, “business community” because I think that is a much fairer representation than zeroing in on just this word “corporation.”

– Robert Keyes, CEO, Canadian Council for International Business

Perhaps the Mensheviks accurately described processes of socio-economic development and revolution that stem from the contradictions in capital when they emphasized capitalism's transformative powers in ways that departed from Leninist

voluntarism. Its subjects perceive these changes as “permanent revolution.” Marx and Engels first use this phrase in *The Holy Family*:

Napoleon represented the last battle of revolutionary terror against the bourgeois society which had been proclaimed by this same Revolution, and against its policy. [...] [Napoleon] still regarded the state as an end in itself and civil life only as a treasurer and his subordinate which must have no will of its own. He perfected the Terror by substituting permanent war for permanent revolution. He fed the egoism of the French nation to complete satiety but demanded also the sacrifice of bourgeois business, enjoyments, wealth, etc., whenever this was required by the political aim of conquest. [...] French businessmen took steps to anticipate the event that first shook Napoleon's power. Paris exchange-brokers forced him by means of an artificially created famine to delay the opening of the Russian campaign by nearly two months and thus to launch it too late in the year.

Leon Trotsky developed the concept more broadly in his “Results and Prospects” (1905) and “Permanent Revolution” (1929). Trotsky argues that a particularly Russian land problem could best be solved by a proletarian-led revolution. Later, Trotsky sought to broaden the concept beyond the Soviet Union to areas where uneven development posed a similar problem. He sought to align himself with the Chinese Communist Party, which had opposed unification with the Kuomintang, and thus to challenge Stalin's concept of “Socialism in One Country.” In this way, Trotsky also returned to Marx's fundamental tenet: that Socialism was, by definition, international.

Hardt and Negri further describe the characteristics of a multitudinous subjectivity that is in motion. Such a subject is ontologically productive and imagines a new way of being in the world:

[The productive, creative subjectivities] are in perpetual motion and they form constellations of singularities and events that impose continual global reconfigurations on the system. [...] Even the asystemic elements produced by the new multitude are in fact global forces that cannot have a commensurate relationship, even an inverted one, with the system. [...] New figures of struggle and new subjectivities are produced in the conjuncture of events, in the universal nomadism, in the general mixture and miscegenation of individuals and populations, and in the technological

metamorphoses of the imperial biopolitical machine. These new figures and subjectivities are produced because, although the struggles are indeed antisystemic, they are not posed *merely against* the imperial system – they are not simply negative forces. They also express, nourish, and develop positively their own constituent projects; they work toward the liberation of living labor, creating constellations of powerful singularities. This constituent aspect of the movement of the multitude, in its myriad faces, is really the positive terrain of the historical construction of Empire. This is not a historicist positivity but, on the contrary, a positivity of the *res gestae* of the multitude, an antagonistic and creative positivity. The deterritorializing power of the multitude is the productive force that sustains Empire and at the same time the force that calls for and makes necessary its destruction. (*Empire*: 61)

The multitudinous subject shares several characteristics with the concept of permanent revolution. The multitude would develop over several centuries in much the same way that any permanent revolution would unfold. Secondly, the common itself has a perceived permanence as well. The multitude requires the common in order to develop, and hence the common must also endure over several centuries. Moreover, the common assumes a certain perceived permanence by the subject itself – the human subject that perceives commonalities between itself and its predecessors. This common has endured throughout human history. Moreover, in the broader definition of multitude as the development of a subjectivity, the perceiver also perceives itself as a permanently developing, contingent becoming. This subject is imagined as ontological in its becoming. The subject “is” in a constant state of “becoming.”

Paolo Virno has begun to locate a “grammar of the multitude” that explores much of the common within this new subjectivity (34). I attempt to pair elements of this project with a grammar of the Movement of Movements. Moreover, reading them rhetorically, I consider the role that structural elements play in such an analysis. These include genre, stylistics, and audience consideration.

I share the problem that this project explores with many others. Hardt and Negri have recuperated the concept of multitude from the seventeenth century philosopher, Baruch Spinoza, and have suggested a relationship between the Movement of Movements and a multitude whose significance is global – painting possible contours of the multitude and occasionally shading outlines of the Movement of Movements using history and philosophy (Empire 65-6). Although I rely upon history, I focus primarily upon the rhetoric of manifestos, communiqués and other statements. The later chapters of my dissertation focus not upon the Movement of Movements but rather upon its predecessors. I examine a series of poems, murals, manifestos, and other documents that surround three earlier political events in search of a genealogy that prefigures the Movement of Movements. In this way, my project explores the emergence of resistance to the ideologies of neoliberal capitalism in the last quarter of the twentieth century. It seeks to delineate some of the alternatives that the Movement of Movements has produced, and provides a context for understanding the movement's revolutionary characteristics.

This project's contribution could be succinctly phrased in the following way: the idea of a permanent-revolution-of-the-common as a revolution that ends revolution or that ends the time of non-revolution permanently. It is also here that my study takes on its deepest and perhaps most naïve qualities. What fascinate me are the contours of that revolution and its enormous mass. As capital fully develops the planet and without another planet to seek, the sowing is of proportions beyond measure. The search for an outside will eventually bring the needs of the third world into alignment with the workers of the first world whose militancy has been mitigated for more than a century.

At that point, capital will seek another order, another command structure, and its fragility will become apparent.

This project thus helps to recover discarded history on the left. Much of what Marx reported one hundred and fifty years ago about capitalism has become even more true in the system's contemporary global form. Moreover, during the decade following the events of September 11, 2001 the tightening of governments' focus on fundamentalist terrorism has allowed Communists to re-evaluate their theories outside the long shadows of the twentieth century. Western societies produced some subjects who understand the early 1980s as a time of continued political possibility. By 1980, the Sandinista communists had begun a revolution in Nicaragua. In 1981, the ten men who died in Long Kesh had reinvigorated the political movement in Northern Ireland. In 1982, leaders in Argentina sought to ameliorate the conditions of the nation's economic insecurity, while social unrest gathered against the militarily repressive Junta government.

Then, according to one dominant narrative, events seemed to slow. The Falklands War between Britain and Argentina ended that same year. The political process in Northern Ireland had led to the "Long War." By 1987, the Sandinista party, FSLN, had created a constitution and held elections, which it won that year only to lose in 1990. Meanwhile, in the United States in 1987, many people who followed politics concerned themselves with the Iran-Contra Scandal rather than the perestroika program in the Soviet Union. In 1986, officials at the National Security Council sold weapons to Iran in order to free hostages held by Hezbollah since 1983; the action did not succeed.

Some of these officials subsequently used much of this capital, along with money from Nicaraguan drug-trafficking, to support the anti-communist Contras.

However, in the West, radical politics in the late 1980s did not simply stagnate. Along repressive changes in Eastern Europe and China, one slow quiet movement grew in the United States and Mexico. As Chapter 2 demonstrates, the “Long War” of the middle and late 1980s and the early 1990s manifested itself as more than parliamentary struggle. Moreover, the IRA in that period communicated with the Palestinian Liberation Organization and bought arms from Libya’s Muammar al-Gaddafi. Al-Gaddafi’s involvement escalated after the U.S. bombings of Tripoli and Benghazi in 1986. The political scene in the late 1980s in the West thus created peripheral minoritarian movements that could claim revolutionary heritage and tradition. In Mexico after 1983, while the PRI continued its decades of rule in “La Dictadura Perfecta,” the EZLN gained strength, culminating in its own internationally recognized intervention in 1994.

If the left in the West continues to view the late 1980s as a time of political stagnation, then it will be unable to discern a continuum between the 1980s and the new movements of the 1990s. Ongoing struggles in the period include the concurrent War of the Stones, the immediately subsequent Zapatista struggle, the Alter-globalization Protest Movement, and others that this project does not analyze.

Perhaps the left could learn to contextualize those political events from the late 1980s as part of a broader revolutionary continuum. In *Communists Like Us* (20), Felix Guattari and Antonio Negri trace the legacy of 1968 beyond its immediate effects. Along other points of the constellation, the events of the late 1980s exist in a continuum

with Los Angeles in 1992, Seattle in 1999, and the Southwest in 2006. The left could integrate these disparate political movements into a coherent narrative. This narrative could then begin to challenge the ideology of neoliberalism and offer a true internationalism to replace the racist Western patriarchy that neoliberalism helps to align with empire-building.

### **Neoliberalism Today and the New Creation of New Needs**

The purpose of commerce is not consumption, directly, but the gaining of money, of exchange values. [...] The possibility of commercial crises is already contained in this separation.

– Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*

nothing we are to perceive in this world equals/  
the power of your intense fragility: whose texture/  
compels me with the colour of its countries,/   
rendering death and forever with each breathing

– e. e. cummings “somewhere i have never traveled”

Any discussion of neoliberalism today is a discussion of utopia. The liberal markets that Adam Smith advocated have not emerged under globalism. In the documentary film, *The Reality of the Virtual*, Slavoj Žižek delineates three utopian modalities: the classical, the liberal capitalist democratic model, and the model of pure necessity. This section discusses the second model, the liberal capitalist democratic model in depth, because it is the model against which we must struggle today.

In a 2003 interview, in *The Reality of the Virtual*, Žižek states that most people have perceived the existing order as functioning indefinitely. This, he argues, is “utopia” because we have returned to the idea of the real and we do not need liberal capitalist democracy to suggest to us that we cannot go further:

[Utopia] is what we need more than ever today because ultimately, I claim, the true utopia today is not a different order; it’s the idea that the existing

order can function indefinitely. The true utopia I claim was not communism which disintegrated in '89; it was the utopia of the 90s – the idea elaborated among others by Francis Fukuyama that we discovered the final social form, liberal capitalist democracy – that we cannot go further. (Title 1: Chapter 9)

Žižek suggests that the promise of liberal capitalist democracy after the “fall of communism” keeps us stuck in a prohibition to enjoy.

Žižek suggests that we can use Lacan to imagine why global capitalism creates false freedom. The space of authentic utopia is the place of freedom. Capitalism creates new needs but in a way that blocks real emancipation:

There is a certain [superego-like] urge to false freedom inherent to the [global capitalist] system itself which is why I claim the main task today is to reinvent a space of utopia.[...] The problem here is that radical as [capitalism's creation of new needs] may appear, there is something ridiculously benign about it – about this capitalist utopia. You can go to the end; basically nothing happens. (Title 1: Chapter 10)

Žižek cites Alain Badiou's injunction that, in fact, we might become pitiless censors of ourselves (qtd in Žižek *Reality of the Virtual*). But this “utopia,” the second utopia, after the classical utopia of Thomas More, allows us to go to the end and find nothing.

Similarly Badiou claims that neo-classical ethics is based upon nihilism. Its injunctions and prohibitions are based on a belief, as Badiou argues, that this ethics is nihilist because its underlying conviction is that the only thing that can really happen to someone is death (35). This nihilist threat seeks to eliminate only those occurrences and situations that would bring death. Such an ethics does not seek to bring anything productive into the world or give positive rights – for example, rights that might establish a common demand for employment. It seeks only to ensure that negative rights – for example, those of not being searched, or not being seized – remain protected.

Žižek delineates both the classical utopia of imagination and the capitalist utopia of ever new desires. These new desires proliferate in the second utopia as the search for an outside. Capital seeks an outside, we are reminded by Hardt and Negri, in *Empire*, in one of two ways: capital may seek a new market in another place, or capital may improve upon an existing market through technological innovation (222-31). The intensification of existing markets and the “drafting” of “new populations into the capitalist relationship” satisfy this problem only temporarily:

Expanding the sphere of circulation can be accomplished by intensifying existing markets within the capitalist sphere through new needs and wants; but the quantity of the wage available to workers for spending and the capitalists’ need to accumulate pose a rigid barrier to this expansion. Alternatively, additional consumers can be created by drafting new populations into the capitalist relationship, but this cannot stabilize the basically unequal relationship between supply and demand, between the value created and the value that can be consumed by the population of proletarians and capitalists involved. [...] The only effective solution is for capital to look outside itself and discover non-capitalist markets in which to exchange the commodities and realize their value. Expansion of the sphere of circulation outside the capitalist realm displaces the destabilizing inequality. (Title 1: Chapter 8)

The problem then is that inequality in the relationship between supply and demand exacerbates the inequality inherent in the system – especially in the relation between surplus value and profit. Thus the production of new needs involves a technological innovation or the search for an outside market. In other words, either new subjects desire the same “need” in a different place, or old subjects desire a new innovation in an existing technology or market. I think of the creation of new needs as the knotty problem that relies upon the nineteenth century idea of “progress:” on the one hand, people rise out of poverty by declaring new needs and claiming the technologies that will meet those needs; on the other hand, the creation of new needs makes us slaves to the capitalist process.

For Žižek, the third utopia is a real core of utopia done out of an inner necessity when life cannot be truly lived in any other way. In this way, the given symbolic coordinates are the beginning point for the impossible – for changing the real. When humans create new needs within capital – apart from it – they create the real core of utopia. Žižek argues that if we change the very coordinates of the possible we are not conditioning ourselves for imagining the future. Rather this is working within the coordinates of neoliberalism today.

But we have a third utopia which is again neither this classical utopia of imagining an alternative universe – not even dreaming about really realizing it, then the capitalist utopia of ever new desires, extreme forms of satisfying your desires. There is a third mode which I would say is precisely the real – the real core of utopia. I think a truly radical utopia is not an exercise in free imagination. [...] It's something that you do literally as out of an inner urge. You have to invent something new when you cannot do it otherwise. True utopia for me is not a matter of the future; it is something to be immediately enacted when there is no other way. Utopia in this sense simply means do what appears within the given symbolic coordinates as impossible. Take the risk. Change the very coordinates. (Title 1: Chapter 11)

This is not simply a re-imagining of neoliberalism, but instead is a revolutionary act.

The constructing of this third utopia brings not only neoliberalism to an end, but labels it as the highest and final stage of capitalism.

The third utopia must be enacted because the second utopia has not left the subject any other choice. Žižek reminds us that the idea of the capitalist utopia proclaimed by Fukuyama and others is that history has ended and that liberal capitalist democracy is the “final formula” as Žižek dubs it. If we combine this idea with the observation that no empire in the modern world has been hegemonic for more than a couple of centuries, we arrive at a tenuous position for the “United States, its friends, and its allies.” The imperial sovereign apparatus of Empire predicates itself upon a logic

that itself will not last. Žižek refers to this logic as the “[superego-like] urge to false freedom inherent to the [global capitalist] system itself.”

The second utopia of the final formula of liberal capitalist democracy contains within it a shadow of a permanent state of global war. The final formula of liberal capitalist democracy appeared in several speeches by George W. Bush surrounding the Iraq War. For example, on May 23, 2000, the future forty-third U.S. president delivered a speech in Washington D.C. entitled, “New Leadership on National Security:”

When it comes to nuclear weapons, the world has changed faster than U.S. policy. The emerging security threats to the United States, its friends and allies, and even to Russia, now come from rogue states, terrorist groups and other adversaries seeking weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. Threats also come from insecure nuclear stockpiles and the proliferation of dangerous technologies. Russia itself is no longer our enemy. The Cold War logic that led to the creation of massive stockpiles on both sides is now outdated. Our mutual security need no longer depend on a nuclear balance of terror. (par 2)

This begetting of terrorism on a grand scale is not a state of exception of the years of a private war waged by one U.S. president. Instead it constitutes what Badiou has called one of the three forms of evil. In the first form, a false event emerges as the point upon which to build a false fidelity – a remaining faithful to the logic of the false event. In the case of the war on terror we have the unintended double entendre. It is the paradox of terror on terror. And it is for the benefit of the formula of “the United States, its friends, and its allies,” that this terror meeting terror occurs. This displays the real fragility of the state and captures the political portion of what Hardt and Negri calculate as Imperial network sovereignty.

In *Žižek!*, Žižek uses the example of the film, *Armageddon*, to make the point that blockbuster films and popular culture in general often imagine such a catastrophe that brings about the death of the planet, while few films or cultural artifacts attempt to

imagine a much “more modest radical change” in the reigning economic systems. It is easier, he concludes, to imagine the entire end of life than to imagine the end of capitalism. Its ideology is strong enough to imagine itself as being at the end of history in a peace that is outside of history. In this way, it attempts to convince the world that it does not exist – this is the very core of ideology. The so-called “final formula” of liberal capitalist democracy is a utopia of peace in which consumer society and the initiation of new desires being met by capital is all that there is to life itself – the very meaning of life (Title 6: Chapter 10).

When the United States, its friends, and its allies no longer occupy the dominant military and economic centers of power, it will be difficult to imagine them holding the cultural centers of power as well. If we imagine that the United States is to be the lone global economic and military superpower for the next two or three centuries, a feat that no power in the modern age could manage, then this project would seem a stretch indeed. But it is instead much more likely that the United States will slowly begin its decline as both an economic and military superpower during the second half of this century. From this perspective, the decline and fall of the United States is something of great importance for any discussion of the Movement of Movements toward a utopia of the possible – or what I will call a permanent revolution-of-the-common. Already for a short time, the collapse of the World Trade Center allowed Americans to ask questions about the role of the U.S. in the world as the architecture of the propaganda of the 1950s was slowly eked away. In *The Reality of the Virtual*, Žižek argues that 9/11 possessed a symbolic meaning that ended the utopia of the 1990s. The real terror is

that the ideological times are over, and that we now behave with a pessimistic pragmatism:

And I think that if there is a symbolic meaning to September 11 it is that the time of that utopia is over. The real of history is back, which is why today the urge is not to be terrorized by the so-called “post-political politics” which tells us ideological times are over. (Title 1: Chapter 2)

This argument suggests again the nihilistic “go to the end” of the capitalist utopia with its increasingly radical desires.

However, Žižek also argues that we should attempt to create that which others deem impossible. Utopia is not to be of the classical form in which it is planned and imagined. In this sense, the third type of utopia, the core utopia of the real, shares a characteristic of practice with the second utopia of capitalist liberal democracy.

However, the second utopia imagines only the margins of the existing order and brings them to the realm of the market. The third utopia *begins* with the coordinates of the possible, but out of sheer need quickly transgresses these coordinates. In this way, the third utopia is necessary for the very appearance of any future:

We should dare to enact the impossible. We should rediscover how to not imagine but enact utopia. The point is not again about planning utopias; the point is about practicing them. And I think this is not a question of should we do it or should we simply persist in the existing order. It's much more radical. It's a matter for survival: the future will be utopian or there will be none. (Title 1: Chapter 7)

Žižek suggests that this third utopian space – the enacted and practiced utopia must fill the void that will be left when the crashing of the real into the symbolic order happens again as it did for some Americans on 9/11. The meaning of 9/11, again for Žižek, is that the time of the second utopia of liberal capitalist democracy is over. In this sense, September the Eleventh represents the death of one utopia and the resulting vacuum requires a new one. For Žižek, the death of this world of the long 1990s demonstrates

that we cannot persist in the existing order. The enacting and practicing of new utopias is a matter for survival. In this sense, the future will be utopian or there will not be a future.

### **The Figure of Trainer in Communiqués, Manifestos, and Polemics**

Because Chapters 4, 5, and 6 concern ontologically productive space in the form of short political documents, we need to contextualize the genres of these short forms. In Chapter 4, the documents are communiqués. In Chapter 5, I read one manifesto. In Chapter 6, the focus is on both manifestos and polemics. However, offering solutions to these problems without justifying the solutions rhetorically is the problem of all three genres. This problem is evident in many well-known manifestos such as the Communist Manifesto, the Ultraismo Manifesto, and others. They come to productive conclusions but they do not attempt to show why or how their end will be achieved. They merely point in the right direction. The border is a figure for all of these issues and we should read all communiqués, manifestos, and polemics as trainers of the anomalous – the becoming-animal or anomaly of trainer as outsider who teaches the pack.

Moreover, a communiqué, manifesto, or polemic alienates a more general audience because for many it seems like it comes from another world. In a radio interview during the 1990s, Jeff Greenfield, a producer from Nightline, suggested that many of Noam Chomsky's claims sounded like they came from Neptune. And this is exactly right, Chomsky concludes, because the problem is one of concision. Chomsky actually continues Greenfield's term "concision," although the term ought actually to be omission (Title 1 Chapter 14). When one removes the proof to be shorter, one is not being concise: to do so one omits the warrants, the grounds, and the backing. And of course this sounds like an ontological break from the thinking of the audience-subject

because that subject cannot perceive the links between his own common-mind and the mind that gets suggested by this new claim. The evidence has not been provided.

Chomsky discusses this on television, but the medium does not matter as much as the problem of omission in the discourse in any medium.

The trainer in this case is the subject who produces the communiqué, manifesto, or polemic. This subject is the collective pool of authors—or like-minded subjects who might have been able to contribute similar ideas, whether or not they actually produced the text. In this sense, the trainer is more than the authorship and we will call them, for lack of a better phrase, organic intellectuals.

The act of removing the evidence, warrants, grounds, and backing departs from a general audience. A general audience might miss many of the connections between a proposal and the background. The background would consist of the problem, its history, its significance and its costs, the ethics that form the problem into a grievance, the antagonism of the power and its victimized subjects, the rationale for the change, and the agents of change. A subject who already perceives much of this background or who could quickly grasp most of it—especially the rhetorical history—is part of a different audience.

The communiqué, manifesto, and polemic face resistance outside the border toward a new horizon outside the pack. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari argue that the figure of the trainer doubles the border, which suggests the multiplication of the trainer into critical mass from de-territorialization and re-territorialization. This occurs because the pack, in our case the audience, possesses members who join the group of trainers:

Sometimes the borderline is defined or doubled by a being of another nature that no longer belongs to the pack, or never belonged to it, and that represents a power of another order, potentially acting as a threat as well as a trainer, outsider, etc. In any case, no band is without this phenomenon of bordering, or the anomalous. (245-6)

The border is the space between the authors and their subjectivity on the one hand, and the audience on the other. The audience is near enough to the authors in mentality as to be recognizable. This audience doubts the state and is open to the possibility of something else. But as the authors reach more and more people, there is the possibility that some will be able to act as the authors do—to act as trainers. The manifesto names the capitalist, the pack and some counter-trainer, then trainer for the communiqué, the manifesto, or the polemic, and finally new ontological horizon that involves what Hardt and Negri have referred to, in *Multitude*, as the becoming-common of the multitude (xv). The ideologies of neoliberal capitalism have interpellated the prospective audience by specifying that it should act as individuals. On the other hand, the trainer offers a vision of the becoming-common of all of humanity and expects the audience to respond accordingly. The becoming-common of labor is more than a dream, and the communiqué, manifesto, or polemic begins by arguing that these forces should curb unbridled neo-liberalism.

The problem that such terse political documents face are not with their own audiences but with those outside the border as the horizon of the general or common audience. For the intellectuals to make the communiqué, manifesto, or polemic common, they must do more than name the capitalist, the audience, or the cadre agents who act. They must also use common language and must in fact help to name the becoming-common of the multitude through a grammar of the multitude.

The communiqué, manifesto, or polemic often face challenges in attempting to interpellate their band audiences, form them as potential trainers of the greater pack, which, in this case, is the general public audience. Deleuze and Guattari argue that the group can be split along at least three lines that emerge from traditional society:

It is true that bands are also undermined by extremely varied forces that establish in them interior centers of the conjugal, familiar, or State type, and that make them pass into an entirely different form of sociability, replacing pack affects with family feelings or State intelligibilities. The center, or internal black holes, assumes the principal role. This is what evolutionism sees as progress, this adventure also befalls bands of humans when they reconstitute group familialism, or even authoritarianism or pack fascism. (246)

Some audience members might break with the mass and become part of the trainer group that is represented by the authors. This doubles the border, which is another way of saying that the audience already has the potential within itself to produce more intellectuals or activists who can further train it.

Deleuze and Guattari emphasize the importance of the alliance in disrupting the earlier forms of socialization. These earlier forms do not belong to the alliances that are created by the communiqué, manifesto, or polemic. The authors of such a political document resemble sorcerers and can create alliances with both the village and with the demon, which is the remaining as anomaly:

Sorcerers have always held the anomalous position, at the edge of the fields or woods. They haunt the fringes. They are at the borderline of the village, or between villages. The important thing is their affinity with alliance, with the pact, which gives them a status opposed to that of filiation. The relation with the anomalous is one of alliance. The sorcerer has a relation of alliance with the demon as the power of the anomalous. (246)

The border's doubling seems to suggest that the border possesses itself, or that the pack possesses it before the appearance of the anomalous. This anomalous is a border that gets defined before the trainer as the figure of the other. The border exists

as a non-pack, outside of the pack, in another entity suggesting a not-quite-pack but also not-quite-other. At the moment the identity of the pack begins to wane, we can perceive the border, but already as trainer. In other words, the de-territorialization extends beyond the figure of the trainer to something else as well – some other entity that is not the trainer but is also not the pack.

The communiqué, manifesto, and polemic are documents of minoritarian populations that the sorcerer, the trainer, can create in order to protect the minoritarian position by delineating it from the family, religion, or the state. Deleuze and Guattari argue that the disruption of these earlier forms of organization also help to represent the minoritarian:

There is an entire politics of becomings-animal, as well as a politics of sorcery, which is elaborated in assemblages that are neither those of the family nor of religion nor of the State. Instead, they express minoritarian groups, or groups that are oppressed, prohibited, in revolt, or always on the fringe of recognized institutions, groups all the more secret for being extrinsic, in other words, anomic. If becoming-animal takes the form of a Temptation, and of monsters aroused in the imagination by the demon, it is because it is accompanied, at its origin as in its undertaking, by a rupture with central institutions that have established themselves or seek to become established. (247)

Perhaps the pack ends and a hinterland creates and defines the border before the trainer doubles it as an anti-ontology. I call this anti-ontology because these subjects are in a process of becoming rather than a process of being. Such an anti-ontology, if it were possible, would reflect a constant uncertainty, would choose not to be pack, or would be of another order and yet not the trainer.

The pack can end; that is, there can be other people who are not part of the audience who still act in the scene. They are in a space outside of the pack, having never read the communiqué, manifesto, or polemic, and yet act in ways described by

the authors. In this way, there can be a subject who differs from both the trainer and the pack and is yet bordered by them. Like the gathering intellectuals, activists and cadres, this subject is in motion and reflects uncertainty and contingency.

The communiqué, manifesto, or polemic argues an engaged position. As Cary Nelson observes, one need not view rhetoric in balanced viewpoint theory (110). An engaged critical project does not present a balanced viewpoint theory but the rhetor need not apologize for this. Capital seeks to diminish other arguments by questioning those who challenge its position as though they occupied only the realm of opinion. Balanced viewpoint theory seeks to create consensus; but consensus would not interrupt errors in logic or fact. Balanced viewpoint theory suggests to the audience that all positions are equal, relative, ontological, and possess no rhetorical history, origin, or systemic explanation of how they came into being.

As genres, the communiqué, manifesto, and polemic might use a pedagogy of disruption to reach the audience. They preach to the converted and offer them a direction while simultaneously raising awareness of alternatives in a more general audience. These genres problematize their relationship to anomalous pack audience because they omit details and imagine a new audience that rises with the genre itself. When a new subject reads the document, the processes of disruption, dis-identification, and encoding act upon that uncommitted subject. By creating a trainer for itself from its audience, the communiqué, manifesto, or polemic engages the dialectic between vertical and horizontal audience.

### **Chapter Outline**

Chapter 2 explores the poetry and prose of a British (absentee) M.P. and IRA member, Bobby Sands, in the years before the 1981 Hungerstrike in Northern Ireland,

at HM Prison Maze (Long Kesh). By reading Sands' novella, *Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song*, and collected poetry from *Writings from Prison*, Chapter 2 explores the role of the simian-cyborg in regressing the prison space to a society of discipline. Michel Foucault's classic study *Discipline and Punish* informs the readings of these texts. In this space, one iteration of the simian-cyborg tortures the working-class body and escalates violent tactics. In Imperial Ireland, the scene reflects the break-down of distinctions between remunerated and non-remunerated work and life during the emergence of neoliberalism under Margaret Thatcher. Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical implications of British state terror over the primacy of the working-class body, which is brought into relief by the physical reality of the hunger strike itself, and examines the criminalization of the political body under late capitalism in Ireland in relationship to the use of live ammunition and rubber bullets, the blanket protest over prison uniforms, the dirty protest, prison rights, and hierarchy in the prisons. The body plays a prominent role: the state disciplines it, starves it, and strips it of its clothing and political status.

But Chapter 2 also discusses how a militant hope emerges in the face of such trauma over grief over the relationship to the mother and the childhood body, the horizontal milieu of the Irish Republican community, from the sentiment of the Bardic tradition, from the vertical audience of previous hunger strikers, and from the inspiration of socialists like James Connolly. This vertical audience allows the men to persist with as little violence as possible and thus links them to the ethics of the Movement of Movements. Chapter 2 uses David Beresford's *Ten Men Dead: The Story of the 1981 Hungerstrike* and relies on the work of J. Bowyer Bell as well as other twentieth century histories of the Irish Republic and of the British protectorate of Northern Ireland in order

to situate the struggle within its national histories. Finally, Chapter 2 examines how the liberation struggles in the period of the hunger strike use the media to attack the center of Empire from its periphery and the attempts of the hunger strikers to depart from the standard hierarchy of the IRA even while they could not fully democratize their movement.

Chapter 3 discusses the El Paso/Juárez murals of the *Todos Somos* series (1987-1989) which were produced by Las Artistas de la Frontera and led by Manuel Anzaldo Meneses, the Minister of Culture for the Zapatistas. It explores Chicano-a/ and Tejano-a identity politics as the movement attempts to challenge the militarization of the border. It examines the first and third murals, “Todos Somos Ilegales” (1987) and “El Puente Negro” (1989), for their additive and polymorphous qualities. The murals attempt to critique the border through three formal techniques including blending, refusing to define their own borders, and allowing additions to their forms. Chapter 3 reads the additive polymorphous quality of these murals as a philosophical criticism of the border’s closed militarization since the 1940s. Furthermore, their situatedness is particularly unique to their project because they cannot be removed from their material space. Hence, viewers cannot understand the formal techniques these murals demonstrate unless they also grasp the murals’ location and purpose. Moreover, the murals’ additive characteristic is coupled with a schizophrenic quality that emerges from an attempt at mapping the unmappable as the play of figuration. The murals display qualities of revolutionary muralism and as outdoor art, they cannot be privatized.

Chapter 3 also discusses the lost second mural “Todos Somos Americanos” (1988). It examines the process of “white washing” of this and other murals and its

effect upon the newer murals at the site. It discusses two traditions from which the murals arise: the Cuban revolutionary poster tradition of the 1960s and the outdoor formal techniques of Siqueiros from the 1940s through the 1970s. The work of post-revolutionary Cuban muralists inform this reading because the murals display flat iconographic contours. To a lesser degree, the tradition of David Siqueiros informs the non-fresco outdoor cement-based murals. Walter Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" aids my reading of the context and siting of these murals. Further context emerges from the situation of Diego Rivera's "Controlador" in the Palacio de Belles Artes in Mexico City, and "Man at the Crossroads," an effaced mural in the Rockefeller building in New York City, both of which rely on the situation of their siting directly for their meaning. Chapter 3 makes explicit some of the links between the artists of the border and Zapatista member Manuel Anzaldo-Meneses.

Chapter 4 engages the network struggle of the Zapatista movement through the manifestos of the mid-1990s, "Comunicués from the EZLN." By reading EZLN comunicués, Chapter 4 explores the international Zapatista movement and its challenges to the Mexican State and the Mexico-Guatemala border amidst the first years of that struggle since 1983. Chapter 4 also examines the struggle toward parliamentarianism through the political campaign to stand the Zapatistas for local elections. It emphasizes the EZLN's ability to use the international media to strike not only at the Mexican government, but also at the heart of imperial command. The EZLN uses postmodern structures of organization and multi-media to become a truly international organization with sympathizers and related organizations around the world.

Chapter 4 addresses decentralized forms of power and network struggle and lines of de-territorialization, as well as image rhetoric and public relations.

Finally, Chapter 4 explores the explicit link between Tute Bianchi (White Overalls) and the EZLN beginning in 1994 amidst the alter-globalization protests and promoting common need and catholic love. This need springs from the “accidentally armed” organic intellectuals who act as trainers of the pack in fleeing with a weapon in the form of exodus. Chapter 4 also explores the EZLN’s relationship to power: they challenge the state both in their relationship to sovereignty and in their network organization, swarm intelligence, and relationship to media spectacle in the world of the simulacrum. They help us to grasp both the origins of the Movement of Movements and the relationship to a society of global spectacle.

Chapter 5 reads the Porto Alegre Manifesto (2005) in relation to global biopolitical grievances – those rights that workers demand for resources, control over their bodies and so on. The economic, democratic, and political rights that are sought represent an addition to the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Chapter 5 examines this legacy and the rhetoric that led to such biopolitical grievances and imagines a truly global class that would react to them.

Chapter 5 also discusses how the Porto Alegre Manifesto helps to create a grammar for the multitude, appeals to the vertical audience, and acts as Public Relations Department for the Movement of Movements. The manifesto also lends legitimacy to the Movement of Movements because it emerges from the World Social Forum and can clearly state some of the biopolitical grievances of the multitude in an

ontologically productive manner that surpasses the critical phase of philosophy during the twentieth century.

Chapter 6 examines the Alter-globalization Movement through communiqués and polemics of the White Overalls (1994-1999) and the International Anarchist Conspiracy, whose members are affiliated activists present in Seattle (1999), Montreal (2000), and Genoa (2001). By reading manifestos from branches of Tute Bianchi, websites of alter-globalization organizations, and legal documents and contracts, Chapter 6 explores the spread of the alter-globalization movement from Seattle. Like previous chapters, Chapter 6 analyzes network struggle, but through spatial concerns, geography, and new technologies. It reads these protests as unprecedented work refusals – a global strike of migratory populations that represent swarm intelligence.

Chapter 6 attempts to demonstrate some of the ways in which these struggles differ historically from other struggles against power including the evacuation of the power of the state to promote its withering. Furthermore, Chapter 6 demonstrates how the Do-It-Yourself movement allows us to test political philosophy of the twenty-first century because the movement practices civil disobedience and resistance and builds coalitions. The factionalism of the genre of the polemic takes on a new meaning in the beginning of the twenty-first century: it represents a new radical singularity within the Movement of Movements. This new singularity brings an abundance of biopolitical production to the old ideological, factional, and hierarchical struggles. This new singularity is also present in the multitude as one of the greatest signs of the multitudinous possibilities of the Movement of Movements.

CHAPTER 2  
DIRTY PROTEST: THE BLANKET MEN OF THE SECOND HUNGER STRIKE

We shall continue in our efforts to stamp out terrorism. Mr. Sands was a convicted criminal. He chose to take his own life. It was a choice his organization did not give to many of their victims.

– Margaret Thatcher

After Ireland is free, says the patriot who won't touch Socialism, we will protect all classes, and if you won't pay your rent, you will be evicted same as now. But the evicting party, under command of the sheriff, will wear green uniforms and the Harp without the Crown, and the warrant turning you out on the roadside will be stamped with the arms of the Irish Republic. Now, isn't that worth fighting for?

– James Connolly

In the epigraph above, Margaret Thatcher attempts to make a link between the hunger striker MP, Bobby Sands, and the violence of the IRA. This view was shared for a long time by members of the British government. However, the process of criminalization was a dystopian fantasy that would end within two years. It is not entirely certain how the centers of power of the PIRA and their admitted hierarchical form affected the less hierarchical movements that were to follow it. Moreover, we may not immediately recognize the difference between PIRA's tactics and the 1981 Hunger Strike's strategy.

If we grasp the relation between the earlier cycle of PIRA and the cycles of other movements in this study, we might also understand how common general intellect tendencies rise from a particular social movement to movements at the macro level. Furthermore, the process of regulation and criminalization must be understood because it is repeated in response to the protests of the other moments. First in Seattle, Genoa, Montreal, the protests were slowly moved back away from their objects, the IMF, World Bank, and the WTO meetings until, in the Yucatan, the protests were a mile from the

object of protest. Moreover, the militancy of the IRA both in the hunger strike and outside of it demonstrates something that as of yet has only been claimed by a few of the anarchists – the ability to protect oneself by the same means that the police use to protect their own machinic bodies (flak jackets, gas masks, handcuffs, etc.).

The 1981 Hunger Strike uses a vertical, or historical, tradition to produce a non-violent response from the men in long Kesh, as well as a horizontal milieu of Republican community support. This occurs even as torture permeates both the working-class bodies of this non-violent movement and their captors, producing both remunerated living and non-remunerated labor. Yet, it is within the hierarchical structure of the IRA that we notice a difference between it and some of the more recent movements.

In section one, I argue that both the sentiment and sentimentality of the poems collected in Bobby Sands' *Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song* reflect a Gaelic bardic tradition that brings hope to the hunger strikers. In section two, I argue that remunerated life and non-remunerated work permeate the lives and bodies of both the guards and the prisoners. In section three, I argue that Sands displaces his own sadness onto his mother and re-imagines his boyhood; as a result, what Donna Haraway calls a simian-cyborg subjectivity has shifted as he tries to recall the vitality of his childhood body. Finally, I argue that although the genealogy is best understood by including analysis of the War of the Stones (First Intifada), we can still recognize a continuity of struggle with generally non-violent protests like those of the Zapatistas or the Movement of Movements.

As Beresford explains, after an earlier hunger strike, which was led by one of the founding members of the Provisional IRA, Billy McKee, the British Foreign Secretary for

Northern Ireland eventually offered special-category status to the prisoners. This was offered in 1972 but ended in 1976. Then the five-year blanket protest (September 1976-October 1981) emerged and in March 1978 became the dirty protest (ended in March 1981) in which prisoners refused to leave to empty their waste basins or to shower for fear of being beaten; instead, they smeared excrement against the walls. This protest was followed by a 1980 Hunger Strike for five demands: the right not to wear prison uniforms, the right to exemption from prison labor, the right to free association with other IRA members, the right to one visit, parcel, and letter per week, and finally, full remission re-instatement for the time lost during the protest (126). The hunger strike ended when it appeared that the British Secretary had conceded their five demands.

However, when the demands were not met, the IRA planned a second hunger-strike to be led by Sands. According to Beresford, other strikers would soon join him: Francis Hughes, Raymond McCreesh, Patsy O'Hara, Joe McDonnell, Martin Hurson, Kevin Lynch, Kieran Doherty, Thomas McElwee, Michael Devine, all of whom would die on hunger strike plus, Brendan McLaughlin, Paddy Quinn, Laurence McKeown, Pat McGeowan, Matt Devlin, Liam McCloskey, Patrick Sheehan, Jackie McMullen, Bernard Fox, Hugh Carville, John Pickering, Gerard Hodgkins, James Devine. (123) This second hunger-strike began on March 1 and the dirty protest ended on March 2. The 1981 Hunger Strike ended in October 1981 after the tenth man, Michael Devine, died in August. Six others were still on hunger strike when it ended. Two others had stopped because of health problems; five were removed by family.

## **Ghostly Dialogic with Bobby Sands, M.P.: Contextualizing the Vertical Audience**

### **Contextualizing Sentiment and Sentimentality**

We can recognize the sentiment (if not the sentimentality) as part of a vertical audience that allows the poetry of *Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song* to reach both to the future and to the past. Although its title is a sentimental analogy, it also traces back to the hope and beauty of the childhood of Bobby Sands. We must contextualize the sentiment and sentimentality as well as the out-of-date rhyme schemes in order to accept the title of the third, and most extensive work, *Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song*. Secondly, in order to understand the 1981 Hunger Strike, we must also grasp the sense of hope and greater cause that many of the prison inmates lived by within a vertical audience and the success of the horizontal audience in keeping hope for the present day alive as well. Finally, we must discuss a second cause that made some aspects of hope reach beyond tradition toward a utopian socialist state that link the IRA members to the legacy of John Connolly.

We see a commonality inside the Movement of Movements that matches a PIRA commonality within the strength and will. However, there is little that speaks of the purpose of the work. What is the purpose of freedom? Why does freedom need to exist, especially when we begin to link it to free markets and to link democracy to representative republic values?

The lark, having suffered the loss of her liberty, no longer sang her little heart out, she no longer had anything to be happy about. The man who had committed the atrocity as my grandfather called it, demanded that the lark should do as he wished: that was to sing her heart out, to comply to his wishes and change herself to suit his pleasure or benefit (84).

It is not the female but rather the male birds who sing to settle territory and attract mates. If a bird does not sing in a cage, it is because it cannot attract a mate and has

no interaction with others of its species. The lark does not recognize the order of the cage other than in its body meeting up with it. The idea of a caged bird who does not sing is a bit of a hackneyed phrase. And the idea of a female bird refusing to sing has a kind of sentimentality to it.

In *Ethics*, Badiou names three types of evil (72-76). The atrocity of the lark is an example of one of the types of what Badiou names “disaster” because it socially overcodes the beautiful event of the Lark’s break into the prison complex. However, the atrocity is that the owner tries to completely overcode the social order of the bird and settle himself in this way. He does not expect that it will be a problem that the bird cannot sing while it is in captivity. The man befriends the bird and recognizes its beautiful song. But what he does not realize is that the bird’s song is a function of its regular life. Once the life has been disrupted by the cage, it would require an entire recoding of the bird for it to sing again: within the cage its biological functions were no longer operative. Thus, what begins as an event that has the potential for truth becomes the overcoding of sociality once the lark is expected to be of the same form and behave in the same way in a different environment. The truth of the event becomes expropriated and applied without any judiciousness. This demonstrates that the vanguard of the IRA cannot stand for all of the people of Ireland.

The analogy degrades quickly, however, because not only is the sex of the bird misidentified, but the jailor of the bird, the man who traps “his friend,” is someone who uses the bird as a resource. However, the British government does not consider the freedom fighter in captivity as a resource: the freedom fighter is not the “friend” of the British government. Only if we expand the metaphor to include not only freedom-

fighters but all of the Irish, might the British might recognize the former colony as a resource.

The lark has been rehabilitated, but the situation is not analogous because the logic of the figure extends itself to the greater Irish people of both the North and the South. The man is a figure of Britain and the lark of the whole of the Irish people:

The lark refused, and the man became angry and violent. He began to pressurize the lark to sing, but inevitably he received no result. So he took more drastic steps. He covered the cage with a black cloth, depriving the bird of sunlight. He starved it and left it to rot in a dirty cage, but the bird still refused to yield. The man murdered it. As my grandfather rightly stated, the lark had spirit – the spirit of freedom and resistance. It longed to be free, and died before it would conform to the tyrant who tried to change it with torture and imprisonment. I feel I have something in common with that bird and her torture, imprisonment and final murder. She had a spirit which is not commonly found, even among us so-called superior beings, humans. (84)

As it becomes clearer that Sands identifies with the lark, we see that the analogy does not fit perfectly for a number of reasons. Even if we assume that the bird is male and that the male bird was taken after the man knew that it could sing, then its singing must be the singing of any prisoner. We cannot easily discern a description of the average prisoner to whom Sands compares himself and the lark (84). We cannot easily discern whether Sands would have described the average prisoner as a bird of any kind. If Sands wrote the title, then he is responsible for the off analogy.

The skylark images comes from one of Sands' poems, and its sentimentality belongs to him. It is not entirely clear where the phrase "Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song" enters the rhetoric, but Sands himself seems to have used such a reference: it appears on the front page of the text. It relates a small story that Sands' grandfather told him about a bird. In this story the lark and the man both need their freedom although the man has caged his own friend:

The Lark and the Freedom Fighter/ My Grandfather once said that the imprisonment of the lark/is a crime of the greatest cruelty because the lark is one/ of the greatest symbols of freedom and happiness./ He often spoke of the spirit of the lark relating to a story of/ a man who incarcerated one of his loved friends in a small cage. (83)

The lark is a symbol of freedom and happiness. The spirit of the lark is a positive capability that is nevertheless delivered in a negative framework. In other words, the lark does not express itself as needing freedom. Freedom is not an ontologically productive space – it remains in a negative right. If the lark needs to flee, then it might be closer to being ontologically productive. But in the case of freedom, the lark seeks simply to avoid repression. In this way, we might imagine it as a figure for a productive decade of new forms – the decade of the “sixties” (1963-1972).

The book seems to take its name from the skylark grandfather story. It is difficult to date each of the poems and stories and journal entries. We know that they could have appeared as early as 1976, before the no-wash protest. This would date most of these writings to the late 1970s, but there are a few poems mentioned in the March Diary that could have been written as late as 1981. The order seems to be the following: first *Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song*, whose drafting Sands would have begun in 1976 or 1977, followed by *One Day in My Life* (Winter of 1979), followed by the “Diary.”

First, Sands seems to have had the familiarity with a certain older canon of Anglo-Irish literature. His poems are anachronistic. Second, Sands does not read contemporary poetry and seems to have had little familiarity with modernist poetry. Third, the revision of Sands’ poems would have occurred mainly through memory alone because the material written on toilet paper and cigarette papers had to be smuggled out of the prison.

## **Vertical and Horizontal Audiences**

There are both horizontal and vertical aspects to the hunger strike as humans transmit hope and despair to each other. The horizontal communal aspects of the 1981 Hunger Strike may have eased his suffering a bit, as Sands observes. He is not alone like some of the earlier hunger strikers were. Moreover, there is a grand vertical rhetorical history of hunger strikers. The rhetorical history includes the legacy of earlier hunger strikers such as Terrance MacSweeney, Mohandas Gandhi, Frank Stagg and Michael Gaughan (Beresford 120). The idea of blood sacrifice dates through the Fenian movement and reaches a pinnacle with the Declaration of the Irish Republic in 1916 by a small group, including several poets.

Sands' heart represents a Catholic (and catholic) love that encompasses the revolutionary. Although Sands loses heart muscle through rapid weight loss, he returns frequently to the heart as one of the main tropes in his diary. I wonder if instead of love of which Guevara wrote, the diary speaks of the heart as influenced by the sacred heart of Jesus – a common Catholic icon?

The fasts of the Irish hunger strikers were part of a history that precedes the hunger strike of the Lord Mayor MacSwiney. They began sometime before the fourth century in Ireland, and usually involved the doorstep of the offender's home, in response to a debt or injustice, or dishonor from poor hospitality. (Beresford 75) MacSwiney's seventy-four-day hunger strike in Brixton prison in London began in August of 1920. Gandhi had called for a national fast on 6 April 1919 to protest the Rowlatt Act and whether he was directly influenced by MacSwiney is an interesting question.

Both Troscaidh and Cealachan have specific rules that defined the usage of hunger strike. The fast seems to have lasted for one night. Once Patrick is added to the legend, it becomes clearer how Catholic (and perhaps catholic) love might be part of the rhetorical legacy employed in the poems (Beresford 74).

The text also uses images of shame to explain to the citizens of the British empire that imprisonment is a high crime. The imprisonment of a lark is a crime of the greatest cruelty because the bird is a symbol of freedom and happiness. Suppressing freedom of one does not equal suppressing freedom of all; however, repressing the hope of freedom produces despair. Under these circumstances hope – the eschatological and religious substance – is a form of biopolitical production. The killing of the lark is a great crime that ultimately is impossible. The lark is lonely, but not defeated. These texts survive beyond their writers because they offer the hope for freedom. However, the freedom they offer is only possible in another way of being in the world.

### **On Long-Term Hope, an Outside Cause, and Tradition**

The candle-bearer of any political movement has no proof that he will be followed: he acts as he does because his hope is so great and his heart so large that he must do so. Lawrence Kohlberg argues that humans could be understood to employ six levels of moral reasoning. (29) Abraham Maslow argues that humans could be understood to exist along a hierarchy of five levels of need (306). At the advanced stages the charts of Kohlberg and Maslow converge: the stage of self-actualization seems to be the highest stage. This helps us further understand that Sands acts because to refrain from doing so would mean that he would lose his identity. We can say that Sands is part of the progressive cause that lives on beyond his death.

Similarly we see in other movements that the notion of “our day” coming will expand to the planet and will embrace a certain globalism that in Sands’ time still had only negative antecedents. For example, Sands hears of Thatcher and Reagan’s plans and expresses sardonicism:

I am abreast with the news and view with utter disgust and anger the Reagan/Thatcher plot. It seems quite clear that they intend to counteract Russian expansionism with imperialist expansionism, to protect their vital interests they say. What they mean is they covet other nations’ resources. They want to steal what they haven’t got and to do so (as the future may unfortunately prove) they will murder oppressed people and deny them their sovereignty and nations. No doubt Mr. Haughey will toe the line in Ireland when Thatcher so demands. (222)

A figure of imperial sovereignty appears in Sands’ writing a decade before the theorists had begun to express such ideas. The Irish Freedom Fighter thus also figures as a canary – the warning signal of a rising imperial sovereignty.

Sands brings hope to himself and to others by identifying himself with a greater historical struggle. Sands suggests that he understands the struggles of two other hunger-strikers who died alone without support from a family or their milieu. He recognizes that the torture and end of these men might also be his own fate. However, he recognizes – “indeed yes!” – that his situation is strengthened by his comrades and the support of a broader community. Moreover, he recognizes that he is better off as well because although he will die at the hands of “a vindictive heartless enemy,” he will die in Ireland:

I have come to understand, and with each passing day I understand increasingly more and in the most sad way, that awful fate and torture endured to the very bitter end by Frank Stagg and Michael Gaughan. Perhaps – indeed yes! – I am more fortunate because those poor comrades were without comrades of a friendly face. They had not even the final consolation of dying in their own land, Irishmen alone and at the unmerciful ugly hands of a vindictive heartless enemy. Dear God, but I am so lucky in comparison. (231)

Sands links himself to a greater cause and recognizes those things for which he can express gratitude. He acknowledges that when he goes hungry he is part of a lineage within the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Both Michael Gaughan and Frank Stagg died in British prisons without the support that enabled Sands to become MP. Frank Stagg was an IRA member held in a British jail. In 1976, he began the strike to be shipped to Ireland, and he died after a 62-day hunger strike. Sands writes: “I die proudly for my country and in the hope that my death will be sufficient to obtain the demands of my comrades. Let there be no bitterness on my behalf, but a determination to achieve the new Ireland for which I gladly die. My loyalty and confidence is to the IRA and let those of you who are left carry on the work and finish the fight” (231). Sands also recalls the Fenian Brotherhood who were active during the nineteenth century, expanding the dream of jurisdiction, relevance, and tradition so that he could express catholic love through himself. In *Empire*, Hardt and Negri mention that Francis of Assisi already promoted a broad catholic love (41).

Moreover, Sands recognizes another challenge and hardship that the public might not so readily grasp – the “terrible silent system:” “I recall the Fenians and Tom Clarke, who indeed were most instrumental in highlighting by their unflinching resistance the ‘terrible silent system’ in the Victorian period in English prisons” (219). This recollection reflects an ontologically different view of punishment. It represents what Foucault has distinguished as distinct methods of organizing society: the different societies of discipline and control. The society of discipline allows the subject’s body to be reconciled to the order of the day. The society of control, on the other hand, forces the subject’s mind to reconcile with the order of the day.

Although he disparages the leadership at the time of the hunger-strike, Sands demonstrates that the work of the Catholic church gives a milieu, community, and voice to the Prisoners of War through the Archbishop:

I once read an editorial, in late '78, following the then Archbishop O Fiaich's "sewer pipes of Calcutta" statement. It said it was to the everlasting shame of the Irish people that the archbishop had to, and I paraphrase, stir the moral conscience of the people on the H Block issue. A lot of time has passed since then, a lot of torture, in fact the following year was the worst we experienced. Now I wonder who will stir the Cardinal's moral conscience . . . (220-1)

Sands experienced support on the horizontal level that Stagg and Gaughan did not. During the hunger strike, Sands already recognizes his advantage in regards to his horizontal audience. He knows that the movement is behind him and that he is a freedom-fighter. He will not die alone.

Sands further writes: "All men must have hope and never lose heart. But my hope lies in the ultimate victory for my poor people. Is there any hope greater than that?" (223) The loss-of-heart imagery suggests both the literal loss of heart muscle and other organ tissue, and also the loss of a heart that would not exist without the vertical audience. Sands seeks to put faith in history and in progress. Sands appeals not only to the horizontal audience who have elected him to parliament – those who are most receptive to his cause. He also appeals to the vertical audience – an audience of the future who will ask the same questions and will expect a tradition of insurgency.

### **On Belief in Socialism and the Organic Intellectual**

Sands characterizes all of the books in the prison as garbage because he is desperate for intellectual stimulation. This is a mark of the organic intellectual as Antonio Gramsci describes it (137). Sands argues that the books that he may read do not enable him to learn significantly: "The books that are available to me are trash. I'm

going to ask for a dictionary tomorrow. I'd just sit and flick through that and learn, much more preferable to reading rubbish" (237). This function demonstrates his desire for attachment to the vertical audience throughout history and into a projected future through the only means available – the written word.

Sands' thinking appeals to a vertical audience that includes James Connolly, the Irish ex-patriate Provocateur Socialist turned revolutionary and freedom fighter for Ireland. Connolly participated in Scottish and U.S. politics before returning to Ireland and taking part in the Easter Rising of 1916. For his part in this protest, he was shot by British Firing Squad while wheel-chair-bound. He died at the age of forty-seven. Nevertheless, the twenty-seven-year old Sands identifies with him. "Every time I feel down I think of Armagh, and James Connolly" (221). Connolly is a realization of the power of the vertical audience through writing – a recognition that others might read and come to understand the movement.

James Connolly also represents a socialist vision. His tradition is the tradition of atheist. And his understanding of nationalism is nuanced. Connolly's analysis tempers the patriotic nationalism of Sands. It tempers Sands' fears of death as well because he recognizes that although his cause may not be realized for a while, ultimately their day will come. In "Let us Free Ireland!" (1899), Connolly argues that the worker is the only inheritor of democracy in the republic. He suggests that very little will change if the patriot remains anti-socialist (Simons 42). If we think of the analysis of critical discourse as a rhetorical system, we can see that Connolly has recognized the historical problem of the Pale of Dublin and also the rack-renting that worsened the Irish Famine seventy years before. In the Pale of Dublin, established during the sixteenth century,

magistrates' children actually began to struggle with English because of the stronger pull of Gaelic culture. However, by the nineteenth century and the Act of Union, the Pale had become much greater and entire portions of Ireland expressed allegiance to the British crown (Larkin 84).

Sands puts faith in the privacy of his own mind when he writes, "They can never take those thoughts away from me" (221). This is a direct expression of the vertical audience. In other words, because he sees a plan for history, he can face death. It is also not the audience of Ulster guards whom he recognizes – that horizontal audience meets him with disdain and brutality. It is rather the consideration of those of the global horizontal milieu: Mao, Ho, Libya, and Basque separatists, to name a few.

But as important to the text seems to be the appeal to the vertical audience – to an enlightened posterity. In *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence from Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*, Judith Herman suggests that trauma-bonding is a common experience (62). This is what Sands seems to suggest by maintaining his horizontal audience as a milieu of "Girls of Armagh." At the same time, his conversation is with the tradition of the movement – Connolly, MacSweeney, Gaughan, and Stagg as well as the hunger strikers who preceded the Second hunger strike. As Beresford notes in Brendan Hughes, Tommy McKearney, Raymond McCartney, Tom McFeeley, Sean McKenna, Leo Green, John Nixon, and the three Armagh hunger strikers including Mairead Farrell all participated (121).

### **Incorporeal Prison Machines: The Working-Class Body in Long Kesh Prison**

I have learned two lessons in my life: first, there are no sufficient literary, psychological, or historical answers to human tragedy, only moral ones. Second, just as despair can come to one another only from other human beings, hope, too, can be given to one only by other human beings.

– Eli Wiesel

As Marx observes, eating is an act that reproduces not labor but potential for labor, i.e. labor power. The average prison worker both feeds himself and prepares his body for prison chores the following day. The political prisoners first refuse to wear the uniform of the worker/criminal in the blanket protest and then refuse to wear those clothes in order to slop out their chamber pots in the no-wash protest. Finally, a few dozen refuse to eat. In this way, the hunger strike is the refusal of work because it refuses the reproduction of the means of production that could make prison work possible. First, the inmates refuse work and bear the consequences of remaining in their cells one hundred and sixty seven hours per week. Second, other prison workers – the guards – engage in more work than their normal duties because they conduct psychological warfare on the prisoners and they also clean during certain episodes (like the no wash protest). Third, torture itself is work that includes the act of force feeding.

The smallest of details seem to be larger in prison life, and in this case, food becomes a source of harassment and control. Once the hunger strike begins, food is used in other painful ways. Food is used as both a rationed good and in some cases as a means of taunting. Sometimes guards remove food from the plates of the prisoners. Once the hunger strike begins, they enlarge the portions of the food in order to tempt the hunger strikers. The prisoners in H block are given fruit once per week. On the 28<sup>th</sup> of February, 1981, Sands eats the last food that he will take, which happens to be an orange, which symbolizes for him the Battle of the Boyne of 1690 when William III defeated Catholic forces. “I ate the statutory weekly bit of fruit last night. As fate had it, it was an orange and, the final irony, it was bitter. The food is being left at the door. My

portions, as expected, are quite larger than usual, or those which my cellmate Malachy is getting” (220). In this way, Sands refuses the function of his food, but consumes the bitter, orange fruits of the occupation. As the strike continues, Sands will comment on the food, especially the portion size, imagining that it has increased: “They put a table in my cell and are now placing my food on it in front of my eyes. I honestly couldn’t give a damn if they placed it on my knee. They still keep asking me silly questions like, ‘Are you still not eating?’” (221) He will also continue to speculate about whether others have taken his food, at one point noting a bun that he receives with two bites in it.

Hunger strikers are not anorexics, but they do attempt to control what their bodies consume. Hunger strikers attempt to control something in their lives while they are under direct control of an authority. Moreover, many anorexics present body dysmorphia which no hunger striker recognizes. Hunger striking is no eating disorder – but like a person with an eating disorder, the hunger striker is conscious about limiting food in order to maintain control. Furthermore, most hunger strikers, especially those who risk dying, do not choose to limit caloric intake but refuse food altogether.

The body surprises us and is a negotiated space as is the mouth and anus. Sands has begun to notice the rules of the body differ from what others say. For example, Sands warns that the body does not simply accept the lack of food. The body suffers from the temptation of food – especially in a cell that adds more of it. In fact the hunger strikers are tempted by food in direct ways in order to make their ordeal more difficult. But eventually the mind rules the situation:

I was thinking today about the hunger strike. People say a lot about the body, but don’t trust it. I consider that there is a kind of fight indeed. Firstly the body doesn’t accept the lack of food, and it suffers from the temptation of food, and from other aspects which gnaw at it perpetually. The body

fights back sure enough, but at the end of the day everything returns to the primary consideration, that is, the mind. (239)

This is the manipulation of nature to a degree that the cyborg-as-hunger-striker changes the human form itself. This is not the body as machine, but the body as wound.

The hunger striker directs attention to the body as wound and the unbreakable mind in a negative capability of need as a definition of freedom. Sands' texts anchor will in the desire for freedom. The diary begins to question where the proper mentality stems from – from one's desire for freedom. The broken man is he who has lost the desire for freedom. Sands argues that they will not break him because the desire for freedom for himself and the Irish people is in his heart:

The mind is the most important. But then where does this proper mentality stem from? Perhaps from one's desire for freedom. It isn't certain that that's where it comes from. If they aren't able to destroy the desire for freedom, they won't break you. They won't break me because the desire for freedom, and the freedom of the Irish people, is in my heart. The day will dawn when all the people of Ireland will have the desire for freedom to show. It is then we'll see the rising of the moon. (239)

Moreover, although this capability is mentioned negatively in order to describe what a subject has the right not to experience, we can also perceive an ontologically productive desire: not captivity, but rather everything that can be done outside of captivity.

Freedom from tyranny is not the same as owning property, but using wealth productively, teaching, artistic expression, and so forth.

The hunger strike blends directly into its antecedents, the dirty protest, and the blanket protest (1976-1981). The text shows that this protest flows into the others so that there is a continuous response in the form of an escalation. The blanket protest, the dirty protest, and the hunger strike become a singular event for an international audience.

This diary's theme rapidly transforms into the need for hope by situating the subject inside something larger than itself. Sands himself notes that hope is always a question for survival, although he removes the religious implications and replaces them with a belief in the people: "All men must have hope and never lose heart. But my hope lies in the ultimate victory for my poor people. Is there any hope greater than that?" (223) Losing hope is a way of losing heart. By speaking about his heart, Sands speaks about his hope. He unites the two and this strengthens the text's major trope.

The trope of the heart, or of love, is itself common within the world. This nationalist dream is limited because such emancipation will free only the Irish. Is there a hope greater than "our day will come?" The end result will be larger than any nation. In 1981 the ideas of the global, whether for biopower or biopolitical production, although imminent, had not yet widely permeated the lexicon.

The voyeur seems to need to know the extent of the torture in order to identify with it. We quickly notice how demeaning and how much of a violation it is when Sands receives a cavity search after refusing to bend:

[The guard] stepped beside me, still laughing, and hit me. Within a few seconds, in the midst of the white flashes, I fell to the floor as blows rained upon me from every conceivable angle. I was dragged back up again to my feet and thrown like a side of bacon, face downwards on the table. Searching hands pulled at my arms and legs, spreading me like a pelt of leather. Someone had my head pulled back by the hair while some pervert been probing and poking my anus. (27)

These cavity searches seem to happen with each wing shift. Their horror is incomprehensible because their brutality is so intense that people cannot make sense of it. Furthermore, this faux surgical procedure is a public event for the guards, like biopower deployed in an earlier century. One wonders why Sands is not simply handcuffed before the search so that fewer guards would need to be involved. Grabbing

the hair rather than restraining the head also connotes a kind of rape with the precision instrument – the impersonal finger.

The guards' mocking frivolity adds insult to the captive. Sands describes how the guards continue to laugh while they beat him:

It was great fun; everybody was killing themselves laughing, except me while all the time a barrage of punches rained down on my naked body. I was writhing in pain. They gripped me righter as each blow found its destination. My face was smashed against the table and blood smeared the table under my face. I was dazed and hurt. Then they dragged me off the table and let me drop to the floor. My first reaction was to wrap the towel which lay beside me around my reddened waist. Again I was gripped by the arms from behind and dragged towards the other wing. I just caught a glimpse of one of my comrades being beaten and dragged to the table, while in the background someone else was being kicked out of his cell. (28)

This scene pits the liberal middle-class against the radical worker. Sands observes this with the visitors who come to see him and the writers whose newspapers he reads critically.

We see the luxury of the liberals, who push for the radicals to have better treatment, as a political mistake. The elite have limited the debate by authorizing keeping Long Kesh prisoners. Resistance emerges when the subject attempts to gain political status by hunger strike:

Compare the lives, comforts, habits, wealth of all those political con men (who allegedly are concerned for us, the people) with that of the wretchedly deprived and oppressed. Compare it in any decade in history, compare it tomorrow, in the future, and it will mock you. Yet our perennial blindness continues. There are no luxuries in the H Blocks. But there is true concern for the Irish people. (231)

Thinking class shows that these are systemic problems. For example, the Anglo-Irish establishment might claim that the radicals are simply misfits of poor parentage. The sovereignty apparatus might claim that they are unfortunate mentally-ill people who, by

a twist of fate, did not end in mental hospitals. The government views them as disenfranchised members of a difficult and unsavory political process. Conversely, Sands' rhetoric negates the entire system because, as Sands has suggested, the only solution is a total political solution – not a military solution, not a compromise on prisoner concessions, nor any other power sharing relationship. The solution that Sands embraces is a political solution in which the Republic's government, whether allied to the British in the future or not, does not rule the North and neither does a parliament especially designed for the North. Instead, Sands is proposing something similar to that of Connolly – a socialist solution.

This becomes a problem of class because the guards, who are members of the working-class as well, benefit from the difficulties that are caused by the working-class prisoners. Yet, the guards themselves are members of the working-class and it is harder for them to do the job. Sands describes how the guards refuse to perform routine tasks because they no longer are paid extra for the “dirty protest:”

There was no mirror search going out to visits today – a pleasant change. Apparently, with the ending of the no-wash protest, the mercenary screws have lost all their mercenary bonuses, etcetera, notwithstanding that they are also losing overtime and so on. So, not to be outdone, they aren't going to carry out the mirror search any more, and its accompanying brutality, degradation, humiliation etcetera. Why? Because they aren't being paid for it! (236-7)

The public mercenary in the penal system suggests that the guards have created class warfare against their own masters, which as a side effect helps the political prisoners who, although they are of the same class as the guards, are really bodies through which the guards work out their own brutality and positions of trauma. However, the real significance of this passage lies in the image of the loss of humanity that both working-class guards and the working-class prisoners experience.

## **“What Small Things Came:” Masculine Rituals of Boyhood**

Sands depicts both his boyhood and his mother toward the end of his life in the following ways. First, he compares his body in the prison cell to his body on the track team and recognizes that he is a different person as a Republican citizen-as-prison-dissenter than he was during his boyhood. Second, Sands often writes about the sadness of his mother in an act of displacement of his own sadness. Third, before the beginning of the strike, before face had been lost, Sands chose a hardened man to replace him as commanding officer because there was enough will-power for the other to allow him to die.

The body that will die is weaker than that of a fourteen-year-old's body. He is unable to walk. Sands compares his body at fourteen to his body in prison and worries that his legs may already be dead. The steps that he takes now happen only a few times each day:

Victory was mine and I felt like an Olympic champion. I was fourteen years of age. [...] Today, I feel like a living corpse. The legs that once ran miles, leapt ditches and climbed hills, that once kicked football and swimming and sport are longing to relive and participate in such sport and games again, but are dying maybe even dead well before their time, perhaps never to see the like of it again. Reduced to pacing the darkened inner confines of a filthy depressing tomb of misery and pain and the three steps forward and three back again become increasingly less, perhaps for a few minutes a few times each day. (185)

Sands mourns the loss of boyhood by the man who has spent nearly all of his adult life in a prison cell. The feces on the walls lend a tomb-like kind of appearance to his surroundings and the pain of his life leaving his body has a mournfulness to it as well.

The idea of not being able to walk at all is a kind of humiliation for Sands that expresses the difference between his changing realities. Sands describes his disbelief in the fact that he can no longer walk the floor for even five minutes. He tells of sports

in which he readily participated and compares his suffering to Saigon prisoners. He feels either like a disabled or even a dead person. The mourning of boyhood quickly turns to morose observations on his body:

My legs are heavy and weak and sore and pained and I tire like an old man and my head feels light and exhaustion falls upon me like a shadow and I can't believe that I am unable even to walk the floor for five minutes. I who ran miles in grueling cross-country races and swam miles and kicked football can now barely walk the length of myself, and as time goes on I become more weary, not just my legs but my whole body, and perhaps soon my mind will follow, and I think at least in the tiger cages of Saigon they could see the sky. And I feel like a cripple, maybe even a corpse, but a corpse doesn't feel torture and doesn't wake up in the dead of night terrified or feel the pain of humiliation, degradation, torture or inhumanity. I run another race in my mind and the wretchedness that engulfs and envelopes me laughs at me as I stare at my legs and naked body in disbelief – the rigors of total solitary confinement in H Block have taken hold. (185)

The terror that Sands experiences sounds like a waking nightmare. It seems monstrous and it seems also to be cyborg transformation of the worst order. The machine of confinement actually transforms the body in the same way that the technology of boyhood – the games and competitions – transformed the body of the young man.

In "I Once Had a Life," Sands imagines himself beyond his tomb-like conditions and in the place where he grew up. But when Sands stands, he is no longer in his neighborhood:

Farmer Thompson's old faithful dog brought his sheep in, a few fields away, and a wood pigeon fell to a distant shogun, as I arose, not from my panoramic platform, but out of the inky blackness in the corner of my filthy, cold cell, where wrapping a dirty, flimsy blanket around me to cover my naked body, I stepped toward the barred window and leaned my head against it. (88)

In this passage, Sands moves from boyhood to the trauma of his cell. The inky blackness in the corner of his eye that emerges as he views the lost environment actually becomes the corner of his cell.

In "Dear Mum," Sands speaks intimately to his mother as if it were an occasional poem inside a birthday card. She becomes a princess who guides him like a star. It is as if his gratitude comes from the little things she helped him to see. He seeks forgiveness and eternal memory:

You prayed for me and love me more/How could I ask for anymore/And reared me up to be like you/But I haven't a heart as kind as you. A guide to me in times of plight/A princess like a star so bright/For life would never have been the same/If I hadn't of learned what small things came./So forgive me Mum just a little more/For not loving you so much before,/I give my thanks for eternity. (212)

Sands also seems remorseful for not appreciating his mother enough because his mother's love carried him through much of his childhood. He knows that he might die and he must apologize to his mother before this happens.

We notice here a stubborn intention to maintain his humanity. Several times Sands mentions his heart as the reason that he can continue to perform the hunger-strike:

Dear Mum, I know you're always there/To help and guide me with all your care,/You nursed and fed me and made me strong/To face the world and all its wrong. What can I write to you this day/For a line or two would never pay/For care and time you gave to me/Through long hard years unceasingly. How you found strength I do not know/How you managed I'll never know,/Struggling and striving without a break,/Always there and never late. (212)

His heart becomes the center of the juxtaposition between bravery, success, milieu and spirit when he discusses his mother's reaction: "I heard that my mother spoke at a parade in Belfast yesterday and that Marcella cried. It gave me heart. I'm not worried about the numbers of the crowds" (220). The heart is the spiritual organ that allows him to endure.

There is a common centering around the catholic (non-religious) notion of love. Later he observes the notes from his supporting milieu, including his mother:

I received several notes from my family and friends. I have only read the one from my mother – it was what I needed. She has regained her fighting spirit – I am happy now. My old friend Seanna [Walsh, a fellow blanketman] has also written. I have an idea for a poem, perhaps tomorrow I will try to put it together. (221)

Sands seems to be reaching to his mother as a boyhood act. However, this is not a regression toward boyhood. It is rather the act of an integrated adult subject who can recognize both states simultaneously.

Sands loved birds as a child and considers himself an amateur ornithologist.

However, there is an ominous tone as Sands now waits for the song of the lark:

I read some wildlife articles in various papers, which indeed brought back memories of the once-upon-a-time budding ornithologist! It was a bright pleasant afternoon today and it is a calm evening. It is surprising what even the confined eyes and ears can discover. I am awaiting the lark, for spring is all but upon us. How I listened to that lark when I was in H-5, and watched a pair of chaffinches which arrived in February. Now lying on what indeed is my deathbed, I still listen even to the black crows. (227)

He has found the love of the black crow in the presence of non-duality – that what exists is neither negative nor positive. It seems that many people would expect the black crow to be a gallows-bird. However, Sands has begun to achieve a certain mindfulness that Buddhists would recognize as a path to enlightenment. The symbol of the lark, then, will also signal the proximity of death.

The recognition of boyhood is a recognition of the common. The birds represent boyhood. Occasionally, Sands also uses humor paired with a longing, not only for food, but also the skylark. The joys of boyhood seem to pain Sands:

The birds were singing today. One of the boys threw bread out of the window. At least somebody's eating! I was lonely for a while this evening, listening to the crows caw as they returned home. Should I hear the beautiful lark, she would rent my heart. Now, as I write, the odd curlew mournfully calls as they fly over. I like the birds. Well, I must leave off, for if I write more about the birds my tears will fall and my thoughts return to the

days of my youth. They were the days, and gone forever now. But I enjoyed them. They are in my heart – good night, now. (234)

Sands enjoyed the birds as a child and the act of reaching back into boyhood reads almost like a gift. Sands recognizes their reminder as an ambivalent mourning that will bring about others' mourning within several weeks. The boy keeps faith with his mother, and once he recognizes his mother's fortitude, he can return to his own losses, the loss of childhood and the loss of the ability to pursue his heightened curiosity.

The border between boyhood and manhood along with its initiation rituals are different in prison. Sands spends all of his adult life in jail – some in official status as a prisoner of war, but mostly as an unrecognized prisoner within the criminal system. The birds, his mother, his sister, whose name he borrows to write his anonymous pieces, all symbolize the loss of boyhood in a politicized and disidentified subject who no longer accepts the protestant-mixed team where he played a sport or the little ornithologist. Sands' text teaches us more than the politics of hunger strike or its lamentable practices and fatal results: Sands' text explains what can happen to boy-soldiers in any occupation. Sands is a boy soldier who matures in prison and a junior officer following as commanding officer.

Sands' loss of boyhood and love of his mother seem to coincide. Indeed both give him need to fight back tears, which seems an unacceptable luxury in Long Kesh. Sands-as-soldier is a cyborg who nevertheless cannot remake his boyhood. As a young man, he reaches beyond his years to surpass the older men of the horizontal audience: he reaches to the vertical audience if only to remake himself. He learns history and uses it for analysis and argument. He begins to identify with a purpose beyond himself. He has learned that the struggle is not fundamentally for him.

For Sands, the use of the British army on colonial subjects is monstrous. In “I fought a monster today,” Sands compares the British empire to a monster. He blacks out and feels as though he might be losing his sanity:

They nearly won yesterday. It was inhuman. They beat me into unconsciousness. I think “Is this really happening to me?” and “Can this happen in this day and age?” [...] I’m mad. Yes, that’s it, I’m insane. But my pain suffering and grief must be real. It must all be real. No, I’m right. I know I’m right. I must resist, I have nowhere to run. My tomb may be my grave. (159)

Sands begins to question his own sanity, and consider if such monstrosity could exist during the twentieth century. Because he is not a citizen of the empire, he holds a completely different way of relating to the army. A G8 government can use its army, which it will rarely use against its population, against other non-domestic subjects. In this case, the war prisoners are fit into a niche as they are criminalized; however, their own history, ancestry, culture, and most importantly, political actions deepen the differences between the citizen under the prime minister and the subject under the queen. Moreover, Sands’ text demonstrates the brutality of British occupation by partition, as we see in other parts of the world. Although the IRA’s liberation movement is smaller than other insurgencies in the twentieth century, they are supported by their milieu. After he recalls the support of his family and friends, Sands gains some strength. He write that devils (guards) always have something new but that his resolve will extend from the 740<sup>th</sup> day to the 741<sup>st</sup>:

They always have something new. Will I overcome it? I must. Yes, I must. Tomorrow will be my seven hundred and fortieth day of torture – an eternity. Yes, tomorrow I’ll rise in the H Bocks of Long Kesh. Yes, tomorrow I’ll fight the monster and his devils again! (160)

Four of the five demands were met shortly after the hunger strike ended, during October 1981. In 1983 a large group of prisoners escaped Long Kesh. The prison did subsequently close and the building is being destroyed (Beresford 287).

Sometimes language is used to create distance between members of the same class: specifically, the guards' attempt to use certain vulgar descriptions of the freedom fighters in order to separate themselves from the Northern Irish Republicans and idealize themselves as subjects of the Queen. Sands argues that the guards use the vocabulary of vermin in order to assert their perceptions of superiority over the other:

I now find that this vermin vocabulary is probably used by screws more than anyone else. In the case of the bigoted screw it is not so much aimed at degrading the prisoner (which it does and the H blocks are full of that anyway) but, be it an RUC man or screw the Psychology remains the same – to assert what they perceive to be their superiority over the inferior Fenians. It's the dictate of their sectarianism and loyalism to dominate, degrade and terrify the second-class citizens and so on. (96)

This is an analysis of the self/other classed. The border-crosser needs to embrace identity in ways that differ from those in the middle. We will see this in Chapter 3 as well. Local people on the Mexico border bear more paraphernalia of U.S. citizenry than in the center of the nation. We can imagine a certain British subject dismissing the Ulster Loyalist as an Irishman with an accent by which he can distinguish himself and others from Ulster Republicans.

### **Conclusion**

The hunger strike influenced the Movement of Movements in a number of ways. As a direct-action movement, the IRA has a genealogy of its own that represents the mole and the snake (*Empire* 52-59). In other words, the IRA has a genealogy that is both an insurgency like the Zapatista movement and manipulates the progress of its members as a postmodern media spectacle that eventually centered around the hunger

strikers. Sands was an outsider by IRA standards, and in him we see the modesty of the outsider who rises from foot-soldier to commanding officer quickly and who thus represents both the organic intellectual and trainer/outsider. Sands did not recognize the authority of either the Royal Ulster Constabulary or of the British Military: it did not matter that he carried a weapon for protection against both groups while he carried out his clandestine political and military work. He was not tried for his membership in the IRA nor for the particular operation. So a man who had little significance within the IRA when he was put in prison, became its spokesperson, its icon, and one of the Members of Parliament who abstained from going to Westminster to take his seat.

There was a power in media that the IRA helped to discover for the long-term struggle. In prison, through his newspaper publications and through media escalation, Sands was projected into international recognition. We do not see the same situation with the mural makers or with the War of the Stones. But this is what will also happen with Marcos and the Zapatistas and with the Movement of Movements. In *Ethics*, Badiou argues that an event represents a break from what has already been (44). The war was mainly fought on the regulation of the body as an evental break that is carried through into other sites of resistance, such as the War of the Stones. The body and its focus – arriving from a break with the void – actually won political status after the deaths. The second hunger strike succeeded where the first had not.

Part of the significance of the movement is the non-violence against others who did not participate as guards or other antagonists in the hunger strike event. This does not mean that the hunger strikers were themselves non-violent, but that all of their protest tactics were non-violent. Each of these three heavily supported acts were acts

of defiance but not acts of violence. Outside the prison, the Provisional IRA executed prison guards; but within the prison, the protests were non-violent. Instead of fighting the guards, which would have been quite difficult and would lead to other escalations of violence, or taunting the guards with the fear of their own imminent executions, the Long Kesh prisoners showed a degree of calm and vision that we see emerge again in the Movement of Movements. The length of the resistances was heightened by the merging of the dirty protest into both the first (1980) and the second hunger-strike (1981).

The second hunger strike began with altered tactics so that it could not be undermined by moderates of the Republic, the Unionists, or the U.K., and was also non-violent. The first and second hunger strikes need to be seen together as a single force. The authority apparatus cannot already know whether the second set will die after the first set dies, or in the case of the 1980 hunger strike, ceases the strike; this demonstrates the power of the tactic. In fact, there were riots following the death of Bobby Sands, as well as protests in other parts of Europe. The later publication of the memoirs also made such a continuation possible. It also makes possible his winning of the election for MP that was later held by Sands' contact outside of Long Kesh.

The novelty of the event was expressed by the British Parliament, which quickly rushed legislation that mandated that no convicted prisoners who are serving terms in prison could run for office. The novelty of Sands' parliamentary election coincided not only with the hunger strike, but also with a history of writings for republican newspapers and interviews with the international media. The media presented issues of the men on the blanket protest. It was the internationalism of the media response, along with the

strong milieu and training by other international groups including the PLO and the support of the Libyan government, that enabled the movement to serve as a precedent for the War of the Stones and the Zapatista struggles.

It is this international quality that also served as the link between the IRA and the First Intifada. The PLO offered arms to PIRA (who declined because of Israeli intelligence), and Sands chose Brendan McFarlane, who took over as commanding officer in Long Kesh from Sands when the latter began his hunger-strike. Virno observes that part of the grammar of the multitude is the need for repetition – for experiencing an act one more time (26). The international solidarity of these movements make them part of the Movement of Movements – as much as the Zapatista liberation struggle, the demilitarization of the U.S. southern border, and the de-criminalization of the IRA prisoners. Each of these is part of the legacy of the Movement of Movements. The use of the media makes this a postmodern revolutionary event, and something from which groups like the Zapatistas were able to learn.

Many of the on-the-body actions that were fought in Northern Ireland were not simply protests. Protests have the quality of recognizing the sovereignty apparatus as fundamentally legitimate and asking it to reform itself. Rather, these direct actions made things difficult for the guards and prisoners alike. For example, the place where the inmates would go to empty their chamber pots became impossible because they were being beaten or were expected to wear prison clothes. Thus, the protest became the no-wash protest (Beresford 124). This was not simply a protest, but a direct action.

The crimes under British law were the opportunity for a different regulation of the body as well as a possibility for direct action. Although they did not replicate tactics of

self-rule practiced by the imprisoned IRA members, the republican sympathizers still might have witnessed the hypocrisy of the British empire in the treatment of its political prisoners whose criminal prosecutions did not pertain to existing law. The aims of PIRA, its hierarchical command structure, its clandestine organizational structure, its corruption, etc. differ substantially from the Movement of Movements. The IRA movement is organic, but still seeks recognition by the British – this is a step that the Movement of Movements would not take.

Sands' death created a strategy of direct action that could not be undone by the public and would not be undone by the commanding officer. Sands died not for tactics, but for principle and strategy that would recognize all people as being able to challenge the state. Sands struggled to lead his army into fourth generation warfare – with an ambivalence toward revolutionary space. Fourth generation warfare gets practiced by the paramilitaries. However, the IRA also sought legitimacy and recognition by the practitioners of third generation warfare – recognition as an army by the British Army. In other words, the IRA seeks to be a struggle that is recognized as its own army by its enemy.

This is not a revolutionary position. In it, we can see some of the older twentieth century ideologies that the multitude still needs to surpass in its subsequent development. The text argues implicitly for belief in god and also for belief in nationalism as well as belief in armed revolution: “I believe and stand by the God-given right of the Irish nation to sovereign independence, and the right of any Irishman or woman to assert this right in armed revolution. That is why I am incarcerated, naked and tortured” (219). The limited argument here does not take into account that Irish

independence would still mean rule beside the second greatest capitalist force in history.

As an event, the 1981 Hunger Strike and the working-class bodies of that movement produced a non-violent reaction through an appeal to tradition and to hope for the future. These bodies used a common milieu to survive the beatings and torture that other working-class bodies produced. The hunger strike operated less in the hierarchical structure of the IRA but, as an early movement in this study, it also does not operate fully within the democratization of struggle that we see in the later Movement of Movements.

If we understand how common general intellectual tendencies rise from social movement to movement at the macro level, then we might better teach future revolutionaries in the twenty-first century and beyond. Furthermore, if we recognize how regulation and criminalization repeat themselves in the protests of the other moments, we can better protect future struggles.

Just as it is true that a stream cannot rise above its source, so it is true that a national literature cannot rise above the moral level of the social conditions of the people from whom it derives its inspiration.

– James Connolly

### CHAPTER 3 DRAWING LA LÍNEA: BORDER IN THE *TODOS SOMOS MURALS*

The aesthetic scientist at work within research may be seen as acting inside the processes of becoming – a moving respondent within the blurring of trajectory lines bordering the flux and movement – the fold of inquiry. We choose to work and live within, on the borders of, the aesthetic Deleuzian moment that constitutes art with science.

– Patrick Slattery and Nancy Langerock

Sometimes the borderline is defined or doubled by a being of another nature that no longer belongs to the pack, or never belonged to it, and that represents a power of another order, potentially acting as a threat as well as a trainer, outsider, etc. In any case, no band is without this phenomenon of bordering, or the anomalous. It is true that bands are also undermined by extremely varied forces that establish in them interior centers of the conjugal, familial, or State type, and that make them pass into an entirely different form of sociability, replacing pack affects with family feelings or State intelligibilities.

– Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari

The actual physical borderland that I'm dealing with in this book is the Texas-U.S. Southwest/Mexican border. The psychological borderlands, the sexual borderlands and the spiritual borderlands are not particular to the Southwest. In fact, the Borderlands are physically present wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper classes touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy. [. . .] Living on borders and in margins, keeping intact one's shifting and multiple identity and integrity, is like trying to swim in a new element, an "alien" element.

– Gloria Anzaldúa

The political scene in the late 1980s in the West created peripheral minoritarian movements that could claim revolutionary heritage and tradition. In Mexico after 1983, while the PRI continued its decades of rule in "La Dictadura Perfecta," the EZLN was gaining strength, culminating in its internationally recognized intervention in 1994.

On the U.S.-Mexico border, murals began to appear on which an EZLN official had collaborated. These murals were inspired by thinking that would manifest itself in

the direct action of the EZLN about six years later. In his book, *Mexican Murals in Times of Crisis*, Bruce Campbell suggests that Chicana/o murals owe much to the Mexican mural tradition. Moreover, in *Mestizaje: Critical Uses of Race in Chicano Culture*, Rafael Pérez-Torres argues that Chicana/o works of art have an international and postmodern quality that makes them a crucial characteristic for understanding neoliberalism in the United States and empire in the “American” scene (110).

Chapter 3 studies a small series of three murals along the México/U.S. border located in Juárez/El Paso. The murals, which are entitled *Todos Somos* (Spanish for “we all are”), lie across the concrete embankments of the Río Bravo/Río Grande and analyze the construction of the border. Consequently, the *Todos Somos* murals maintain what Walter Benjamin in “The Work of Art in the Age of Technical Reproducibility” calls “*aura*” that is unique to their project (Ross 534). Benjamin uses the term “*aura*” to explain authenticity, historical testimony, and authority. One cannot excavate the murals from their material space. They are site-specific. When reproducing them mechanically (in photographs or video), one must always note their place. Thus, in order to understand the formal techniques of the murals, one must delineate their location and their purpose.

In addition to the singularity of their location, the *Todos Somos* murals exhibit three formal qualities that shape their analysis of the border. First, the murals blend images, forms, and traditions, thereby demonstrating a polymorphic quality. Second, the murals refuse to define their own formal borders, displaying no central unity. Third, the murals allow additions to their formal borders creating images from left to right and from top to bottom in an additive fashion. These qualities are characteristic of attempts

to map the unmappable, and become what Fredric Jameson calls the play of figuration (Hardt and Weeks 280).

The murals have a problem of reproducibility that is also shared by the Diego Rivera murals “Man at the Crossroads” and “El Hombre Controlador del Universo.” One cannot fully reproduce these murals in photography or film, so I have analyzed them not only from photographs, but also, when possible, at their sites. I have also researched the Rivera Mural that was destroyed at the Rockefeller Center in New York. Rivera “re-created” the mural at Palacio de Belles Artes in Mexico City. Although “Man, Controller of the Universe” might be aesthetically *equal* to the “Man at the Crossroads,” it is not the *same* mural. Similarly, I argue, for the Murals of the Rio Grande/Río Bravo, if there were a process by which to remove the concrete embankment intact and place it in a museum, the murals would be different in this new context. Unlike art works that do not directly relate their formal techniques to a space, these murals rely heavily on the border space for their significance and argument. They become more powerful and provocative when we can view them in site. They analyze the border with their form to blend the form into the border, enabling the border to analyze itself. This is the legacy of *Todos Somos*.

A play of figuration produces the polymorphic quality and de-centeredness of the murals. The border unsuccessfully attempts to conjoin several spaces including, Mexico, the U.S., and Chicano spaces. The border makes it difficult for subjects to attempt the process of cognitive mapping necessary to conjoin local political action with international efforts. Art carries the task of representing what Jameson calls the unrepresentable “functions of the enormously complex new international space” (Hardt

and Weeks 281). Art attempts to show how individual subjects can reconcile themselves with “a multidimensional set of radically discontinuous realities.”

I believe that these murals display several qualities of revolutionary muralism. First, they are public, outdoors, and highly visible. These murals cannot travel on exhibition. One cannot store these murals, display them in museums or in any other way privatize them. Thus, they avoid the elitism of much art and indeed even of many murals. Unlike many U.S. murals, one need not be part of the financial or cultural elite in order to view them. Finally, the *Todos Somos* murals are internationally inspired by both the Zapatista movement and by the tropes and images of the Cuban revolution, including iconography, especially in the photograph of Ché Guevara. They also include flat-dark images and dark slogans in thick lettering, both qualities reminiscent of the Cuban poster art of the 1960s and 1970s.

Chapter 3 investigates how the murals challenge the space of the border. Yet, in order to do this, I must first discuss the tradition of border murals in the U.S. and Chihuahua.

### **Mexican Muralism and Chicana/o Art: A Retrospective**

I combine ethnography and Cultural Studies with Art History in order to read the mural series because these newer disciplines level the hierarchy of artistic production. Campbell suggests that in response to Mexican murals, ethnography can supplement art criticism as a methodology because the former minds the public image (73). This approach dispenses with the idea of high culture, something cultural studies has also challenged. This method also recognizes the production of the image and its public visibility:

Ethnographic representation, a mode of writing charged with paying close attention to context, local experience, and its own authority in the re-presenting of cultural phenomena, must also concern itself with its own relationship to the production of the public image. [. . .] Implicit in the treatment of the recent history of mural production in Mexico is an understanding of the mural form as a nodal point in the articulation of spatial, public, and aesthetic discourse and practice. This shift away from the theoretical frame of traditional art historical criticism has several strategic implications for the treatment of the image. First, the image is resituated within a broader horizon of cultural practices and significations. This maneuver levels the “high vs. low” cultural topography that often discreetly underlies the privileged place of the framed visual object in writing up its history as art history. Second, the cultural form is examined from the point of view of production. The visual image is not mistaken for the cultural form in its totality, but instead is apprehended as the visual prism through which the constituent elements of the cultural form are refracted for public visibility. (Campbell 26-7)

For these murals, as with ethnography, context is everything. Moreover, we should recall the imperative that anything can be a text. As we see in Chapters 2, 4, 5, and 6, my dissertation reads texts that differ from the standard documents of political science and literature in order to situate them in “a broader horizon of cultural practices and significations” (Hardt and Weeks 284).

The land also plays a distinct role in these murals’ production land protects their context because by excavating the land beneath the murals, one destroys their project. As Pérez-Torres has argued, Chicana/o art is aimed at subjects who must navigate territorialization and de-territorialization simultaneously. These subjects must incorporate self and other into the same bodies. These bodies incorporate both alienation and home, familiar and strange:

Whether explicitly drawing on images of land or not, Chicano public art helps illuminate and illustrate the way in which people can conceive of themselves as both belonging and not belonging at the same time. Implicit in this attitude is a form of mestizaje, an incorporation of the self and the Other. In relation to land, the thematic representation of mestizaje offers an insight into simultaneous feelings of alienation and home. Land becomes, in these visual texts, something both familiar and strange. Chicano public

art offers a vision in which mestizo and mestiza bodies, made to feel as strangers in their own land, can believe – with humor and dignity and faith – in the possibility of a better world. (152)

Mestizaje in the *Todos Somos* series manifests as polymorphism. The mixed form and additive qualities of the murals reflect the self and the other. This additive quality coupled with this polymorphism create the idea of a better land and projects Aztlán as an utopian homeland.

The *Todos Somos* series thus present an ethnic background that also manifests an internationalism. Pérez-Torres suggests that many people associate Chicano public art with land in all of its significance, including the otherness that land associations traditionally created. However, contemporary murals like the *Todos Somos* series re-envision land representation to make it more inclusive:

[Chicano public art] locates subjectivities in history as they attempt to define public space according to new racial and ethnic configurations. In this way, land becomes a central concern as a site of public space. Land in all its different significances returns again and again in the works of Chicano/a public art: land as national border, land as militarized frontier, land as political front line, land as the guarantor of citizenship. Land becomes a fictional figment that at once separates the “Us” of the U.S. from the dark Other and yet encompasses both Us and Other. The work of the poster is to re-envision this fictional figment, making of it something not exclusive but encompassing. It seeks to re-envision land not as the grounds for exclusion but as the basis on which to forge connection and community. The thematic and strategic concerns of Chicano public art are to redefine the significance of land and, in the process, transform the public spaces mestizo bodies occupy. (124)

The *Todos Somos* series re-envision the land as national border, militarized frontier, political frontline, and the guarantor of citizenship. At the same time, the appeals to internationalism do not allow the exclusivity that many people associated with the land in the past. While the configurations are still often ethnic in these murals, the position and the references are both multicultural and international.

As we see in *Todos Somos*, contemporary muralism represents a new form of unofficial public discourse that differs substantially from the older realist, socialist, and official state Mexican muralist tradition. Campbell suggests that, in the last thirty-five years, official auspices of the Mexican state have sought to efface the public discursive character of murals in order to regulate national cultural production. He suggests that this creates the erroneous assumption that Mexican mural art has vanished:

The much lamented “disappearance” of mural art in Mexico after the Mexican School is, upon closer inspection, a visual illusion created by the continued capacity of official Mexico to control terms and reach of public discourse. The globalization of officialdom has brought with it an ideological screen that blocks a coherent public view of national popular cultural production, even in its most public forms such as mural art. (17)

The *Todos Somos* series represents one of the re-emergences during the last thirty years of more democratic and independent mural scenes. These new mural scenes, as Campbell notes, emerge from cooperation between local communities, their spaces, and the artists that they house. In the case of *Todos Somos*, this produces internationalism at the border. Although “the globalization of officialdom” does not affect these international murals in the same way that it affects Mexican murals, a certain tendency to ignore these marginal murals exists within the United States as well.

The body also becomes a formal focal point. As Pérez-Torres argues, labor helped develop Chicana/o consciousness, and Chicana/o identity has developed in personal and cultural space at the point of intersection of economic, political, and cultural forces:

The notion that social power is played out through the human body – that the personal is political – has greatly influenced the direction that Chicana/o cultural and critical work has taken. Just as the need for labor in the United States fostered the development of a Chicano consciousness, Chicano identity has often been expressed in terms of personal and cultural

development at the nexus of various systems of economic, political, and cultural exchange. (140)

Social power manifests itself through the body, a truth remembered in these murals. Officials trap this body behind sniper scopes, and catch it running in the de-territorialized zone, while artists anthologize it in portraiture. Consequently, these artists, U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry, represent the body of the economic refugee who travels to the U.S. by foot to find work. This body is the symbol par excellence of the sites of struggle.

I think too, of the recent visit to this site in November 2006 by the leader of the Zapatistas, Subcomandante Marcos; Apache helicopters overhead monitored and photographed his body and the bodies of 2,000 others. This unannounced visit closed the bridge to the traffic of the elite commuters. The bridge allows them easy passage, while most wait in lines that exceed several hours. The swarm body that Subcomandante Marcos represented could not fit on the bridge because it was too large and unwieldy. Moreover, it dwarfed the representatives of the United States and struck alarm in their national security apparatus.

Chicana/o mural art owes much of its tradition to earlier Mexican murals. However, it has departed from the post-revolutionary crisis that has splintered the Mexican mural movement. As the Mexican school declined, Campbell argues, Chicano muralism gained momentum. It draws from a national Mexican culture and emerges during the Mexican post-revolutionary crisis in particular and globalization more generally:

Chicano muralism appears historically at the same moment that the Mexican School enters into decline, and draws heavily from the legacy of the "tres grandes," which is to say from a Mexican national heritage. Moreover, the Chicano movement, like the blurring of the U.S.-Mexico

border in general, is closely related to the post-revolutionary crisis of Mexico and the pressures of economic and cultural globalization. (210)

The Chicana/o movement reflects the postmodern global moment as well. It helps us to understand both the ebbing of sovereignty under globalization and how the border has blurred.

If we can understand that Chicana/o art helps to explain postmodern neoliberal American culture by way of subcultures, then we can better perform a “cognitive mapping” of the space of regional specificity. Pérez-Torres first supports this claim:

Chicana and Chicano artists have overtly or covertly understood their work to be part of a globalized and interconnected world. Seen in this light, Chicano culture – like other subnational cultures – provides a potentially telling and informative system of knowledge in the postmodern world. As an identity forged out of globalizing currents, Chicano identity negotiates global forces through a regional specificity of expression and culture. (131-2)

Chicana/o culture acts as a conduit, not for globalization, but for alter-globalization movements. Chicana/o culture does not simply resist globalization, but rather reflects and seeks to steer it.

### **The “Todos Somos [...]” Series**

#### **“Todos Somos Ilegales”**

When viewers look at the murals from left to right, they see a midnight blue background with words in an outline form that declare “YOU SURE YOU DON’T NEED ME ANYMORE?” The word “anymore” slants against the hood of a blue-green jeep, with a government insignia on the door, drawn flat against the mural in clean lines. The image faces inward, its directional force pushing the viewer’s gaze toward the mural’s center. Immediately in front of the jeep, one sees what looks like an explosion in pastel pink, which might represent the sky at dawn or dusk, the same blue for a river, and

white. But the explosion turns out to be a white dove. A pair of hands reach from the top of the mural to break the dove's neck. The bird's black head leans back. The muralists have sketched the hands in dark lines and a bluish tint. Like the slogan and the jeep, they appear cold and dead.

Underneath the hands, the muralists have written in pink filled lettering "TODOS SOMOS ILLEGALES." Above "Somos Ilegales" is written in the same light blue filled lettering "WE ARE ALL WETBACKS." Underneath these words, the muralists have rendered a river with the banks colored in contrast. One of the banks appears in a darker grey with a series of circles or tires and a clear line in darker blue. The muralists have delineated the banks and mountain range nearest the edge of the mural toward the land (of the Juarez side) in light grey. The muralists have rendered a less definite line along the river and against the pink sky. Does the pink sky, in the center of the mural, anchor the composition? The muralists have used pink as a dominant color toward the center of the mural but it has little currency on the sides.

The muralists have clearly divided the center section by contrasting light grey with midnight blue. Here the night sky meets the daylight sky. Viewers know that they perceive the sun because the round pink area does not completely fill its space as the midnight sky does. In the night sky, the muralists have outlined in pink the words "ABAJO DE DOWN WITH." In the daylight sky, the muralists have written in midnight blue "SIMPSON RIDING" so that the message seems to read "Abajo de (down with) Simpson Riding." The reference seems to be an insider reference, and, in fact, the mural later questions the statement. Perhaps the low-rider muralists from Juarez whom

Anzaldo Meneses invited, and whom in *Colors on Desert Walls* Mike Juarez calls “Cholos,” painted this as a kind of signature or community reference (18).

Under the night sky, a boat with an eagle for a hull sails on the water toward the pink sun; while to the right, two people on a kind of inner-tube raft float toward the boat. Just above this, slightly off-center toward the upper edge of the mural, a white border surrounds a “Brown Power” symbol. This image of the Chicano movement, the largest image in that section of the mural, contrasts white arms and the white border with a brown background. This image emerges as one of the clearest in the mural. Below the symbol, to the right, viewers notice a black and white face that appears to be Mexican or Indio and is suffering. Next to the face, a figure appears to be running with long black hair trailing behind. Above this figure, the muralists have written in midnight blue filled letters, “SIMPSON QUE?” To the right of the words, a bluish-white line with a darker blue line tracing it travels from upper left to lower right. This river-like line symbolizes La Linea again.

According to Juarez, Anzaldo Meneses invited the muralists to express their “views about immigration issues facing both nations” (18). Viewers encounter a mural that the muralists have conceptualized and planned, and whose images and overall structure seem spontaneous. The muralists have not balanced the mural symmetrically. The text displays great variety in an additive multi-layering characteristic. For example, the muralists have painted the Chicano Power symbol over another image behind it. Viewers see tentacle-like swirls shooting from underneath the Chicano Power symbol.

The mural lacks a complete bordered ending. The first slogan in cool blue outline begins several feet before the jeep. The muralists have not painted the jeep on the

edge of the mural, but instead a few feet up and in. In this way, they have staggered the left border of the mural. Similarly, viewers cannot easily discern the right border. On the concrete embankment, viewers might have perceived another brownish image which others might have added later. The muralists seem to have painted a part of the top border to match the desert sand so that it simply blends into the landscape. At other places, bright pink paint zigzags against the edge of the concrete. The bottom edge has a clear line that fades in parts. In other parts certain images, like the Indio face in black and white and a second bearded man, seem to dip past the mural's edge.

Viewers focus on several images that the muralists have emphasized by their size, color, intensity, contrast, and especially by the fact that the muralists have painted them near the edges. The government jeep in light blue-green, the sketched hands, the white dove, the boat with a bird's head for a hull, and the surrounding structure for the boat in blue and pink all appear at the edges. Moreover, the Chicano Power symbol, the Indio face in white and black, and another face with black overtones all appear toward the edges. The muralists have emphasized the smaller of these dominant images, including both faces, by contrasting black on a light color such as pink or white.

The pastels represent the landscape of the region, but also subordinate themselves to the other colors. However, the pink area in the center adds to the compositional balance. Once viewers allow themselves into the colors of the mural they can clearly see a dove flying in the pinkish sky toward the Juarez (south) end of the mountain range through which the river flows. Viewers see the pink boat floating on a darker river under an even darker sky. The only brown in the entire composition comes from the Brown Power/Chicano symbol. Because the jeep appears in a light blue-green

color that would remind viewers of Mexican government vehicles, and because it appears with a universally accepted branch on the government insignia, viewers cannot readily discern whether the vehicle represents the U.S. or Mexico. Nevertheless, this jeep, with its windows tinted black, appears quite menacing.

The directional forces seem to suggest the turmoil that the border creates. Viewers see the jeep heading inward on narrow parallel horizontal lines while the wings of the dove struggle outward and downward against the jeep's directional force. Moreover, the word "anymore" slants. This slanting makes the diagonal outward force clash with the horizontal inward force. Moreover, the diagonal helps the eye move over the mural. This movement suggests that the "anymore" question represents a changing state of affairs: once the U.S. needed Mexican workers, but recently it has tightened and defined its borders. While the doves desperately beat their wings and the whiteness explodes, the image also seems to move along the diagonal. These outward diagonals clash with the curves of the river bank, which, like a rain-bowed series of half-arches, directs the viewer's gaze toward the Brown Power symbol and toward the midnight sky and pink sun.

Meanwhile, although the horizontal lines appear stagnant, the boat seems streamlined. Like the jeep, its lines run parallel so narrowly that its hull moves the viewer's eyes toward the large white face to the boat's right. After those lines, the mural seems to de-emphasize some of its directional force and regroups in a triangle nearer its right edge. To the right of the running figure (vertical line), the muralists have not emphasized the images; instead, here the mural appears unfinished. After this, two diagonal lines converge before the second face. If the muralists had emphasized the

material in triangle as a focal point, they would have created better balance. The large face to the right of the triangle achieves this to a degree, but the muralists seem to have not emphasized it. The face appears less bright than other focal points.

### **“El Puente Negro”**

Near a black railroad bridge that traverses the canal – a bridge that immigrants without papers have used to cross over to the United States – sits the faded, partially destroyed mural, “Puente Negro.” The appearance of the phrase “Puente Negro #1” suggests that this is the first of a sub-series within the *Todos Somos* series entitled “Puente Negro.” In places within the mural, viewers cannot see the lines. Most people struggle to find and photograph the murals. People risk danger to get to them along the international border. When one photographs the murals from one of the walking bridges, this yields limited results. Moreover, the murals in the *Todos Somos* series have been nearly destroyed. Although Juarez lists “Puente Negro” as destroyed, the mural is not quite as invisible as that might suggest. Viewers to the site can still see many of the images in the mural. In the following, I have both analyzed, and where necessary, conceptually (unfortunately not artistically) reconstructed, to the best of my ability, the images that I have seen and photographed.

Viewers can clearly discern that this mural is indeed “Puente Negro.” Viewers can also discern that it belongs to the *Todos Somos* series when they observe the tentacle-like swirls that mimic “Todos Somos Ilegales.” Furthermore, the muralists have painted “Puente Negro #1” in the same pastel pink paint of “Todos Somos Ilegales.” More significantly, the words “TODOS SOMOS. . .” (We all are. . .) appear within the swirls. Viewers observe that the muralists have rendered the same ghost-like images in

“Puente” as in “Ilegales.” Similar smaller figures, like the running figure in “Ilegales,” resemble a figure wearing a hat in “Puente.”

There are four sections of the mural. Viewers first encounter “Todos Somos,” followed by the Guevara portrait, another portrait of a man in a suit and tie, and finally a section that the muralists have decentered. This last section depicts a railroad bridge that leads into a blue section, which the muralists have aligned with a maroon section.

In the “Todos Somos/We All Are. . .” section, the swirls point toward five wheels. The muralists have drawn the wheels like cogs of a mechanical device or the spokes of a train. Both would suggest the railroad bridge. To the lower right of the train image, the muralists have depicted another craft: it actually resembles a space cruiser. Four semi-circles corner the craft. A fifth semi-circle with “#1” next to it moves the eye toward the Guevara portrait and the writing beneath it.

Beside the “Todos Somos” section, the muralists have drawn a portrait of Ché Guevara in black and white with a grey star on his beret. On the left of the portrait, they have written “VIVA CUBA” (Long Live Cuba). To the right of the portrait, they have written “ché Creyeron matarte a 30 ANOS tu ejemplo sigue VIVO. . .” (Ché, they thought they could kill you; after 30 years, your example continues living). Beneath this sentence, the muralists have written a word that has faded and the date 1988. This date also suggests the series because the muralists produced these three murals between 1987 and 1989. Below the portrait, the muralists have written in white lettering “Arriba Mexicano” (Long Live the Mexican). Above the portrait, they have written “DEPORTE SI DROGA NO” (Sports Yes Drugs No).

To the right of the Guevara portrait, seven arrows point toward the two-foot wall. Unfortunately, the seven arrows point to the right of the portrait toward a set of images that have faded. I will attempt to reconstruct as much as I can by listing what I see there. Immediately viewers can see that the arrows are part of a different layer than the slogan about drugs. The arrows align but not with the slogan. Instead, they point toward empty space. Below the arrows, viewers note a mushroom or storm cloud, and in its eye, the muralists have drawn the portrait of a man in a suit jacket and tie. The muralists have sketched him in the ghostly manner also found in "Ilegales." To the left of the portrait, the muralists have drawn a book, scroll, or page of a book.

To the right of the portrait of the man in the suit, the muralists have sketched what appear to be bullet holes. Above them, viewers can clearly see the words, "Puente Negro" (Black Bridge), which the muralists have written in block letters in pastel pink. In another section, the muralists have rendered a mask that they have built into the break. To the right, the muralists have rendered a figure in a hat. To the lower right, viewers recognize parallel lines that the muralists have equally spaced, and which seem to indicate the railroad bridge and the characteristic tentacle-like swirls again. This leads into a blue section that appears as another section break. The blue section aligns like puzzle-pieces with a maroon section. More swirls appear before the mural again fades. The muralists have written the word "Puente Negro #1" above the swirls and "ZORRILLOS" (Little Foxes); later the word, "CATHARSIS," appears as well. Farther down the mural, a profile of a face appears whose lips are blowing. The muralists have sketched the face in black and white. To its right, the muralists have created another

blue edge with a white masked figure against the edge. This figure looks like an Indian god statue.

Because “Puente Negro” has deteriorated, two characteristics are highlighted: first, the mural lacks a background against which to set the images; second, the pastel light-weight paint gives a chalky appearance to the mural. “Ilegales” also presents these aspects and emphasizes that the muralists have attempted to merge organically with the concrete embankment. Furthermore, this second characteristic suggests the techniques of Siqueiros have influenced the muralists more than the traditional fresco style of Rivera. Siqueiros developed a revolutionary form with a paint that could bind with concrete. If viewers compare the series with newer murals, they find little concrete interference in the latter and instead well-defined figures heavily contrasted against the background with no sketches. In a photograph of the intact “Ilegales,” viewers see beige background concrete and faded pastels that mirror the landscape’s pastels (from dusk sky to colonia shacks to desert sand). Viewers also see sketches of figures, and shapes and line vectors that polymorphously interact with each other. The work nearly blends into the environment.

Viewers see this replicated in “Puente Negro.” As the mural has deteriorated, the process has magnified those characteristics. The mural has naturally decayed as barely visible river sediment passes over the concrete. The fading not only emphasizes a pattern, but also presents a conscious vision for the series. The murals redefine and complicate lines within their own space and borders. They produce an additive quality that suggests the utter futility of creating a border in the middle of a geographic context of a culture (El Paso/Juarez). They mimic tradition and history with this additive quality

and critique the border through continual additions. Finally, the murals also attempt to become part of La Línea so that the landscape critiques its own space.

### **A New Generation: “El Respeto Al Derecho Ajeno Es La Paz”**

I have noticed a distinction between the series of murals entitled *Todos Somos* and another mural, that I refer to as “El Respeto.” Hence, I distinguish between the political project of the *Todos Somos* series and other murals, if only to delineate the period of the late 1980s. “El Respeto” originates from many of the same traditions as the murals of *Todos Somos*. But it exemplifies the context of a new generation in the same space and sets about creating a separate project.

A new generation created “El Respeto Al Derecho Ajeno Es La Paz” as a more verbose and simplistically designed mural. The mural centers around six major images, each of which dominates a section toward the edge. The muralists have surrounded each image with slogans. Clearly this mural is of a different sort than the *Todos Somos* series because it relies almost as heavily on its slogans as it does on its images. The *Todos Somos* murals are complex, suggestive, polymorphic, and decentered. This mural suggests an update of the other murals because these muralists have rendered its images much more clearly and placed the entire mural upon a blue background. This begins to challenge the idea of an additive mural, like the ill-defined-space murals of *Todos Somos*. However, I will show how viewers still see the two most important features of a common tradition, an additive quality and a spatial challenge within borders. The mural challenges the orthodox political positions of the Chicano/a movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

It begins with a blue-washed background. The same color blue appears as that of the blue-washed murals on the other side of the bridge, as if someone had made a

mistake or had blue-washed an offensive mural. The muralists have also broken the mural into two distinct sections. Each section has the blue background, but the muralists have not joined them together. After viewers see the second section, they come upon another image and another slogan outside the blue-washed background. This image matches the larger mural. This does not mean that this mural is incomplete. Rather it possesses an additive quality – like the other canal murals. In this way, it challenges the border because it refuses to contain itself or allow itself to be cataloged or contained.

In the first section, viewers notice two swastikas crossed out and a sign that reads “Anti-Facismo.” Viewers encounter a portrait of Uncle Sam as a devil with horns followed by a portrait of Ché Guevara. The Uncle Sam image has a red and blue hat and a black goatee. The figure has yellow horns and a blue face that matches the blue of the background. It wears a green shirt and has a white and red face with blank eyes. The figure appears stark, reddish, and menacing. Near the portrait are slogans for “VIVA CHIAPAS,” “VIVA ZAPATA,” “EZLN,” (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional) and “P. VILLA.” There are also two other slogans “ENTRE LOS INDIVIDUOUS COMO ENTRE LAS NACIONES EL RESPETO AL DERECHO AJENO ES LA PAZ” (Between Individuals like Between Nations Respect for Others’ Rights is Peace) and “HASTA LA VICTORIA SIEMPRE ‘EL CHÉ’” (Until Victory Always ‘El Ché’).

In the first section, the muralists have sketched the second image, a black portrait of Ché Guevara with the face absorbing the blue background. They have outlined the figure in red and painted the star on his beret red. The stern image connotes ferocity; but the second set of words qualifies this initial appearance. The

muralists have painted “URGENTE” (Urgent) and “AMOR Y PAZ” (Love and Peace) inside the box, and they have outlined all letters in black and red. This clearly delineates their motive, and reinterprets the movement that includes Ché Guevara as an image within that movement. Armed revolutionary struggle seems to merge with an urgent call for love and peace.

Guevara is further tied to the movement by the slogan, “VIVA LA REVOLUCIÓN MEXICANA VILLA #1” (Long Live the Mexican Revolution Villa #1). The fact that the Mexican Revolution predated the Cuban Revolution by fifty years suggests that the muralists have situated Guevara within the Chicano/a tradition. Furthermore, “Villa #1” seems to suggest that one might see Villa as the first revolutionary figure among a tradition of the Latin American working-class revolutionaries of which Guevara is a part. Guevara, while not Mexican, can then help to expand the notion of Chicanismo/a, the ideology of working-class Mexican-American nationalism, which centers around the southwestern United States. Above the Guevara figure, they have written “ABAJO BLOQUEO A CUBA-ALTO AL YANKI TERRORISMO” (Down with blockade of Cuba – Stop Yankee Terrorism).

In the second section, three images appear, with a fourth outside of the blue background. The first seems to be John Lennon, and the second is a psychedelic sunflower. The third shows a figure running as viewed through the lens of a telescopic rifle sight. The fourth shows a hand breaking a rifle in half.

An image of John Lennon in a Chicano/a mural means that the Chicano movement in general and this mural in particular moves beyond Mexican culture for its referents. It does this with Ché Guevara as well. However, with Lennon it moves

beyond Latino/a revolutionary culture toward a global culture and themes of world peace. As many Chicano/a critics have observed, Chicano culture represents the sited resistance of official U.S.-Mexican culture. In this way, Chicano culture creates a third space. Chicano culture has positioned itself within the permeable U.S. culture. Thus, viewers might hypothesize that when the mural incorporates an image of John Lennon, the text manifests that global culture has been admitted into Chicano/a consciousness.

The muralists have painted the John Lennon portrait in fire red, bright yellow, and blue, with the blue face of the background with Lennon's trademark sunglasses. Someone has written "#1 MEXICO" on the forehead. The muralists have painted the hair in the same red, blue/purple, red-orange, and yellow purple of the sunflower. They have painted his shirt yellow and have outlined his purple jacket purple in red. Next to him they have written in red, "Haz el amor no la guerra" (Make love not war). A red heart appears next to the word "amor," while the word "guerra" appears in dark blue with a yellow-green atom drawn next to it. Above the portrait, someone has written "No mas bombas al mundo" (No more bombs in the world).

The muralists have drawn the second image of the second section, the psychedelic sunflower, like the sun in wavy fire red, but with purple, green, and bright red alternating toward the core. The sunflower looks like both a psychedelic sun and a flower all at once. Next to this image, also in the alternating red and dark blue lettering, they have written the following: "NO MORIRÁ la FLOR de la PALABRA" (The flower of the word will not die). Graffiti has interfered in this section only, suggesting that the section might have produced more controversy than the others.

The third image of the second section displays a red figure inside a yellow background, outlined by the crosshairs of a rifle's telescopic sight. Surrounding the image, the muralists have written in black: "PELIGRO: ZONA DE TIRO" (Danger: Firing Zone) and below, "MIGRA CHOTAX" (Fucking Immigration). The muralists have written the words "Zona" and "Tiro" partially outside of the blue background; and under them, the muralists have written the word "RIO" (River). When we recall that the river is called "Rio Grande" in the U.S. and "Río Bravo" in Mexico, we see why the mural refers to the river. This suggests that one can contest, name, and rename even the space of the international border. Viewers locate the words outside of the boundary. This suggests the out-of-bounds aspect of this hinter-land firing zone. The running figure itself represents a Mexican immigrant without papers attempting to run across to the U.S. as viewed by the border patrol.

The image outside of the mural shows a red circle that the muralists have outlined in black with a black hand breaking a black rifle in half. Both ends of the rifle spill outside the circle. They have written "VIVE CHE!" in red and outlined it in black. They have professionally rendered this image. However, this section outside the mural's blue background border again suggests an additive quality. The section further challenges the issues of border and containment. Its own image moves beyond the confinement of the space where the circle has confined it. In this way, it challenges the lines of the space of La Línea.

Viewers also encounter further evidence of an additive quality within this mural. Above the section of the rifle scope and the broken rifle, a message testifies to the current moment. This mural is older than this last statement: "BUSH VA POR EL

PETRÓLEO, NO POR OSAMA” (Bush goes for oil, not for Osama). I took the photographs of this mural for the research project on November 11, 2001 – exactly two months after September 11. It seems doubtful that this is contemporary with the primary mural and yet the lettering fits inconspicuously like much of the lettering above the mural. If one were not reading closely, one might glance over the message and think that the muralists had written it at the time of the mural’s construction.

I have suggested that viewers could read this mural as being from a different tradition than both the images done by Anzaldo-Meneses and the militant Chicano movement of the 1960s and 1970s. However, I must qualify both of these statements. First, viewers find that although different, this new mural springs from the tradition to which Anzaldo-Meneses and the muralists of the Frontera LIBRE belonged. Second, both this mural and the late 1980s murals show an additive quality. This suggests that no one can adequately fix the border region because the border is always in flux. Third, like the *Todos Somos* series, this mural actively challenges its own borders by allowing its words and images to extend beyond its own delineation. Finally, while this mural qualifies and adds to the Chicano movement, it nevertheless makes classic references to the figures and slogans of that same movement, including the Cuban poster art of the 1960s and 1970s.

### **Reproducibility and Situation in the Mural Form**

The militarization of the border began in the late teens of the twentieth century. The United States prepared for war and attempted to reconcile itself to the role it had played in the Mexican Revolution and the mobility of agents in Chihuahua to challenge the power vacuum there between 1906 and 1917. I would suggest that the region most likely became polymorphic and decentered as it tried to reconcile itself to an

other/another space. This other space existed in the U.S. resident or citizen whose parents came from Mexico, and who was told she could not speak Spanish. Because they did not belong to Mexico, and because the U.S. government often treated them as second-class subjects, these Chicanas found themselves at once in both places and in neither. They thus occupied a third space, another space.

When a work of art attempts to represent this space, and the culture and material reality around it, it can only partially represent the “absent cause,” as Althusser has referred to such unrepresentable realities (62). The result is symbolism and a distortion of the figures within the work. This occurs especially when the content of the work must radically resist traditional artistic figuration. The murals resist artistic figuration because they refuse to subscribe to one master narrative. Instead, viewers observe a series of conversations, a Bakhtinian “heteroglossia.” In these murals, heteroglossia takes the form of multiple tongues or multiple discourses. One can see multiple discourses through image, a polymorphism and the lack of a center that refuses to end the conversation and that continually adds to it. This is evident in the *Todos Somos Series*.

The space itself is the political border between empire/superpower and developing nation. This space, simultaneously form and content, can never be fully represented but may be partially grasped through a “play of figuration.” In a presentation at a conference, “Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture” in 1983, Jameson discussed the concept of the “play of figuration.” This figural process deeply influences the form of the political postmodern work of art:

Play of figuration” [...] is an essentially allegorical concept that supposes the obvious, namely, that these new and enormous global realities are inaccessible to any individual subject or consciousness [...] which is to say that those fundamental realities are somehow ultimately unrepresentable

or, to use the Althusserian phrase, are something like an absent cause, one that can never emerge into the presence of perception. Yet this absent cause can find figures through which to express itself in distorted and symbolic ways [...] I take it that this figural process will remain central in all later attempts to restructure the form of the work of art to accommodate content that must radically resist and escape artistic figuration. (Hardt and Weeks 279)

As an artistic term, it has particular relevance for aesthetics and the problem of representation after modernity. As the work of art attempts to represent the fragmented subject that resists figuration at all junctures, the form of the work of art will restructure itself. For murals of La Linea, then, figuration describes the process by which the murals, in the tradition of Siqueiros, become inseparably linked to the surroundings. The murals also constantly incorporate new elements into their borders. This additive quality complicates their own borders and critiques the international border. The murals refuse to follow the forms of easily categorized classical references to beauty and form. Instead, they are asymmetrical and additive.

Jameson further discusses figuration as a modernist response to the repositioning and de-centering of the subject by imperialist capitalism. He delineates the new “problem” for art in postmodernism by discussing the new characteristic of postmodern space. Finally, and most importantly, Jameson links politics to the failure of art to give figuration to the new system:

At this point I realize that the persuasiveness of my demonstration depends on your having some fairly vivid perceptual sense of what is unique and original in postmodernist space [...] Briefly I want to suggest that the new space involves the suppression of distance [...] and the relentless saturation of any remaining voids and empty places, to the point where the postmodern body [...] is now exposed to a perceptual barrage of immediacy from which all sheltering layers and intervening mediations have been removed. [...] I take such spatial peculiarities of postmodernism as symptoms and expressions of a new and historically original dilemma, one that involves our insertion as individual subjects into a multidimensional set of radically discontinuous realities, whose frames range from the still

surviving spaces of bourgeois private life all the way to the unimaginable decentering of global capital itself. Not even Einsteinian relativity, or the multiple subjective worlds of the older modernists, is capable of giving any kind of adequate figuration to this process, which in lived experience makes itself felt by the so-called death of the subject, or, more exactly, the fragmented and polymorphic and decentered decentering and dispersion of this last (which can no longer even serve the function of the Jamesian reverberator or “point of view”). And although you may not have realized it, I am talking about practical politics here: since the crisis of socialist internationalism, and the enormous strategic and tactical difficulties of coordinating local and grassroots or neighborhood political actions with national or international ones, such urgent political dilemmas are all immediately functions of the enormously complex new international space I have in mind. (Hardt and Weeks 280)

This is exactly what viewers expect in the *Todos Somos* series: time and structure have been condensed, accelerated, and emptied out. Meanwhile the images saturate viewers with multiple themes, attempting to instruct them on various parts of the Chicana/o tradition. Viewers soon see this decentering in relation to modern life and to a culture that tries desperately to situate itself between two nations, identities, and languages. Thus, viewers can see why the figuration is necessarily polymorphic, fragmented, and decentered within the mural.

Through several examples, one can specifically map the “enormously complex new international space” to which Jameson refers in the U.S./Mexico border in downtown El Paso/Juarez at the Rio Grande/Río Bravo River. First, local attempts to reform U.S. Border Patrol policies have failed largely because they can be coordinated neither with Washington D.C. nor with an absent U.N. that would balk at arbitrating dual immigration policy forum between Washington D.C. and Ciudad México D.F. Second, Mexican socialist internationalism was crushed by the U.S. between 1916 and the mid-1930s. Woodrow Wilson’s World War I policies toward U.S. borders had enormous effects in later years. For example, they made it possible to create the U.S. Border

Patrol in the early 1930s. These factors helped to contain the revolution and to support alternately repressive and reformist (not revolutionary) regimes in Mexico. Finally, these political dilemmas have manifested themselves in both literature/theory about the border (Gloria Anzaldua, Cherie Moraga, Norma Alarcón, and others). They have influenced a rich mural tradition in both cities, not the least of which is represented by the murals on the international border of the Rio.

Viewers see the problem anew when they look to the “Man at the Crossroads” situation. The Mexican Muralist and Marxist Diego Rivera did not reproduce his New York mural through photography, nor does he move it as a “portable mural,” to Mexico City. Rather, he reconstructs the mural in Mexico City. Thus, viewers do not encounter a mechanical reproduction of a mural; they encounter an artist’s manual reproduction of it. The mural in Mexico City is no more the same mural as the material is the exact material in New York.

When John D. Rockefeller asked Rivera to create a mural for Rockefeller center in New York, Rivera did it willingly, knowing that both Matisse and Picasso had refused the commission. Matisse claimed that people could not view his work by its best method of display. Desmond Rochfort observes that Picasso’s reason was not recorded (130). Rivera, on the other hand, had recently finished work on murals in San Francisco and Detroit. Rockefeller commissioned “Looking with Hope and High Vision to the Choosing of a New and Better Future” (Rochfort 129). He wanted Riviera to show progress in an idealistic fashion. Rivera began the work with sketches and then began to work on the wall.

He was still sketching on the wall when he received a letter from Rockefeller that asked him to remove a figure from the right center of the mural. Rivera's sketches show that originally the figure had been a workman with a cap, but somewhere during the public stages of the creation of the work of art, Rivera transformed the figure into Lenin. After the formal successes of San Francisco and Detroit, where Rivera had received critical acclaim and had also been accused by some of the more radical elements in his movement, including Siqueiros, of painting for the bourgeoisie, Rivera decided that he would demonstrate in the most visible of places who was in control (Rochfort 130). Rivera refused to remove Lenin from the mural, stating that in order to show the progress of men he would have to show the undeniable leader of the proletariat. Rivera was approximately eighty percent finished with the mural six months later when Rockefeller's representatives asked him to leave the building. Rockefeller paid Rivera his entire commission of \$21,000 in full. Months later, workers chipped the mural from the wall.

Rivera then went to the Palacio de Belles Artes in Mexico City and, without another commission, recreated the mural from scratch, where it is presented today as "El Hombre Controlador del Universo." For this latter work, as Convici Freide observes in *Diego Rivera: Portrait of America*, Rivera added a section where Rockefeller and some New York bourgeoisie celebrate heavily while others suffer. He wrote of the original mural that it would "continue to have aesthetic and social value – when the building eventually passes from the hands of its temporary capitalist owners into the commonwealth of all society" (qtd in Rochfort 131).

We must qualify any assumption that “El Hombre Controlador del Universo” is the same mural as “Man at the Crossroads.” First, different ownership of the murals indicates that they were different responses to distinct historical realities. Second, Rivera changed the mural by including John D. Rockefeller Jr. in a nightclub in the Mexico City version. Third, viewers must accept that the contentious image of Lenin absorbs a different meaning in the capital of Mexico. The Mexican president, Lázaro Cárdenas, unofficially supported Lenin’s successor, Leon Trotsky, for several years. The mural would mean something else in the heart of capitalism.

For a similar reason, one could not remove any of the Rio murals – even physically – from the international border without utterly changing their significance. If one placed them in a museum, one could not expect them to retain their specificity. The conscious acts of painting them on the concrete environment of the canal helps the murals to challenge the concept of the border and create a site of resistance.

Viewers can move along the imagined trajectory of the Rivera murals from New York to Mexico City. They move from an elite space to a popular one. The La Línea murals occupy a public and well-traversed space. The cities themselves create over-determined context for each mural. First, as viewers move from New York to Mexico City, they move from a smaller city to a larger one. They also move from one of the five richest metropolises in the world to an industrialized city without an empire. New York City is now the largest node of the largest empire in the world, while Mexico City is one of the largest cities in the world and the capital of a developing nation. Although the Rockefeller building represented a public space, it also represented a kind of elitism that viewers do not encounter at the Palacio de Bellas Artes. The Palacio de Bellas Artes

allows easier access and does not hold art only for elites. However, as an art museum, it creates its own limitations for the act of viewing. The space remains culturally elite. The murals at the border, on the other hand, occupy popular spaces.

“Man at the Crossroads” is not the same mural as “Man, Controller of the Universe” because, in part, viewers lose some of the political context when the image of Lenin hangs at Palacio de Bella Artes instead of Rockefeller Center. At Palacio, viewers lose the radical revolutionary characteristic of a space that greatly challenges the function of its own space. Similarly, the context of the *Todos Somos* series changes when one mechanically reproduces them by photograph. The photograph removed them from the space that they had created as landscape and that they had examined and criticized.

Rockefeller representatives have denied viewers a possible finished “Man at the Crossroads.” Similarly, we are denied access to the *Todos Somos* series. At one point barbed wire enclosed them and the largest police force on the North American continent, the U.S. Border Patrol, guarded them. Today, they no longer exist. The U.S. was not concerned about protecting the murals, but rather the land upon which the artist’s collective had situated them. The land is the ultimate reach of the jurisdiction of the U.S. If one stands in the river, one is in Mexico; if one stands on the North bank of the river, one is in the United States. Large fences along the sloped embankment lead to the unguarded United States but prevent one from traveling there.

The photograph that I have seen of “Todos Somos Ilegales” and those I have taken of the decaying “El Puente Negro” do not capture either mural within the borders of the lens. The angles tilt. The difficulty of photographing the space mimics the

difficulty in saying anything convincing about the context of the murals. Like the military buildings, the barbed wire, and the razor wire, the position of these murals on cement linked them to their space. The murals are neither as subversive nor as fluid as the bodies of culture that carry themselves back and forth over La Linea.

I have written and analyzed the *Todos Somos* murals from a distance through photographic reproductions. Therefore, we should examine issues of reproducibility in them. One cannot remove the murals from their situatedness. I can support this argument by demonstrating what remains when a situated object gets de-contextualized. The murals cannot retain their aura away from the border. Conversely, when the muralists produced these originals on the concrete environment of the canal, they allowed the murals themselves to challenge the concept of the border and create a site of resistance there.

In “The Work of Art in the Age of Technical Reproducibility,” Benjamin argues mechanical reproduction jeopardizes the authenticity, historical testimony, and authority of an object – its aura. (Ross 534) The original object’s authority depends on its historical testimony. Authenticity is the essence of what an object transmits from its “substantive duration” to the object’s testimony of its own experience. As mechanical reproduction highlights extra aspects and resituates the art object in unintended contexts, technical reproduction interferes with this authenticity. The case of ownership exemplifies this process clearly. Benjamin concludes “that which withers in the age of mechanical reproduction is the aura of the work of art” (Ross 533). In other words, when I photograph the murals, I interfere with their authenticity because I can then stick the photographs in a time capsule, bury it halfway across the world, and leave

instructions for people to excavate it in two hundred years. This act would interrupt the mural project's authority by interrupting its own historical testimony to the project of critiquing the border.

These murals are in this space by no accident. The location is as much in the choice as in the paint on the cement because this constant reminder of the space helps the murals blend into their surroundings and criticize the border. Second, no other place in the world can produce the materials of this image: one cannot overlay another mural on another human barrier. The U.S. and Mexican governments have covered the embankment in cement. One cannot reproduce the embankment elsewhere because it is an indispensable part of the mural. Even if the same artist collectives of the *Todos Somos* series could manually reproduce the murals on a drainage ditch in Omaha, or in Omagh (Northern) Ireland or even in Belfast or Jerusalem, each site would host a different set of murals than those at the U.S./Mexico border.

Rivera was able to move the entire public spectacle of "Man at the Crossroads" from Rockefeller Center to Palacio del Belles Artes, re-title it, and reconstruct it. Thus, in the text's wake, it engaged its own changing form and its own problems of representation that problematize community space. When the mural ceases to be "Man at the Crossroads" and instead becomes its Spanish-titled equivalent, "El Hombre Controlador del Universo," there is an interesting question of reproduction that is not mechanical. Rivera's reproduction is less of a threat than a photograph of it because mechanical reproduction does not need the original as much as process reproduction needs it. Benjamin reminds viewers of the socio-historical and cultural realities of their art object when he encounters the problem of mechanical reproduction to identify the

essence of a work of art. Benjamin explains that the work, as an original, when faced with technical reproduction – instead of manual reproduction – no longer preserves all of its own authority:

First, process reproduction is more independent of the original than manual reproduction. For example, in photography, process reproduction can bring out those aspects of the original that are unattainable to the naked eye yet accessible to the lens, which is adjustable and chooses its angle at will. [. . .] Secondly, technical reproduction can put the copy of the original into situations which would be out of reach for the original itself. Above all, it enables the original to meet the beholder halfway, be it in the form of a photograph or a phonograph record. (Ross 527)

Therefore, one must understand a photograph of any of the Rio murals or of “Man at the Crossroads.” It is a partial representation that reaches forth into another teleology, chronology, or situatedness, which might even emphasize things that an artist never meant to represent.

The near total destruction of the *Todos Somos* series has also nearly destroyed the auras of all three murals and the project at large. Without a historical testimony, their authority is challenged. When one reproduces an art object that has been destroyed, one may save the object from becoming an artifact. Indeed, in this study, this is exactly what has happened to “El Puente Negro.” Someone has destroyed both “Todos Somos Ilegales” and “Todos Somos Americanos.” However, because a published photograph of the former mural exists, we can re-infuse the aura of “El Puente Negro” into the analysis of the partially remaining mural under the bridge.

Benjamin generalizes the phenomenon of reproduction in mass culture to suggest that reproduction, as a technique, detaches the reproduced object from tradition. Reproduction substitutes copies for a “unique existence.” He argues that, “in permitting the reproduction to meet the beholder [. . .] in his own particular situation, [. . .] [this act]

reactivates the object reproduced. These two processes lead to a tremendous shattering of tradition which is the obverse of the contemporary crisis and renewal of mankind” (Ross 537). Because the only mural of the *Todos Somos* series that remains (even partially) is “Puente Negro,” I can only speculate as to the original effects of the murals upon their environment. I can address the *cultural* and *artistic* traditions from which the murals sprang. But I cannot adequately address the object’s “groundswell” (in Heidegger’s language) that Benjamin suggests is part of a tradition of the object itself.

### **Radicalism in the Mural Form**

Although not as prolific as Diego Rivera in the United States, David Alfaro Siqueiros redefined revolutionary muralism. In 1932, Siqueiros taught a course in mural painting at the Los Angeles-based Chouinard Art School where he began experimenting with new techniques for creating murals. When Siqueiros opened his “Experimental Workshop” in 1936 in New York, he continued to expand the zone of methods for a revolutionary art, working with Harold Lehman, Jackson Pollock, Sande McCoy, Axel Horn, George Cox, Louis Ferstdt and Clara Mahl, Roberto Berdecio, José Gutiérrez, Conrado Vásquez, Antonio Pujol, and Luís Arenal. They called the workshop “a laboratory of modern techniques,” and Siqueiros later adapted the experimental easel work to his work as a muralist (Rochfort 147).

From this tradition of paint on cement in outdoor rugged conditions, the murals of the Río take their inspiration. Siqueiros had been altering Frescos on cement that radically changed the way that people viewed murals because large open spaces could now sustain them while withstanding the natural elements. Although Rivera created content that was revolutionary enough to cause him to lose his commission in New

York, he was, nevertheless, still painting the way muralists had done for centuries. Siqueiros had largely criticized Rivera for working for Rockefeller, but he also criticized the more famous muralist for working in the traditional style of frescos. For Siqueiros, it was not enough that the content of a mural was revolutionary or conveyed the proper ideology. The form, too, had to structure itself around revolutionary formal development. Therefore, Siqueiros created a lab in New York where they developed a paint that could bind with concrete, which would then allow murals to be more successfully rendered in open, outdoor spaces (Rochfort 148). It is from this tradition, and the tradition of the Cuban Posters that the international border murals take their training in form and revolutionary content.

The *Todos Somos* series merges content with form to create multiple resonances. Because their content criticizes the existence of La Línea and U.S. immigration and enforcement policies, their form must also challenge La Línea. They challenge the border through their own uncertain beginnings and endings, borders and edges, additive qualities and polymorphic and decentered referents. If one removes the international border from the space where the murals resided, the murals become artifacts. Or, as has actually happened, people removed the murals from the border through decay and/or destruction (white-washing) so that only photographic images remain. The images become new reminders of an environment or landscape that once arose from itself and criticized a border in which it was situated.

Along with Manuel Anzaldo Meneses, Carlos Callejo painted *Todos Somos Ilegales*. His experience provides an example of the sort of crossing that characterizes the region and simultaneously situates, complicates, and characterizes this border.

Callejo was born in El Paso but lived in Juarez from age four to age nine. His U.S. citizenship, like all of ours, is simply a matter of demography (Juarez 67).

In an interview conducted by Mike Juárez in 1993, Callejo speaks about the status and role of murals on the border. He observes a gap between the acceptance of the authenticity of murals as a form and their position as art: "The quality of murals as 'art' has been questioned more often than their authenticity of expression" (Juarez 68). According to Juárez, this skepticism is in part natural because "murals are [a relatively] recent phenomenon, diverse, scattered, only semi-permanent and of variable quality" (67). Much of the art world has neglected them. Little criticism has engaged them. However, Callejo believes that "they are an art form in their own right, and serious criticism and major commissions are long overdue" (67). Callejo has observed reasons why as of yet scholars have written little on murals relative to other art forms:

At the same time, some of this critical silence represents social prejudice and ignorance of the aesthetics of murals. Too often, the spokesmen of the official "art world" conveniently stereotype murals as folklore, as protest art, and as minority art, poor art for poor people, in order to dismiss them from serious consideration. Murals, however, are not only protest or simply large paintings on walls; they are paintings binded [*sic*] into architecture, public art conceived in a given space; art rooted in a specific human context. (Juárez 67)

An "aesthetics of murals" would then mean more than simply the representation of image that Jameson has discussed in relationship to cognitive mapping.

Callejo observes the vacuum in such space surrounding the political content of the region. For him there must be a conscious remembrance through representation: "You can see the ignorance, the lack of interest to tell these stories, especially for our areas" (Juarez 67). In fact, murals themselves speak over that silence: "Murals tend to serve multiple purposes. One is to fill gaps" (Juarez 64). One of these gaps concerns

information flow and the politics of its regulation: “Murals tend to fill a need for honest communication between all people on a non-verbal level. Muralists communicate ideas which often get neglected by our politicians and media or newspapers, ideas which need to be explored in the public's eye” (Juarez 68). This sort of regulation of information flow also subverts ideology through the manipulation of space. If a large painting on a wall is bonded into the architecture of the community, it is not only rooted “in a specific human context” but also demonstrates social responsibility and commitment.

To understand these murals in a larger context we have looked toward the revolutionary muralist tradition from which they spring. Because they are public outdoor murals, highly visible in a common well-traversed space, they avoid both financial and cultural elitism. The murals of *Todos Somos* attempt to critique the border through blending into their surroundings, by refusing to define their own borders, and by allowing additions to their forms. In this way they become the border and criticize it from the inside.

Their situatedness is unique to their project. One cannot understand their form and the formal techniques that the muralists have employed unless we understand the murals' location and their purpose at such a location. The murals seek to call attention to themselves, to call attention to the space that they inhabit, and to critique that space from within. Moreover, through their own open form, the murals refuse to “end the dialogue” about the existence of the border. They seek to end attempts to contain the border by refusing to contain themselves as art objects. Finally, the murals' additive

polymorphic and decentered quality – a play of figuration – make them a salient attempt at mapping the unmappable.

Once we understand that we cannot remove the murals from their environment without losing their aura, we begin to grasp their power. We begin to grasp the use of that aura in a general and pervasive critique of the existence of border spaces. Much other art does not relate formal techniques as content in order to critique a unique space from which one cannot remove it. One cannot remove these murals, and thus they rely heavily on the space for their context and for the power that they wield in an environmental critique. In this way, we better understand the formal choices of placement on the embankment. We better understand the blending, lack of borders, and additive qualities that the muralists have employed to critique the border through form.

## CHAPTER 4 “ACCIDENTALLY ARMED”: DIRECT ACTION OF THE ZAPATISTAS

It could be thought that the documents from any guerilla movement would be roughly the same, with certain grievances, demands, observations, and so on. However, among the many documents of organized struggle throughout the world, the communiqués of the EZLN (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional), also known as the Zapatistas, figures a struggle that serves as an ontological horizon for the twenty-first century. If one continues to think that struggles are identical, or over-simplifies them, then one will continue to under-estimate the fragility of Empire. If one continues to read the struggles as equal, then one’s own activism will unfold along vertical hierarchical lines rather than along the horizontally networked ones. According to Hardt and Negri, the Zapatistas “adopt all the elements of the traditional structure and transform them, demonstrating in the clearest possible terms the nature and direction of the postmodern transition of organizational forms [...] make irony itself into a political strategy,” and never intend “to defeat the state and claim sovereign authority but rather to change the world without taking power” (*Multitude* 85).

This is exodus in a strong form and the first four communiqués demonstrate these qualities in the following ways. First, this bold declaration demands unconditional surrender without war. This demand emerges after a statement of five centuries of grievances and links with the surrender of troops who might join the EZLN. Such a communiqué has never been seen before.

Second, the document becomes a written document. It states that the civilians and those who are accidentally armed must be one and the same. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari suggest that one should flee with a weapon. Also accidentally this means

that the state has forced the group to continue to flee with weapons. Third, it shows that national symbols are a useful tool for the circumstances. The constitution of origin (1917) is something that shows the link between Zapata and the EZLN; the struggle for transitional democracy is something that wields limited although immeasurable power in Mexico. Fourth, the foundation is the formation of the front that will actively resemble the movement of movements in coalition form as early as 1996. It is an altruistic and utilitarian alignment that encompasses a catholic need and a catholic love. If one can recognize the need for such a vision, then one can better understand the Movement of Movements. In this way, one can also grasp the importance of network-based movements in the struggle against hegemony.

### **Going Public: The Struggle, 1993-1994**

#### **Introduction to the First Declaration**

We are a product of 500 years of struggle: first against slavery, then during the War of Independence against Spain led by insurgents, then to avoid being absorbed by North American imperialism, then to promulgate our constitution and expel the French empire from our soil, and later the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz denied us the just application of the Reform laws and the people rebelled and leaders like Villa and Zapata emerged, poor men just like us. We have been denied the most elemental preparation so they can use us as cannon fodder and pillage the wealth of our country. They don't care that we have nothing, absolutely nothing, not even a roof over our heads, no land, no work, no health care, no food nor education. Nor are we able to freely and democratically elect our political representatives, nor is there independence from foreigners, nor is there peace nor justice for ourselves and our children./ We are the inheritors of the true builders of our nation. The dispossessed, we are millions and we thereby call upon our brothers and sisters to join this struggle as the only path, so that we will not die of hunger due to the insatiable ambition of a 70 year dictatorship led by a clique of traitors that represent the most conservative and sell-out groups. They are the same ones that opposed Hidalgo and Morelos, the same ones that betrayed Vicente Guerrero, the same ones that sold half our country to the foreign invader, the same ones that imported a European prince to rule our country, the same ones that formed the "scientific" Porfirio dictatorship, the same ones that opposed the Petroleum Expropriation, the same ones that massacred the railroad

workers in 1958 and the students in 1968, the same ones the today take everything from us, absolutely everything. (Par 1)

The communiqué begins with the declaration, "Today we say: enough!" This rhetoric counters the problem of five hundred years of oppression and addresses the problem of when exactly to begin the struggle. The EZLN contacted the world in the First Communiqué by contextualizing five hundred years of struggle of the indigenous peoples of modern-day Southern Mexico. The writers mention six periods of struggle. First, they had to fight against slavery. This first period lasts about one hundred years, beginning in 1492. The second period is a couple of hundred years until Mexico gained its independence. The third period centers around the Mexican-American War which ended in 1848. The fourth period is approximately fifteen years long, encompassing the 1850s and early 1860s, when Louis Napoleon attempted to overtake Mexico and Benito Juarez fought against him. Finally the period of the Porfiriato lasts approximately thirty years.

By outlining these five periods, the writers contextualize the continuing struggle. Moreover, this periodicity places the mythic people at the forefront of the discourse. The assumption here is that the ancestors are of the same people, and can be referred to as the people's forefathers. This poses a question of lineage and creates a narrative, but the problem must be one of history as well. When any narrative is created of ancestry and harnessed to current demand the question emerges, what exactly was the experience of these long dead people? The experiences of the dead both collectively and individually differ from experiences of the living who now demand power in the name of the accumulated ancestral dead.

This problem of the *nom du pere*, as Jacques Lacan has observed, has always been a “no.” Their collective experiences become the single archetypal father for whom the name was always no, but now the “no” originates with the state as the father. The people perceive this state father as themselves but with the sociopolitical status of other as the object of the “no.” The father possesses the status of the other because he is the father. As the Mexican state, he is the father of the Caucasian psycho-analytic family. He is the father of some other distant land who suffers in silence and is told “no.” If the father/state tells his children “no,” this action becomes an externality because the “no” the peasant father produces becomes the original abrogation of cost. Because he has nothing and because the state says “no” to him, he may simply be a conduit for the “no” – the “no” of the father and the “no” of the father-state. The Chiapas communiqué exorcises the “no” of the father without mentioning that conduit “no.” They have displaced the “no” onto the state, and attack it from there.

The communiqué states the historical grievances in a long lineage of declarations, but also listing more contemporary and common concerns: housing, land, work, health care, food, education, the right to freely and democratically elect political representatives, independence from foreigners, peace, justice (par 1). Specifically these grievances concern expropriation and neglect. The expropriation grievances of course involve war and exploitation and require direct action. These would include the major epochs of Spanish Colonial Period, the Spanish American-War, the war for independence from France, and the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz (1876-1911). They narrate the exploitation of the Mesa Amerindians during Mexico's wars and the stripping the nation of its wealth and national resources:

To prevent the continuation of the above and as our last hope, after having tried to utilize all legal means based on our Constitution, we go to our Constitution, to apply Article 39 which says: "National Sovereignty essentially and originally resides in the people. All political power emanates from the people and its purpose is to help the people. The people have, at all times, the inalienable right to alter or modify their form of government." Therefore, according to our constitution, we declare the following to the Mexican federal army, the pillar of the Mexican dictatorship that we suffer from, monopolized by a one-party system and led by Carlos Salinas de Gortari, the maximum and illegitimate federal executive that today holds power. (Par 3)

Specifically these grievances are those of expropriation and neglect. The expropriation grievances of course involve war and exploitation and require direct action. They include using the Mesa Amerindians during Mexico's wars and stripping the nation of its wealth and national resources. The second set of grievances declare that since the state has not done anything for the people then the people should not allow the state to persist and should revolt. These grievances do not seem to have been associated with the state directly but seem to ask the philosophical question, whether the state? That is, what is the state's role today? The government stands accused: it does not care that Chiapas people are dying of hunger, nor that they are dying of curable diseases nor that they are denied the most elemental subsistence. It does not care that they do not have anything, including a roof, land, jobs, health, food, or education. It does not care that they do not have the right to freely and democratically elect representatives, nor does it care that they do not have independence from foreigners or that they lack peace and justice for themselves or for their children.

In short, by invoking Article 39 of the Mexican constitution, the EZLN is expressing a peaceful, parliamentary, and fundamentally just analysis. They seek to recognize their role in supporting the political power of the people. From this support, the EZLN

can claim a right to help the people to “modify their form of government” (Par 3). This analysis reflects a traditional desire for the developing nation of Mexico to mirror the transatlantic liberty of John Locke and Thomas Jefferson. However, the EZLN has proposed a revolutionary event by using the mandate of Article 39 to overthrow the government. By suggesting that the government be overthrown, the EZLN have extended the limit of the phrase “modify their form” to its extreme.

This particular modification, though, is not simply trading one dictatorship for another. The EZLN suggests that the grievance of having nothing is legitimate and thus the evacuation of that form of exploitative power is the goal. We will see more of this trope in the sections to follow. In this sense, the particular type of overthrow of the form and goal of exploitation is an exodus because, as we will also see below, the Zapatistas refuse to take power.

The communiqué begins with a seemingly serious idea in point one: “Advance to the capital of the country, overcoming the Mexican federal army, protecting in our advance the civilian population and permitting the people in the liberated area the right to freely and democratically elect their own administrative authorities.” This first declaration attempts to disrupt the reigning idea of Mexico, and thus reflects the basic definition of socio-political revolution. It is interesting that they plan in advance to protect the civilian population from their own advance as well as from any collateral clashes of the government forces. The question then becomes one of Jameson’s political violence as exodus (Hardt and Weeks 120). The exodus is, in part, from exploitation. However, any political exodus necessitates a rear-guard action against the forces of the state as it pursues the fleeing subject. This is what Jameson means when he invokes the figure

of defensive revolutionary violence (Hardt and Weeks 120). In other words, the question of violence or pacifism is a red herring because any revolutionary event invokes the reactive violence of the state. The EZLN promotes observation by the Red Cross and the removal of drug traffickers and other criminals from their movement. They attempt to maintain the security of the civilian population. And yet, political violence still occurs because the state itself cannot negotiate a counter-force without violence. This means that the population could only flee from capital as a kind of violent overthrow or upheaval.

Those who do not fit neatly into Empire have been referred to as the new barbarians: occupants of brittle enclaves who do not have the same problem. They do not attempt to move vertically through history or horizontally through the entire population like members of the Paris commune would have. This is not simply a question of periphery versus center. Empire is concerned with the shifting of the new center. Empire is concerned with the periphery becoming center (*Empire* xii-xvi). It will handle multiple centers in itself but it will not manage a challenge to authority from a peripheral becoming a center and so this is a problem that seems to function through the entire network. What is the distinction between those who can function at the high level of being multiple centers and not being a derivative center of another and those who can function only as peripheries and as challenges to power that must be crushed? Are the centers of power fixed then? It seems that they are now fixed as empire. One should ask what are the centers of power that have remained the same since at least 1945 and what are the new or emergent centers that are not dominant? I am not yet ready to suggest that simple power is the only characteristic that will permit an

insurgency to move across peripheries or across multiple centers. It must also be the common element that gives power to such an insurgency as well as its ability to leap to the center.

Thus, the taking of Chiapas and the taking of Distrito Federal are real threats. However, it was never responded to by the general population because the flare up never became large enough. By remaining small it was able to remain part of the mole and the snake (Empire 52-59). Hardt and Negri offer a new trope to contrast with Marx's description of the mole. The mole represented the ability to burrow underground during an earlier moment of political sovereignty. Hardt and Negri suggest that the undulations of the snake better describe the flat smooth space of Empire. The size of the movement might not affect the undulating aspect of the snake in flat space as much as the space itself affects the situation. Size is not so much the protection of flat space as it might once have been and does not require the same protections or burrowing as was once required of underground movements. The metaphor is not that of the burrowing insect like the cockroach anymore, but rather, hiding on the surface in the dirt and dust as the body of the flea.

In "seal point," the communiqué issues a call for international monitoring: "Second: Respect the lives of our prisoners and turn over all wounded to the International Red Cross." This second position attempts to disrupt the idea of total war. The Zapatistas suffered few wounded, and they did not practice violence themselves. This means that the war can continue like a low grade infection for many years – this is reminiscent of Mao's long march or of Ho's run for independence from the French.

However, simultaneously, the demand notes that the population must struggle to maintain a non-violent approach. The exodus from capitalism will be a difficult one (par 4). The Zapatistas fight a moral war in which the government must be held to a standard that will, as an after effect, allow the Zapatistas to live on without having to fear the gun or to fight a tactical struggle. Tactics slow the production of strategy and the Zapatistas recognize this. Strategic thinking also seems to involve a general move toward internationalism.

The Zapatistas are also a media-savvy group. They of course maintain websites, videos, and photographs, and they reach out to other groups in an international forum – including Ya Basta and the European groups like Tute Bianchi, whom the Zapatistas have inspired and influenced for nearly two decades. The Zapatistas would prefer to bring the Red Cross and to create protection and bring further interest for the movement.

Moreover, by demanding respect for the lives of prisoners the EZLN suggest several problems. First, perhaps the Mexican government needs to be reminded to respect its prisoners-of-war. Second, the lives of the prisoners are to be spared and respected.

In point three, the communiqué demands prosecution of the enemy: “Third: Initiate summary judgments against all soldiers of the Mexican federal army and the political police that have received training or have been paid by foreigners, accused of being traitors to our country, and against all those that have repressed and treated badly the civil population and robbed or stolen from or attempted crimes against the good of the people.” This third position does not distinguish between the police and the army as

Lenin did in *State and Revolution* (37). Lenin had argued that the police could not be turned in the way that the army could. He demonstrated that those who controlled the army controlled the revolution. However, as the communiqué states, corruption links the police to the army. This leads one to wonder whether during any revolutionary struggle in Southern Mexico, the army might need to be replaced along with the police force. After *State and Revolution* was published, the assumption had been that the army would not fire upon its own citizens in the way that the police force would. The police had a stake in the state to a degree that enlisted soldiers did not. This limitation demonstrates the problem in Southern Mexico of corruption extending beyond the police.

This demand adjudicates many of the problems of the present moment attempting to bring the army and the political police to justice. In fact, these kinds of summary judgments against soldiers imply a new set of courts – revolutionary tribunals. When read this way, this portion of the communiqué sounds revolutionary. Revolutionary tribunals would depart from the bourgeois justice of the Mexican federal courts. If traditional courts were used, the same vested interests of the state that spread corruption from Mexican police to the Mexican army would obstruct political trials of military leaders. The failure of such a gesture might create the space for legitimate action afterward because the stated grievances would then be made public.

In the fourth point, the communiqué asks for a change in personnel in the army: “Form new troops with all those Mexicans that show their interest in joining our struggle, including those that, being enemy soldiers, turn themselves in without having fought against us, and promise to take orders from the General Command of the Zapatista

Army of National Liberation.” This fourth demand involves the production of the common. This is a positive development because it seeks to include general production in a struggle of the common rather than simply building a vanguard party. When the new soldiers are from the government, they may still take part because their expertise will be welcomed. They will learn to take orders from the General Command of the EZLN. The idea that soldiers will fight for the opposite side applies Ho’s principle about making your opponent weaker as you grow stronger by using your weaknesses as strengths and by using his strengths as weaknesses. Moreover the perseverance of struggle here suggests that there are people who can help the situation.

The fourth demand asks that people who are interested join the struggle. The position suggests, as in Russia during the early Soviet period, that enemy soldiers who turn themselves in and who promise to take orders from the EZLN serve the common cause. The demand figures the production of the common. Whether the army maintains the milieu that supports guerilla action or not, the army has a certain authority with the citizens of Chiapas. However, they are also a movement that wishes to grow exponentially. Instead of fighting the Federal Army of Mexico, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation wants deserters, and exodus from the vacuum of power that is left from the movement marching North. Were this to happen, the result would be another bloodless coup.

With the fifth position, we note the audacity and comic aspects of the communiqué as pastiche of the traditional manifesto: “We ask for the unconditional surrender of the enemy’s headquarters before we begin any combat to avoid any loss of lives.” However, as in any joke, there is some truth to this position – this is the truth of the

majority. They have right on their side and it seems that they would like a different world, but they are not naïve about the ways of power. They understand that the government would have to be destroyed either by withering away after being evacuated, after exodus, or by being exploded through revolution. The demand for unconditional surrender makes a joke of the entire military apparatus by suggesting that right makes right instead of its original adage, might makes right. If there were not a comic element to this approach, the rhetorical strategy would express a hubris possessed by the strongest powers of the twentieth century who asked for surrender before they began World War One. Thus there should be the understanding that the act is both sacrilegious against the state and church, and is also meant to taunt the powers through their own history.

Furthermore, this suggests that the EZLN might be the only army on Earth or in history who produce a kind of peace for themselves and for their opponents. In other words, they transform war into a kind of game with consequences that are serious, but that do not produce the traditional results of war – the killing of the other's forces. This is an interesting transformation because it is ontological, producing warriors without a war, warriors who will never fight, warriors who have an army that will never leave its military bases in the jungle. They are calculated and cunning, shrewd, and they do not take human life – this is a future utopian warfare that they begin practicing in the twenty-first century. The war itself began with the public relations of opposition of Mexico, which has been and continues to be blown up by Chiapas. The effects in the court of public opinion are that Mexico is losing the battle internationally as the EZLN has become among the most famous insurgent groups in history.

When we think about the violence of groups in the United States, Europe, or Latin America, the EZLN is among the few whom even the right cannot condemn as terrorists. The EZLN became an organization of swarm intelligence and twentieth century insurgency that seeks to offer models for future centuries when political fortunes will have changed and when revolution becomes inevitable.

This sixth position demands that the government “suspend the robbery of our natural resources in the areas controlled by the EZLN.” This affects the view of the Porto Alegre manifesto when it asks for the protection of natural resources. The EZLN will have a duty to protect its own natural resources from outside investment. Second, this will enable the community to use the resources and claim a sovereign existence. Third, the EZLN becomes an organization that protects the broader community and its environment more than a “military organization.” This is something other organizations have not done.

Fundamentally, the EZLN will not attempt to possess the area. Control of the area is the key question about a new sovereignty that dissipates the sovereignty of the Mexican government. The writers invoke communism’s third stage, when there will be no competition because everyone’s own work and biopolitical production will be the dominant force. The people who attempt to use the resources of the area would have to give their consent to share the resources with the world’s population. Like the Amerindians, they would understand that they are not the owners of these resources.

Jingoism is characteristic of everyone who believes in a community that is different from any other community. There is no “we” here because people within the “we” are always dying. Communism seems to already grasp this because it refuses to recognize

tribal affiliations. This demand presents a direct path to communism because it does not assume land rights. "Finders keepers" is not a good way to distribute wealth, and this could create problems in reforms even after the populace has claimed the right to the land. This raises a fundamental question about what communism is and does. Communism is the antidote to the randomness and arbitrariness of wealth, privileged birth order, and so forth.

### **Modification After the War: Second Declaration Epigraph in the words of Zapata**

It is not only those who carry the swords that make blood flow and shoot out fleeting rays of military glory, who are privileged to choose the personnel of the government of a people who want democracy; it is a right as well of the citizens who have fought in the press and in the tribunals, who are identified with the ideals of the Revolution and have combated the despotism that fouls our laws. For it is not just shooting off missiles on battlefields that sweeps away tyranny. It is also by hurling ideas of redemption, slogans of freedom and terrible anathema against the executors of the people that dictatorships are toppled and empires brought down. . . And if the deeds of history show us that the demolition of all tyranny, that the overthrow of all bad government is a combined work of the idea and the sword, then it is an absurdity, it is an aberration, it is unheard-of despotism to want to exclude the healthy elements that have the right to elect the government. The sovereignty of the people is constituted by all the healthy elements that have full conscience, who are conscious of their rights, whether they be civilians or accidentally armed, but love liberty and justice and labor for the good of the Country.

– Emiliano Zapata, as spoken by Paulino Martinez, delegate to the Supreme Revolutionary Convention Aguascalientes, Ags., Mexico, October 27, 1914

Zapata's remonstrance in this long quotation is both invective and pedagogical: war alone does not eliminate tyranny. It expands ideas of redemption, offers slogans of freedom, and is anathema to the powers of the state, and specifically those who execute citizens for dissent. Moreover, Zapata continues, the overthrow of all bad government is a combined effort of the idea and the sword. Therefore, it would be despotism to exclude any people who have the right to elect the government. The

sovereignty apparatus must include those organic intellectuals who could serve as leaders.

Those civilians who are accidentally armed must love liberty and justice, and must labor for the good of the country. The civilian population and those-who-are-accidentally-armed must be one and the same. The civilians are those who are more likely to keep their heads down and not subvert the system. The problem of those who resist by becoming animal is not the same as those of the people who are inside the pack. The civilian is a pack animal, while the accidentally armed is the anomalous border-crosser.

Citizens who work in the press and the tribunals are the revolutionaries whom Bolshevik Russia would call “cadres.” The Whites during the Russian Civil War, that is the people of the old order who would strive for the “fleeting rays of military glory,” could not be trusted and had to be made to follow orders from the cadres. It is important to remember, however, that Zapata presented this to the Supreme Revolutionary Convention in Aguascalientes in 1914 – ten years after the rise of the Petrograd Soviet, but also four years before the Bolsheviks could begin to re-train their Whites with people who had “fought in the press and in the tribunals.”

This common link suggests that Zapata grasped his moment and expressed a broad revolutionary internationalism. The 1914 Supreme Revolutionary Convention in Aguascalientes reflects the Revolutionary Petrograd Soviet of 1905. When the Mexican cadres fight in the press and in the tribunals, they become the same type of organic intellectuals who will be used four years later to re-train the Whites in the Russian civil war.

Point one emphasizes international conventions on war: “First. We have without fail carried out our military actions within the international conventions on war; we have received tacit recognition as a belligerent force, nationally and internationally. We will continue to comply with said agreements.” The EZLN has subscribed to all the international conventions on war. They do not explain immediately from whom they have received tacit recognition. But by recognizing the international conventions on war, they have de facto legitimized themselves as an army. In this way, they take on the dangers of the state. However, in the power vacuum of Southern Mexico, they also gain a certain amount of legitimacy. The EZLN faces the responsibilities of such legitimacy carefully and ethically by calling for monitoring. Fleeing with a weapon represents an exodus from the power system that the EZLN recognizes by subverting the hierarchy of the organizations like the army.

This gesture might cause the audience to think that war itself is something by which one receives recognition, which is dangerous because it leads them into thinking that the war itself might be something worth receiving recognition from. Second, it might explain to people in the vanguard of the future that there would be a future in which they might take power. The point is not to take power, as we have observed before, but rather to flee with a weapon. There an immense difference between these goals and the latter must be the foundation for any movement of movements.

Point two argues for a cease-fire:

Second. We order our regular and irregular forces everywhere in national and foreign territory to carry out a UNILATERAL EXTENSION OF THE OFFENSIVE CEASE-FIRE.

We will continue to respect the cease-fire IN ORDER TO PERMIT CIVIL SOCIETY TO ORGANIZE ITSELF IN WHATEVER FORMS IT CONSIDERS

## NECESSARY IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN OUR COUNTRY.

The EZLN recognizes that civil society is not possible during war, and calls for a cease-fire. By ceasing to fight, the EZLN argues, civil society will organize itself in pro-democratic form. By using the terms “offensive,” the EZLN prefers to waive its right to flee with a weapon. By involving both national and foreign territory, the EZLN blurs the sovereignty between Mexico and its contested province. Moreover, it blurs the line between the state of Mexico and that of Guatemala and between the subject of the Mexican Federal Government and that of Chiapas nationality.

Fourth, by using the phrase “regular and irregular forces,” the EZLN obfuscates the details of its operation and its numbers. Finally, the EZLN manages to allude to the international wings of its forces, including the fellow travelers in Ya Basta in the United States and the Yellow Overalls and Tute Bianchi (White Overalls) in Italy, Finland, and elsewhere. This last point is of particular importance for constructing vertical history.

We recall that the EZLN inspires these international organizations. The vertical audience is the inspiration and reception that proceeds from the Petrograd Soviet to Zapata’s Supreme Revolutionary Convention, from Zapata to the Zapatistas, from the Zapatistas’ call for “Ya Basta” (Enough Already) to the White Overalls of Italy and the Ya Basta Yellow Overalls of the U.S. This genealogy would include many others before and after Zapata. But here, I emphasize the EZLN’s legacy to its international wings and the latter’s participation in the Movement of Movements.

Point three concerns militarization. “Third. We condemn the threat hanging over Civil Society by the current militarization of the country, complete with specialized personnel and modern equipment of repression, on the eve of federal elections. There

is no doubt that the Salinas government is trying to impose itself via the culture of fraud. WE WILL NOT PERMIT IT.” The EZLN is an army that demands that there not be private armies and that all such armies should de-militarize. Forbidding militarization addresses the “specialized personnel” who can disrupt any citizen rally at any point.

Moreover, with the “modern equipment of repression,” the simian cyborg body has altered again and alters perpetually. Haraway defines the human as the primate who uses technology. But technological progress does not mean progress in humanism. In fact, Haraway is characterized as coming from the anti-humanist tradition as a post-humanist. The technological innovations of the informational war machine — riot gear, radios, and now databases, biometrics, and small cameras — act as “modern equipment of repression” that limits the simian aspects of protests and the militarization of the cyborg body. These subjects who wear body armor neglect crime fighting, and instead focus upon political repression as “specialized personnel.” Militarization of the weakness of the primate body is hypocritical because one set of cyborgs fights another less technologically updated set of cyborgs. When these cyborgs are stripped of their quality, though, they are all weak and common, like the people whose bodies they repress. It is in this moment that their “common humanity” emerges when the cyborg qualities of the war machine are subverted. In this way, the police officer’s power is performative and contingent on the degree of his cyborg relationship to his primate body. The EZLN does not want personnel to be militarized on the eve of an election.

On another level, militarization most threatens the multitude. The multitude cannot resist the military with stones. Instead, the EZLN wants to see that the country is not so heavily militarized both at a specific point and throughout its longer struggle. In this, the

EZLN calls for a change in tactics that will change strategy in a historic fashion. The effects of complaining against the militarization of one moment – the middle period of the EZLN – involves a discussion of militarization in general and of the population as it fights to possess defensive weapons, and to go to protests and direct action events without weaponry.

The military should redress grievances in other ways. The military needs to be fought by counter-military power. This will eventually make the structure crumble. Its power is crushed and the multitude flees while armed. Eventually the multitude will be armed and become much larger than the state. Once there are no technological advantages except for the arms themselves, the struggle will change. Someone will ask the army to fight against the multitude directly – to fire on the population. This will involve hundreds or thousands of people. When this happens, the population will turn and many of the soldiers will turn as well. Only the police force will remain with the state. As Lenin reminds us, this is the fundamental difference between the state and the army (*State and Revolution* 21) The police are a force of the state, while the army is a force of the nation.

The fourth point of the second declaration proposes that all of the independent political parties should declare that they are ready to form a government that could produce democracy: “Fourth. We propose to all independent political parties that they now recognize the state of intimidation and the lack of political rights that our people have suffered the past sixty-five years and that they declare themselves ready to form a government capable of the political transition to democracy.” The wording here is

careful: all independent political parties should recognize the reasons that the people need relief from the post-revolutionary consolidation.

Point four states that the people have suffered from intimidation and lack of political rights for sixty-five years. What we see involved in point four is the ability of the outsider and trainer once again to declare that it has a responsibility to become the border. In other words, the Zapatistas, who at this point are outside of the parliamentary process, can speak to those who are disenfranchised within it. These represent the border crossers. They are the figure of the outsider.

Moreover, point four acknowledges a political transition to democracy. It is important to recognize that while they begin with the call for parliament, they end with something else. The Russian Revolution began with a priest and a line of women seeking bread. Need is the fundamental driving force of existence. People do what is necessary for them at any given moment. What was most necessary for the Zapatistas was to get the PRI and its corrupt intimidating legacy removed from the Federal Capital. Besides that, it was clear that the Zapatistas had not allied themselves with any particular faction, but rather expected all political parties to struggle for democracy.

One would want to know whether they had an enthusiastic reception in the poorer provinces, and especially in Chiapas. We will return to this question in terms of subsequent manifestos. But what is interesting here is that, although the demands they make are by no means revolutionary, their tactics and strategy would lead them to a revolution like, Hardt and Negri's snake (*Empire* 52-9). The tactics and strategy reflect the undulating snake. By refusing to ally with a particular political group, the EZLN does

not behave like the mole with its underground political apparatus. Instead, it forms weak coalitions, which better reflect the flat undulations of the snake.

Point five concerns truth and morality: “Fifth. We denounce all the manipulation and the attempts to dissociate our just demands from those of the people of Mexico. We are Mexicans and we will not lay aside our demands nor our arms until Democracy, Liberty and Justice are achieved by everyone.” The simple fact that the Mexican government could use any apparatus to manufacture consent means that the population must have argued against the government. Moreover, the Mexican government, in accord with the U.S., would argue against the Zapatistas. The Zapatistas thus create a position that cannot separate itself from the other. In this way, they become both trainer/border and vanguard simultaneously. It is important that they be seen as a non-vanguard vanguard. By being called Sub-commander, Marcos has been able to dissociate himself from vanguardism. The manifesto is meant to be a different media savvy resource. The Zapatistas are better organized as a vanguard, but they also seem to disassociate themselves from such programs.

The establishment of civil society ended the war that had begun on December 31, 2003. Thus the Second Manifesto calls for the end the second military situation and the beginning of peaceful efforts toward Democracy, Liberty, and Justice. “Sixth. We reiterate our disposition to a political solution in the transition to democracy in Mexico. We call upon Civil Society to take on once again the central role it played in stopping the military phase of the war and to organize in order to conduct peaceful efforts toward Democracy, Liberty and Justice.” The end of the military phase in favor of the political phase does not appear to have happened in the way a Civil Society would expect. Civil

Society was to be given a voice after the military phase which gave the Zapatistas an international voice.

In point seven, the EZLN calls the honest elements to join in a national dialogue: “Seventh. We call the honest elements of Civil Society to a National Dialogue for Democracy, Liberty and Justice for all Mexicans.” This presupposes that certain elements, although not in power, might be part of civil society. Civil society here means that the Zapatista movement cedes power back to the towns, villages, cities, and camps and not only in Chiapas. The Zapatistas do not attempt to take power, but rather evacuate the places of power in favor of democracy. This influences the Movement of Movements in the most direct way possible, showing the people of the movement that this is possible.

#### **Continuance: Desire for Transition and Three Points of the Third Manifesto**

By the point of the third communiqué, the EZLN attempts to move from a post-war phase to a transitional period that involves recognition of the national symbols as expropriated by the resistance forces, recognition of the constitution of origin of 1917 (a once revolutionary document itself) as now transitional toward a new constitution, and a transitional government that could move toward democracy. “First, that the Motherland be taken from federal government custody. The Mexican flag, the justice system of the Nation, the Mexican Hymn, and the National Emblem will now be under the care of the resistance forces until legality, legitimacy and sovereignty are restored to all of the national territory.” The flag, hymn, and emblem are all pathos-based appeals to nationalism, and not a part of rational argument.

The resistance forces will hold these emblems under their care. In doing so, the resistance attempts to unify the nation behind the EZLN. The practical operational

definition of “under the care of the resistance forces” might be tenuous once legality, legitimacy, and sovereignty are restored through out the national territory. Legality here means that the law courts’ rulings would be followed. This means that the separate judiciary does not have to confront corruption. Legitimacy in this context means that government follows the revolutionary gains. The government party in power, the PRI, is an institution of the old revolution. The EZLN demands that this party be swept aside and that the other parties recognize the constitution of 1917. The short war was conducted in part to get the attention of the 65-year-old government, and to yank it back from the North American Free Trade Agreement that was bankrupting so much of Mexico and hitting farmers especially hard.

In this way, the EZLN does not appear internationalist but rather as Nationalist Revolutionaries who are struggling for independence. It is interesting that the Zapatistas who have inspired Ya Basta in the U.S. and the Yellow Overalls and the Tute Bianchi in Europe does not make demands independent from those of the nation. In this way, the EZLN offers a clarion call, but does not seek to take power. Instead many of their actions are symbolic – some of them as shows of force, and others as signs of solidarity. The EZLN, as a postmodern revolutionary force, presents itself as guardians of the gains of the 1917 revolution and generate ideas of civil society from that model. This seems to be a kind of reformist view in a leftist land.

Point two discusses the constitution of origin. “Second, the original Political Constitution of the United Mexican States is declared valid, as written on the 5th of February of 1917, with the incorporation of the Revolutionary Laws of 1993 and

inclusion of the Statutes of Autonomy for the indigenous regions, and will be held as valid until a new constitutional body is installed and a new constitution is written.”

Here the EZLN strikes a balance between demanding a new constitution and accepting the legitimacy of the old. This is akin to Lenin’s position in 1902 that revolutionaries should act simultaneously on two levels, the open and public legal level and the clandestine (106). The open public level would involve the old constitution, and would simply recommend that what had already been established by the revolution should remain in effect while the constitutional convention drafts a new document. On the other hand, the Clandestine level represents the legacy of the 12-day war in January 1994 and the ensuing conflict as the paramilitary forces formed and began to side with the government against the EZLN.

Point three calls for transition. The effects of this portion of point three of the third manifesto acts quite simply to liquidate the Party-State:

We call for the people of Mexico to struggle for recognition for "the transitional governments to democracy. These shall be social and political organizations, as they are defined by the distinct communities for themselves, which maintain the federal pact agreed upon in the 1917 Constitution, and which are included, without regard for religious creed, social class, political ideology, race, or sex, in the National Liberation Movement. The EZLN will support the civilian population in the task of restoring the legality, order, legitimacy and national sovereignty, and in the struggle for the formation and installation of a national transitional government for democracy with the following characteristics:

1. The liquidation of the system of Party-State and really separates the government from the PRI.
2. The reform of the electoral law in terms that guarantees: clean elections, legitimacy, equity, non-partisan and non- governmental citizen participation, recognition of all national, regional and local political forces, and that convenes new general elections in the federation.
3. The convening of a constitutional body for the creation of a new constitution

4. The recognition of the particularities of the indigenous groups, recognizing their right to inclusive autonomy and citizenship.

5. The re-orientation of the national economic program, putting aside lies and deceptions, and favoring the most dispossessed sectors in the country, the workers and the peasants, who are the principal producers of the wealth that others appropriate.

This will happen in less than five years – in part because of the Zapatistas' uprising.

However, the second point deems it necessary to reform electoral law in several ways.

First, it expresses a demand for clean elections. The PRI had won elections through corruption for decades. Second, the EZLN calls for a political mandate wherein everyone participates. Third, it calls for the laws to allow participation. Fourth, and this is quite interesting, the manifesto calls for non-governmental citizen participation which means something approaching direct democracy. Fifth, all local forces are to be recognized by the Federal State and the convention of new general elections in the Federal Republic.

Here the EZLN calls for a constitutional convention. This idea would be radical in the U.S. where some of the founders expected a convention every twenty years or so. But even in Mexico, this would create real instability which might aid the cause of anarchism. The indigenous people demand recognition that allows them both autonomy and citizenship. Finally, the communiqué mentions that the national economic policy should favor the most dispossessed. This lauds wealth production at the level of the local producer, and refuses to grant authority to NAFTA. The idea that wealth is being appropriated from the indigenous people toward the urban elites is, of course, not new. However, this radical change in the economy would probably actually bring revolution.

## Memory: The Tradition

As in the first three communiqués, the fourth begins with the phrase, “Today we say.”

TODAY WE SAY:  
WE ARE HERE  
WE ARE REBEL DIGNITY, THE FORGOTTEN OF THE HOMELAND  
January 1, 1996

This maintains the unity of the rhetorical trope. The introduction to the Fourth communiqué reproduces the first section of the First communiqué. However, in the fourth manifesto this also refers to rebel dignity. What does it mean that they cannot be visible to the Mexican community and especially to the Mexican government?

The following demand emphasizes commitment: “A political force which struggles against the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and against the centralization of power. A political force whose members do not have any other privilege than the satisfaction of having fulfilled its commitment.” The commitment is altruistic. This utilitarianism begins with need, but quickly expands toward a universal catholic need and a catholic love. This is the place where the movement must not falter. There are many communities in Mexico who have learned to speak the same language, the language of Castilian Spanish. But the communities in the southeast speak all of the languages that are not fully conquered. These people work the land. All of those communities, all those who work the land, are invited to stand on our side so that together we may give life to one sole struggle.

This communiqué refers to Zapata’s struggle in the second decade of the twentieth century. By 1912, the Northern revolution was unfolding near the U.S. border, while the southern revolution gained momentum. Both moved inward toward the capital.

Zapata implored the struggle to continue against capital because the land of the grandfathers had already done this – had already held the land:

We must continue to struggle and not rest until the land is our own, property of the people, of our grandfathers, and that the toes of those who have paws of rocks which have crushed us to the shadow of those who loom over us, who command us; that together we raise with the strength of our heart and our hand held high that beautiful banner of the dignity and freedom of we who work the land. (qtd in Manifesto, 3 par 1)

They simply wanted dignity and freedom but had difficulty during the Porfiriato – the period when Porfirio Diaz ruled in a dictatorship. The strength of the heart and of the hand is similar to Ché Guevara's injunction some fifty years later. (105). It also broadened the front, which is exactly what the EZLN attempts to do in this manifesto.

There is a strong moral injunction at play here. They must fight the men of the estates who have taken the land from the others – the Indians – and who have mocked the people from their estates and exploit their labor. If they want to be good and honorable men, then they need to continue to struggle.

We must continue to struggle until we defeat those who have crowned themselves, those who have helped to take the land from others, those who make much money with the labor of people like us, those who mock us in their estates. That is our obligation of honor, if we want to be called men of honesty and good inhabitants of our communities. (qtd in Manifesto 3 par 1)

This creates a kind of moral injunction that brings more people into the formation of the front.

Zapata then asks that they be more united than ever with their hearts, and that their undertaking maintain a fidelity to a good life:

Now then, somehow, more than ever, we need to be united, with all our heart, and all our effort in that great task of marvelous and true unity, of those who began the struggle, who preserve purity in their heart... (qtd in Communiqué 3 par 1)

Finally, Zapata argues that the manifesto be passed on and that it grow: "We beg that those who receive this manifesto pass it on to all the men and women of those communities" (qtd in Manifesto 3 par 1). In this last wish, the Zapatistas differ from Zapata. The Zapatistas begin to use the world wide web with the start of the second phase of their struggle, which coincides with the web's first stage and indicates the EZLN's commitment to media, technology, and innovative practices. The Zapatistas are clandestine. Zapata was not. Zapata was camera shy; the leader of the Zapatistas is not.

### **The Flower of the World**

The following quotation demonstrates for us the meaning of Ché Guevara's saying that revolutionary people are not like normal people and they may die early without the revolution but more often they die with the revolution itself. They are zealous because they know that any time that they have left is borrowed time from the moment that they take on the task of the revolution. In the following quotation the day will come when the revolutionary masked face will die but the rest of the earth cannot be killed: "the flower of the word will not die. The masked face which today has a name may die, but the word which came from the depth of history and the earth can no longer be cut by the ears with its cannons" (qtd in Manifesto 3 par 1).

Each of the grievances deploys a literary device. They identify the following needs: housing, land, employment, food, education, independence, democracy, liberty, justice and peace. They support this with grievances about the following actions of the government: it gives them lead and paper for their children rather than adequate food, destroys their homes and their history rather than giving them dignified shelter, promotes ignorance rather than knowledge, gives them cemeteries rather than land,

buys and sells their bodies and their shame rather than giving them just and dignified work, offers death as their future rather than life, imposes laws of the few on the many rather than respecting the right to sovereignty and self-government, builds jails and graves rather than honoring liberty of thought and way of life, employs criminals and assassins rather than promoting justice, proposes to erase history rather than recognizing the right to preserve it, dreams with the flag and the language of foreigners rather than supporting the homeland, announces war and destruction rather than promoting peace (par 8-20). The first – that the fight is caused by hunger – is true in any revolution. The fight for the roof puts us squarely in the first manifesto again. Each of the manifestos builds but this one returns as a kind of recapitulation of the struggle that had begun two years earlier. The third grievance for education and knowledge has not previously been emphasized separately. The grievance for the land as well as many of the other grievances are poetic. The right to full employment, which we will see again in the Porto Alegre manifesto, is a radical demand.

The fight for life sounds simple but it is not. This is not really the pragmatic campaign that others are concerned with pragmatism is not the same as the need for respect. In asking for dignity of thought, they demand not simply freedom of speech but an ontology not to be defined by the border.

The fight for justice is more abstract. Each of the ten material grievances listed above seem to center fundamentally around justice itself. “Our blood and our word have lit a small fire in the mountain and we walk a path against the house of money and the powerful. Brothers and sisters of other races and languages, of other colors, but with the same heart now protect our light and in it they drink of the same fire” (Ibid) The

fight for the homeland is a fight against imperialism. The fight for peace is for a biopolitical right. The demand that becomes a necessity is also part of the imagery because there is a long night of five hundred years. "Our blood and our word have lit a small fire in the mountain. Drink of the same fire." (Ibid) This manifesto begins to speak metadiscursively about the importance of language, and the purpose of language in making their existence possible.

### **Five Hundred Years**

The first phase called for a change in the original violent space. This gave way quickly to the National Liberation Movement. It took two years, however, for the NLM to begin to organize and to make real its proposals. In the second paragraph of the Fourth Communiqué the betrayal of the EZLN is mentioned (par 2). The government used both the army and the police to attempt to assassinate the leaders of the EZLN. The most powerful weapons that the EZLN have are political force and history. There were many left in jail. In order to salvage the organized crime of the government by the Mexican Federal Army, there were secret pacts as if selling the Mexican Nation.

The fourth communiqué suggests that the Mexican government behave like neo-conquerors. Their arrogance, racism, and constant humiliation attempted to exhaust the milieu of the EZLN, which did not happen. At the point of the secret pacts, groups were calling for a plebiscite for peace and democracy because the government refused to take on war directly. Never before had a peaceful civil society spoken with a clandestine armed group. This led to a series of conversations among different countries. The Zapatistas produced three initiatives: first, an international arena in opposition to neoliberalism; second, formation of civic committees; third, the

construction of the new Aguascalientes as a place for encounters between civil society and Zapatismo.

The Zapatistas quickly called for an intercontinental festival, which enabled the movement to jump to the center of Empire. After the festival, the EZLN begins to expand into a front. The EZLN first calls for a broad opposition movement that could encounter and coordinate united actions. This made clear that it did not aspire to take power. This is important because it represents one of the first modern political movements that did not aspire to take power. In fact, we recall that in an earlier communiqué, the EZLN planned to march on the capital. It becomes clear that the EZLN was in the middle of a shift within its thinking, working through these conditions as it progressed. The original simple language of the EZLN is in fact more complex than it first seems.

The call for “a space where popular wills may encounter and coordinate united actions with one another” (Par 3) is a call not only to Frontism but to the formation of what will soon become the Movement of Movements. The EZLN attempts to define the new National Liberation Front as the following:

A political force which can organize the demands and proposals of those citizens and is willing to give direction through obedience. A political force which can organize a solution to the collective problems without the intervention of political parties and of the government. We do not need permission in order to be free. The role of the government is the prerogative of society and it is its right to exert that function. (Par 4)

We do not need the force to be one that exerts itself; rather we participate through obedience. Moreover, this new force not only takes orders from the people but it asserts freedom with the movement.

The following position discusses the commitment of a strong insurgency: “A political force which struggles against the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and against the centralization of power. A political force whose members do not have any other privilege than the satisfaction of having fulfilled its commitment” (Par 5). Moreover, the commitment is one of altruism which is closely aligned. This utilitarianism quickly expands beyond need toward a catholic love. This is the change. This is the place where the movement must not falter.

Those who rise organically in each country and who are part of the Movement of Movements build upon what is found in the communiqués of the EZLN. The lack of hierarchy transforms them into those who do not seek to take power, but rather claim sovereignty in new ways. If one can understand the part that the Zapatistas play in the Movements of Movements, then one will be able to better understand the development of network resistance movements in the twenty-first century. If one grasps the abilities of network-based movements in the struggle against hegemony, then communities can be structured around the new type of activism – one that resembles more direct action than protest. If one continues to conduct activism along vertical hierarchical structures rather than around the horizontally networked ones, then one cannot help build the communities of resistance that are so necessary. Theory itself suffers when the hierarchical elements flourish.

“In this revolution, no plans have been written for retreat.”

– Martin Luther King

CHAPTER 5  
“A RIEGO DE PARECER RIDÍCULO”: PORTO ALEGRE

Those who hate most fervently must have once loved deeply; those who want to deny the world must have once embraced what they now set on fire.

– Kurt Tucholsky

Those who make peaceful revolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable.

– John F. Kennedy, White House Speech, 1962.

**Introduction**

When many citizens of the Global Eight nations view television footage of the Movement of Movements, they probably meet the images with confusion: *what* are these people protesting? Perhaps comments about the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, or the World Trade Organization float by. Moreover, it is not certain where one can find a document that represents the Movement of Movements. A manifesto may become the blue-print of an ontologically distinct moment in world history; or like most manifestos, it might be consigned to a historical footnote. If the Movement of Movements lacks a unifying voice against Empire, it will lose the ethical force that has been building since 1968. Without a voice, the movement will stammer and splinter and act out not simply defensive violence as it flees, but violence against both itself and the state. Finally, if manifestos of the movement are not taken seriously by scholars, it is possible that the new post-critical phase of philosophy that Hardt and Negri discuss in *Empire* will dissolve back into critique, and all feasible solutions will be rejected once more. It is in this context that the significance of the Porto Alegre Manifesto comes to the fore. This document creates a cogent blue-print for the

movement. As a product of the World Social Forum, the Porto Alegre Manifesto grants much to the Movement of Movements. It grants legitimacy and materializes the concerns of the multitude.

The new ontological horizon is difficult to perceive because many of the demands do not appear radical. For example, the call for a new tax, while systemic, would not create revolutionary change. Yet, today the World Social Forum's alignments also do not represent mainstream political thought. The signatories to the WSF have built their points upon the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights; but, unlike the U.N.D.H.R., they do not stem from negative rights. Rather, they are politically constructive and ontologically present. Moreover, this manifesto is international, and thus differs from those of the 1960s and 1970s in that it is more capable of representing a global class. First, the Porto Alegre Manifesto acts as a double, an outsider, and a trainer to the general population and, more specifically, to the World Economic Forum. Second, although certain resolutions seek to reform the world economy, their effects would be revolutionary if enacted. The economic resolutions represent a majority of the manifesto and any revolutionary potential is buried in the small details of economic security. Third, the manifesto boldly states the last resolutions, concerning peace, justice, and reforms to democracy. Each of these present some bold techniques – the fighting of discrimination, the end of environmental destruction, and the dismantling of all foreign military bases. If one recognizes the significance of the Porto Alegre Manifesto, one can use systems theory and critical discourse analysis to grasp how the demands of the Porto Alegre Manifesto rhetorically and historically position themselves. The horizon of change reaches us with internal tensions. The Movement of Movements

brings forth a postmodern revolution-of-the-common which ontologically differs from anything else in history and brings with it unique contradictions, paradoxes, and aporias.

This [name?] is the problem of the entire opening of the Porto Alegre manifesto. The writers of the manifesto have managed to concisely document many ideas in support of the actual proposals, but they have omitted the origins of those ideas and the logistical implementation that would be involved. The proposals obey the law of concision; but because it omits much of what most readers would need to grasp the system, the document risks alienating the public as well.

## **Twelve Proposals for Another Possible World**

### **Debt Cancellation**

Cancel the public debt of countries in the South; which has been paid on various occasions and is the best way for creditor States (international financial establishments and institutions) to force most of humanity to accept their protection and, in turn, prolong people's misery).

In order for the effects of debt cancellation to work, the nations that owe the debt would have to change their governments. Specifically, developing nations would need to use funds to raise the standard of living for the populations. Through the IMF, World Bank, and WTO, the G8 must continue the apparatus in order for the accountability that debtor governments bring to finance capital; debtor nations could embezzle funds if they were not regulated by the same apparatus that brings the debt into the funds in the first place. This would entail creating some form of special group, like the World Bank, who would enforce the development of those nations. Debt would need to be reinstated from the people downward rather than from the people upward.

Under the current system, the assumption is that the people as a mass benefited from the funds that the nation incurred as debt. Consequently as a mass, the people

are responsible for the debt of the nation. But in actuality the people have not benefited from the funds. All too often, the funds pass from the elite to the people, with the elite receiving a disproportionate amount. If this is the case, then the elite should pay the majority of the debt. Instead, as we will see below, through tax havens and through the lack of regulation of financial transactions, the majority of the debt begins with the people and then only those portions which the people do not pay are paid by the elite.

The proposed solution might alienate manifesto readers because they will not necessarily believe it. The solution assumes structures that the manifesto does not mention. The word, "external," assumes that the World Bank should maintain the internal debts of the countries of the global south. The proposal would most likely generate wealth for the citizens of these nations. The local financial institutions would need to address wealth beyond race or class interests. However, the international institutions suggest wealth beyond the nation-state. The creditor states have less control over the corporate systems. By focusing on the problem of money in these ways, debt becomes a substitute for capital as a new form of machinic, or reified wealth.

Assuming that some form of social activism other than revolution could neutralize corrupt leaders, the problem then becomes the circulation of this newly unfixed form of capital. This assumes that what should be done can be done without disrupting the entire system and creating another. The rhetorical history of what Benjamin describes as the dialectical image, assumes the act of living under occupation and under imperialism.

This presents the nation as concept that is unchanging and transcendent. The image of the nation does not account for ancestors, whether that nation is a debtor

nation or a lender nation. In this phantasmagoric model, one assumes that subjects' ancestors actually incurred debt, rather than the corrupt leaders. Second, subjects are then responsible for the debts of their ancestors because it is national debt and the nation is unchanging. If we explore the rhetorical history of image—in this case the pre-industrial or industrializing nation—we begin to grasp movement and change. By recognizing the image of a given debtor nation, we recognize that its representation has meant different things at different points in history. Its national subjects differ radically from each other in the present and differ from those in the past. This is of course true for representations of lender nations and their subjects as well. We will see this same logic at work in the environmental proposal. In both cases, the phantasmagoric image, or the failure to recognize the dialectical image continues to reproduce the same hierarchies and inequalities.

The dialectical image demonstrates that the living developing world subject, the other, has not created the debt – the accumulated wealth of capital owed to the Western corporate subject – but rather that such reified capital lies in the relationship between the ancestors of the corporate subject and the developing world.

These ancestral myths create two dialectics with four entities: the subject, which is contemporary, corporate, male, Western, and voiced; the other, which is contemporary, peasant, often female, of the global South, and whose voice is not represented; the subject's own ancestral other, which is past, imperialist, male, Western, and voiced; and the other's ancestor, which is past, peasant, female or male, of the global South, and whose voice is represented by another other, the "corrupt leader." In this myth, the other's ancestor and the contemporary other merge into one

historical other that owes the debt. In this myth, the other's ancestor and the other do not differ. Thus the debts that the developing nation has incurred through false leadership and corruption can now be abrogated to the other's ancestor, and from there to the other.

The corporate subject assumes that the other's ancestor is not equal to himself, when in actuality, the perceptions of the subject's ancestral other merely obfuscate centuries of exploitation. The myth erases the other's ancestor except in one key way: the other's ancestor serves to continue the othering process by telling the corporate subject that it can imagine another time when its own ancestor, the ancestral other, carried a "white man's burden:" that is, the other's ancestor needed to be civilized.

This lie is exposed in the manifesto. "Cancel the external debt of southern countries, which has been already paid many times over, and which constitutes the privileged means of creditor states [...]." In other words, the debt has historical significance and origins, and has been "paid" both in principal and in the suffering of the governed.

### **Tobin Tax**

Apply international taxes/rates to financial transactions (especially applying the Tobin tax/rate on speculative transactions on currency), to direct foreign investment, to consolidated profits of transnational corporations, to the sale of arms, and to activities that emit gases that contribute to global warming.

The Tobin Tax suggests a new ontology against neoliberalism. It suggests that in the future, the dismal science will no longer measure an economy. The Tobin tax proposal exemplifies how the writers of the manifesto have thought extensively about systemic problems and have distilled their thoughts. This tax on financial transactions would generate funds for government and "public" projects. The proposal would make

irrelevant the current technique of circumventing national tax laws. In the language of Badiou's *Ethics*, the proposal represents a break with Keynesianism, which itself represented a break with liberal capital. Neoliberalism represented a break with that break. The financial proposals of Porto-Alegre thus represent a break with the neoliberal break.

Yet, the proposal does not accuse the neoliberal proponents of anything; rather, it solves a problem whose cause is not stated. In this way it offers a positive rhetorical gesture rather than a negative one. This rhetorical gesture represents what Hardt and Negri refer to as the end of the deconstructive phase of critical thought and the beginning of a new phase of ontologically productive thought, one that began in 1994 with the Zapatistas and Tute Bianchi. Like its other proposals, the Tobin tax proposal seeks to lift the world out of poverty by catching the root of neoliberalism – the abrogation of cost, which in this case represents the cost to society of corporations avoiding taxes. In an ontologically productive and almost polite manner, the proposal offers a way to circumvent the abrogation of cost.

A limited analysis displaces total value with exchange value and does not convert exchange value into use value, which biases the system toward certain priorities. Thus, when economists rely only on market exchange value, they calculate only profits and those costs that impact upon immediate profit, but they can never calculate greater costs that the market cannot measure. The manifesto writers do not judge the capitalists. But they also do not enumerate as value those costs that the capitalists attempted to abrogate. Moreover, the writers do not identify how governments should spend the funds from those taxes, which is a question posed by the new economics.

Second, this analysis needs to figure – in a gesture of cognitive mapping – greater costs to society so that a global movement could use such a tax to ameliorate those costs. The Tobin tax reform attaches an exchange value to everything in order to covertly attach a use value, which the world remunerates as exchange value. If the world implemented the Tobin tax, it would trigger a vast economic transformation. The Tobin tax would end abrogation without criticism and without any negativity. The Tobin tax simply solves the problem.

Hardt and Negri concern themselves with the dismal science because they do not want to focus on exchange value but rather on use value. Use value represents the last stage – the withered-state and communism – which no one can perceive. The writers of the manifesto do not provide the background that explains why the economic system needs the Tobin tax nor do they discuss exchange value and use value. They request that the audience reckon the value of life through tax – converting use value into exchange value. The cost for each transaction would differ, and would mean a different tax proportionately for each group of transactions on the grounds that they produce different costs in converting use value to exchange value. More importantly, manifestos do not explain why they are taxing transactions. They know that taxes could be assessed on each and every transaction as a flat tax rather than a proportionate tax. They implicitly authorize the discussion of converting use value into exchange value.

### **Tax Havens**

Progressively dismantle all kinds of fiscal, legal and banking havens, which are nothing more than refuges for organized crime, corruption and all kinds of trafficking, fraud and fiscal evasions, and opportunities for company and government complicity.

With the abolition of tax havens, corporations would find it more difficult to abrogate cost, which is the fundamental effect of neoliberalism in general making costs appear elsewhere. For example, a U.S.-based multi-national energy corporation might seek to abrogate the costs of stabilizing the petroleum fields of a country that would oppose the practice by appealing to the U.S. government to use the military. This would allow the corporation to obtain the benefits of stabilized fields without paying for them. The corporation might succeed in petitioning the U.S. government to commission a military force that would consist of mercenaries via another corporation, like a private military contractor. Whether the U.S. used the military or a corporate force, taxes would cover the costs. The oil corporation would then benefit from a double abrogation: the expenses that stabilize the oil fields that should have cost the corporation would instead cost citizens through taxes. The corporation's portion is abrogated through corporate tax law and through U.S. Congressional enactments in the U.S. federal tax code.

The tax haven also helps the corporation avoid its costs as an individual person. Moreover, the tax haven helps hide illegal trafficking, fraud, and black operations. The manifesto notes that tax havens exist within the legislation of developed countries and thus we can imagine islands, both physical—purchased with hidden money—and figurative—created by the federal tax code.

Like the Tobin tax, a tax on the havens would impede the abrogation of cost. In this case, unlike in the case of transaction taxes, the Tax Haven proposal would eliminate the shelters altogether. This would lead to a greater transparency, not only among the corporations but also among the governments who make use of slush funds.

## Right to Full Employment

Ensure that each person has a right to work, to receive social security and to retire, respecting the equality between men and women, this being imperative for national and international public policy.

In the *Grundrisse* and *Capital* Volume One, Marx discusses the lumpenproletariat as part of the surplus army of labor. The figure of the surplus army of labor changes the discussion from the lumpenproletariat in several ways. First, Marx saw the lumpenproletariat as a backward workforce that differed from the proletariat, could not act as a vanguard, and could not lead to a revolution. This representation of the nineteenth century lumpenproletariat suggests self-alienation that differs in degree from the self-alienation of the proletariat. One might represent the nineteenth century argument in twenty-first century rhetoric: the lumpenproletariat suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder, involving family environment, ignorance and poverty, lack of upward mobility, the growth of inequality, and a gap between themselves and the working-class. Today we also use another category, the “Working Poor,” to discuss the permeable link between those who have jobs without security and those who do not have jobs.

Second, Marx perceives the surplus army of labor as a downward drag upon wages. Furthermore, the government expropriates a portion of the wage in tax. Most importantly, the employer expropriates a larger portion of the surplus labor value for profit. Thus, the wages arrive late with portions doubly expropriated. The drag upon wages suppresses the market exchange value for a given surplus labor. It also removes another portion of the exchange value and returns it to the capitalist as profit as well. If this remainder were not abrogated, it would return to the public. This other abrogation of

cost works as a second expropriation. This second expropriation removes from the potential collective surplus labor value its own force and nullifies it.

Thus, when the manifesto proposes full employment, it attempts to remove this second expropriation. This expropriation existed under imperial capitalism. But it becomes more prevalent under neoliberalism. This second abrogation asks to account for the costs of productive activities in the global south and the labor value of the larger populace, especially of the poor—who constitute a super majority in the global south—the working poor—who comprise a growing portion of the working class in the global north—the working class, and the lower middle class—a group largely ignored by Global Eight standards.

We then see a third abrogation from west to global south. The third abrogation of cost involves the removal of western and northern workers from the vanguard of class warfare when the worker of these regions joins the capitalist in the class warfare against the workers of the global south. The divide of worker against capitalist regresses, creating the struggle of rich against poor or haves against have-nots. There is significant difference in these diverse groups. The poor in the north and west suffer from obesity. The poor in the south suffer from hunger, which is the most extreme form of poverty because the subject must spend most of their time at acquiring basic subsistence. The working poor in the north suffer from lack of security or healthcare. Members of the working-class in the north who possess job security, but lack education and cannot participate in the information labor economy in the same way as their non-laboring middle-class counterparts may. The working-class in the south possesses no job security because neoliberalism has eliminated their job security. The lower middle-

class in the north suffer from the problem of upward mobility. The lower middle-class in the south are rarer and fit into a middle-class hierarchy that blurs the distinction between upper and lower middle-class. The four classes in the south thus affect the surplus army of labor in new ways.

The abrogation of cost develops by driving wages down collectively by converting its use value into an exchange value and also by keeping a remainder for profit. The effects of this are several. First, of course, the capitalist takes the labor power and converts it into a certain fixed amount of labor. A second exploitation happens when the capitalist converts the discrete labor from its use value into exchange value, because at this point, and in the same instant, he reserves a remainder for himself as profit. Use value becomes exchange value and in the process is skimmed.

The third exploitation is more abstract because it involves collective surplus labor power – what Marx refers to when he names the surplus army of labor. The capitalist uses the threat of reserve labor power to regulate the market. This allows him to skim the conversion of a second remainder of exchange value from his employee's labor. The first remainder originates with the employee's labor. This second remainder develops as the market mediation of the perceived labor power of the unemployed. If they were employed – if there were full employment as the manifesto demands (the demand of the Porto Alegre manifesto) then the second remainder could not be taken.

The fourth exploitation occurs when the process of the market mediation of the surplus army of labor is repeated. But now, when the process starts in the north, it repeats in the global south. This abrogation of cost repeats on a collective level by replacing a northern surplus army of labor with outsourced labor of the Global South.

This affects them collectively many times more than it would in the north or west because much more of the population are poor and working poor. The surplus army of labor concentrates in the global south. Out-of-date minimums protect their wages and prevent the ethical threat of the worst, hunger. Thus, the second remainder of the south dwarfs the north.

## **Fair Trade**

Promote all forms of commercial justice by rejecting the World Trade Organization free-trade regulations, and by implementing mechanisms that permit the processes of production that bring goods and services more progressively to a new level of social norms (as per the recommendations of the International Labour Organization (ILO)), totally exclude education and health, social services and culture from the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the WTO. The convention on cultural diversity that is being negotiated in U.N.ESCO right now should explicitly claim the right of culture over the right of commerce.

The Fair trade proposal implies that current fair trade agreements do not function. The World Trade Organization has proposed laws that contravene the general rights of society. Mechanisms could equalize social and environmental norms involved in producing goods and services. The manifesto suggests the WTO should exclude education, health, social services and culture from the scope of the General Agreement on Trades and Services (GATS). If the world excused health, education, social services, and culture from the GATS, this would effectively end neoliberalism. The manifesto seeks to stop neoliberalism from attacking the agricultural and the cultural (Hardt and Weeks 249-50). Hardt and Negri note the end of formal subsumption and the beginnings of real subsumption occur when that which was not capitalist becomes part of capitalism (*Empire* 255). Education, health, social services, and culture should not be part of capitalism, but should be treated as biopolitical production. This will lead to a kind of enclave temporarily until enough counter power can be achieved whereby the

workers in these sectors will be able to accumulate abundance and after living without capital in remunerated life will be able to live without capital in non-remunerated life as well. Such a proposal implies an exodus such as Virno and Hardt and Negri discuss.

However, currently only reformist positions support a proposal for equitable trade because the latter also supports profit. The manifesto does not mention a barter system or regression of capitalism from neoliberalism. Instead, the proposal attempts to restore Keynesian economics. The manifesto wants to promote free trade in ways that would lift three billion people from poverty. The UNESCO convention on cultural diversity suggests that cultural and political rights of public culture must prevail over commercial rights. This would not only lift people from poverty, but also value them as humans.

However, the manifesto is not a reactionary document because it proposes rights that during the Keynesian period were perceived as impossible. This manifesto orients toward the future. It offers not only what Jameson has referred to as an archeology of the future, but also an archeology of the past, reviving certain aspects of Keynesianism that seem to work to protect people. By favoring cultural rights and public cultural support, the manifesto supports these beings, these ontologies, over property.

### **Food Security**

Guarantee the right of each country to nutritional sovereignty and security by promoting rural agriculture. This assumes complete suppression of the subsidies on the exportation of farm products by the United States and the European Union, and the possibility of taxing imports in order to stop dumping practices. In the same way, each country or group of countries should be able to decide individually to prohibit the production and importation of genetically-altered foodstuffs.

The food security proposal is the most revolutionary of the economic claims because if the majority of the people of the world concerned themselves with activities other than finding food, creative productive expression would explode. The proposal

suggests a new ontological economics that could “feed the world” – a new kind of abundance economy. The proposal would fully displace exchange value with use value.

The idea of abundance without measure has existed since approximately 1980. Perhaps if a permanent state of global war had not taken place, the world could have been fed earlier. Instead of producing standing armies, within a few decades, direct upward mobility would take place in the developing world. This would produce what Hardt and Negri have referred to as political love (*Empire* 41). Western subjects would gain strong bonds with others.

Allowing people to grow their own food means that the people would have sovereignty and security and would be better prepared to oppose neoliberal capitalism. Although this proposal is the most radical of the economic proposals, even it is not truly revolutionary. Instead, it attempts to set itself against neoliberal practices, allowing the people to export agricultural products, and tax imports to avoid dumping practices that devalues goods. By promoting peasant rural agriculture rather than the corporate agriculture industry, the world could stop the practices by which the U.S. and the E.U. subvert the export of agricultural products.

In many places since 2006, food shortage riots have emerged. Money in the U.S. farm bill and money in the subsidies of farms enables the U.S. to pay farmers not to plant crops. Like healthcare, food should move from the private to the common. Instead, the common demand has been institutionalized through planting subsidies, which corrupt market forces. The manifesto argues that people should be able to grow their own food, but also that farmers in nations should be able to feed non-growers.

Those who live in areas where it is not possible to grow food should produce other goods and services.

## **Patenting**

Prohibit all “patents on the mind” and on living things (be they people, animals or plants), in the same way as with the privatization of people’s common goods, namely water.

The proposal suggests several types of patenting, including “patenting of the mind.” This includes the patenting of intellectual property. Napster created one such example of the original patenting problem involving the downloading of media in a format that the holders of the patents had not anticipated. This format has now been largely re-privatized but a percentage of media is still downloaded for free. The discussions around cultural formations like Napster have meant that intellectuals and other writers have begun to take positions on a creative commons. In this space lies the potential for transforming the publishing of all ideas in all formats. Indeed the form in which this dissertation resides and most documents that discuss the creative commons remain in some form privatized. I am thinking here most obviously of *Empire*, which remains in print and has no creative commons equivalent outside of “pirated” versions on the world wide web. The manifesto is part of a movement objecting to the privatization of media. Corporations have sought to limit the Google project from granting on-line access to those books that remain in the private domain for seventy years, and which most likely represent all contemporary ideology in which a reading public would want to partake.

Forbidding patents on life would drastically affect the human genome project. Bio-technology corporations have created a politics of fear. Some scientists have

attempted to map parts of the genome in private while mapping other parts in public. The proposal reacts to those historic inequalities.

The manifesto also reacts to the water wars that began during the 1970s. During the nineteenth century, water rights in the West were not as intensely contested as they are today because there were not enough people residing there yet. As the U.S. and Canada fully consolidated themselves, the problems of water rights rose. Water rights became contested as the inlets of the nations began to develop. The manifesto devotes a subsection to the privatization of water, which has become an increasing problem throughout the world. The privatization of access to water is in some sense the privatization of the body itself in the most profound of ways. The body is more than sixty percent water and water is required for most biological processes. Although the need for food is common, the means by which to obtain food are diverse. On the other hand, the need for water is common and the means by which to obtain it are extremely limited.

One might argue that the privatization of the common is a form of bio-power as control over the means of life. The privatization of water is a particularly egregious form of biopower because water is necessary for all forms of life and is essential to so many human processes. This also means, however, that the privatization of water is a politically potent and dangerous effect of Empire. And this danger affects not only the subjects under Empire, but because of its intolerable state in regulating a necessity, this danger also potentially could challenge Empire.

The privatization of animals and other plant life is connoted to the privatization of traditional medicine and other palliatives. The patenting proposal reacts to the

privatization of medicinal plants. Some cases involve plants that indigenous peoples have used for long periods of time and which they can no longer use in the same ways or cannot transport because the genetic structures of those plants have been mapped by corporations. The corporations who hold the patents on genetic mapping hold patents on the use of those plants for medicinal purposes. This is real subsumption as the common use value is converted into exchange value. The uses of non-medicinal plants are still use-values—beauty, stopping erosion, etc.—but they are rarely patented because they cannot be readily converted into exchange value.

The privatization of animal and plant life is thus also the privatization of the global commons. It is a great injustice to the indigenous peoples of the Global South who rely upon these animals and plants. The most common of these includes the privatization of common lands and seed. In the case of land and seed, it is the privatization of the production of food. Corporations hold patents on genetically modified seed and in some cases attempt to prevent farmers from saving seed — a practice that is as common to humanity as agriculture. The proposal argues that it is not fair to privatize that which belongs to all.

### **Public Policy to Fight Discrimination**

Above all, fight for different public policies against all kinds of discrimination, sexism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and racism; fully recognize the political, cultural and economic (including the regulation of natural resources) rights of indigenous communities.

This proposal short circuits complicated histories of various terms. The first part of the proposal specifies four types of discrimination, beginning with general discrimination. By leading with general discrimination rather than ending with it, the proposal emphasizes the common aspect of the victimization of discrimination. This

small gesture of reverse synecdoche is a figurative trope of the Movement of Movements itself, which emphasizes the common in the same moment that it emphasizes the absolute necessity of radical difference.

By stating these grievances negatively, the proposal attempts to regulate the symptoms rather than proposing ontologically productive solutions. In this sense, like the environmental proposal, the discrimination proposal belongs to the earlier legacy of critique. But perhaps this departure is wise for the manifesto. In order to produce constructive suggestions about difference, the proposal would need to clear a space for each of these differences to flourish. The manifesto seeks to create a space where difference would be acceptable. Each of these differences are social constructions that do not serve biopolitical rights.

Ending discrimination is another example of the Leninist principle of the widening of the democratic sphere during times of relative political openness. This proposal would affect indigenous people whose political, economic, and cultural rights have been curtailed. It would expand the venues in which organizing could take place. Regulating xenophobia must accompany plans for an education system that does not leave the citizens of a nation fearing that they will lose their jobs.

The second part of the proposal focuses directly upon the indigenous. By spending fifty percent of its language on the indigenous, the proposal emphasizes that indigenous peoples represent the most radically subaltern of global peoples. As we will see in the environmental proposal, the indigenous are the poorest of the poor and represent the legacies of the inequalities of industrialization. By devoting more space and time to the indigenous, the proposal demonstrates one of its rhetorical and

philosophical strategies: enough rhetoric has been spent on the represented, the wealthy, the state-protected, the sovereign, the fed, those with access to a high environmental standard of living, the militarily powerful, those with communication access, those with some access to democratic processes, and so forth. In order to apply justice to the problems of the world, more time, energy, and rhetoric has to be spent on those with few resources.

Because the manifesto states its grievances negatively here and does not recommend ontologically productive examples, I have found it useful to provide such an example in the U.S. in the form of reparations. This proposal centers around racism, xenophobia, and discrimination against “indigenous people.” Reparations would address the economic forces of U.S. racism against African-Americans by rectifying the economic inequalities caused by slavery. Reforming the Department of Indian Affairs would create a protective space that would also lead to a policy that could have a similar effect as the Reparations proposal. If Native Americans were granted reparations for the thirteen broken treaties of the U.S. during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there would be far less economic inequality. The U.S. would also need to recognize the legacies of the 1848 Treaty. Many Chicana families would benefit from reparations that corrected the inequalities brought about by the 1848 annexation.

The manifesto has created these sorts of possibilities and the ability to think in ontologically productive ways with each of the concepts that would otherwise remain in the earlier form of critique. By focusing upon the direct communication of the negative critique in over-determined concepts, etc., the proposal allows the reader to suggest

greater possibilities that might link race to class once the obstruction of discrimination has been removed.

## **Environment**

Take urgent measures to put an end to the destruction of the environment and to the threat of serious climate change brought on by global warming, and exacerbated by the excessive use of individual transportation and non-renewable energy. We must begin to instate another model of development rooted in energy conservation and the democratic control of natural resources, especially drinking water.

The environmental movement has begun to organize and hold power in certain parliaments. They constitute a large contingent of the Movement of Movements and some of their members promote sustainability along with worker rights and labor issues, both domestically and publicly throughout the world. But in the G8 countries, often the environmental movement fails to attach labor concerns to the resources that it tries to protect. However, when it has linked sustainability to labor, the Movement of Movements has greatly benefited from environmentalism's high visibility.

In the G8, industrialization mitigates the effects of environmental degradation and does not directly affect most workers' means of making a living. These two factors contribute greatly to the separation between environmental and work grievances in the Global North. Thus, what is a flat concern in the Global South, biopolitical grievances concerning how one works and lives, is instead separate in the Global North.

Often the rhetoric in the Global North will distinguish between "developed" and "developing" nations. This repeats the cold war categories of First, Second, and Third World nations, but subsumes nations of the second, obsolete category after the supposed victory over Communism into the first or third category. The First World nations usually meant the U.S. and its industrialized allies. Second World nations were

the allies of the Soviet Union and, in some cases, non-aligned nations, both of which were mostly partially-industrialized nations. The phrase, “Third World Nations,” remains and continues to refer to what is more frequently known by the politically correct phrase, “developing nations,” meaning industrializing and pre-industrializing nations.

We see the inequalities masked by these distinctions in the authorized rhetoric of environmental degradation that lately centers on concerns about global warming. Such concerns fail to call attention to the inherent inequality of the uneven development of capitalism by focusing on regulating current emitter nations. Much of the carbon in the atmosphere was emitted since the 1990s; but even more was emitted before the 1970s by the G8.

Since neo-liberalism, China and others have begun to industrialize. However, emissions increased since globalization mostly because the industrialized nations were emitting more, not simply because China and others had begun to emit. The industrialized nations have two legacy costs, while China and the others have one much smaller legacy cost. The industrialized nations have an industrializing legacy cost and a cost since industrialization. China and the others only have the former.

If the “developed” nations were to act on their legacy costs of carbon emissions to the planet, then the “developing” nations would benefit immensely. Inequality would decrease along with emissions. If world administrators were to do this within national sovereignty, rather than by regulating corporations, they would need to estimate historical emissions nation by nation. This analysis would create a new taxonomy that did not simply regulate current emitter nations but would create a category of emitters who emit today and have emitted for over a century.

In the poorer nations, environmental movements sometimes promote workers' rights because the grievances concerning environment degradation affect local standards of living. Extremely low standards of living center around workers' rights to living wages. This nexus of low standards of living links environmental degradation to the right to a living wage. In the Global South, there is less industrialization to mitigate the effects of poor environmental conditions. Such conditions more immediately translate into poor living conditions.

### **Foreign Military Bases**

“Demand the dismantling of foreign military bases and the expulsion of their troops except those serving under an official United Nations mandate.”

Of all the political demands of the manifesto, this one is the most far-reaching for several reasons. First, dismantling military bases would eliminate the ontological possibility of Empire. Of the one hundred and eighty foreign nations, the United States holds military bases within approximately one hundred and thirty – some seventy percent. This percentage does not include military bases of the allies, which act as a set of foreign military bases for Empire as well. Noam Chomsky has called Israel a U.S. aircraft carrier. These military bases create the administration – what Negri has described, in *Revolution Retrieved*, as wealth at the power of command – through which Empire must operate (34). Empire's sovereignty management cannot be addressed with some other system. Military bases in the foreign countries represent dark colonialism that appears strong and supple but is actually fragile and which must constantly address challenges to its authority throughout the world.

This dark side of the legacies of colonialism leaves us with the vestiges of a combination of inherited British hegemony and a long conflict against the Soviet Union

and the People's Republic of China. In the twenty-first century, Empire does not equate to Imperialism that began for the United States with the assassination of William McKinley. As Hardt and Negri have noted, Empire de-centers the mechanisms of world control (*Empire* xii-xiv). This control emanates from multiple centers, and operates as a non-place of exploitation. However, we cannot ignore the significance of the U.S. military bases, which, in their own way, echo earlier British hegemony.

### **Corporate and Alternative Media**

Guarantee the right to information for all citizens by means of legislation that: a) puts an end to the concentration of resources among a few exclusive communication giants; b) guarantees autonomy for journalists before shareholders; c) favors non-for-profit press outlets, particularly alternative and community-based ones. The respect of these rights implies civil checks-and-balances, particularly in the form of national and international media watchdog groups.

Although in the G8, corporations have dominated the common airwaves, they have also begun to concentrate media in the developing world. For example, in Mexico, corporate newspapers have already begun their take-overs. Mexican television shows often reflect a distribution that is similar to the one that Chomsky has noted in the U.S. – eighty percent of the programming serves as distraction and twenty percent is meant to obtain the consent of the upper echelon of the governed.

This proposal calls for legislation and civil checks and balances as the means by which three demands will be met. The call for legislative regulation implies that these demands can be met by civil society in the widening of the democratic spheres of circulation. Some militants might perceive this as a naïve position, although it actually strengthens positions during repressive moments when clandestine operations would be needed. The state cannot completely narrow those positions or strangle communication networks when proposals like this one have been met. The point

demands that legislators and watch dog groups control the process and rectify three grievances. The overall-effect of the proposal would be to create a body of research from which citizens could construct their own narratives of a given event. This already occurs because citizens might construct their narratives of an event from one or two news outlets and the interpretations of their peers. However, if the proposal were implemented, citizens could pull from a greater number of sources and perhaps from sources that were of a higher standard. They might still construct narratives that were influenced by their peers. But one would hope that those peers would also receive a higher standard of information. The power to interpret information still lies with a number of other factors of positionality, including, but certainly not limited to, focus and attention of the peer group, degree and quality of mentoring and education, time, and so forth. Yet, the proposal would make a greater deal of resources available for that process of education.

The manifesto observes that corporations control all of the wealth among media. Administration is putting wealth at the power of command and in this sense, corporations are administrating the news for the state while smaller media organizations find limited resources with which to cover events. If corporations did not control all of the resources, then the news and viewpoints would reach more people. Much media would probably continue to meet a low popular standard for accuracy. However, consumers would have greater access to news and might choose differently. Moreover, the state would find it harder to bury information because corporate media would no longer saturate the scene. A greater diversity of narratives surrounding news that was politically sensitive to the state could reach the public. Currently, journalists are

beholden to corporate interests that do not want certain stories made public. If journalists had autonomy over shareholders, the news media might resemble that in the Keynesian economic period. During that period, U.S. news organizations were corporate but because share holders and investment banking had not entirely permeated the cultural sectors, journalism divisions of news corporations often had more autonomy. The most common example in the U.S. would be the legacy of Edward R. Murrow and his news division for CBS first on radio and then on television. However, New Journalism, too, during the 1960s was published by the *New York Times* and other major newspapers. The budgets often permitted these divisions to produce new research for stories, rather than today's common practices, which include creating derivative news stories from the Associate Press Wire. This means that one body of facts is gathered by a single international news organization—albeit one that the industry perceives as standard. News organizations often build similar stories around these facts, which has caused media specialists like Noam Chomsky, for example, to read small snippets from many outlets to gather a greater body of facts. In *Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media*, Chomsky observes that he can do this because he has a research budget, a research degree, staff, and a network of international helpers (Title 1 Chapter 15).

If legislation favored not-for-profit media organizations, the diversity of narratives would produce a greater multiplicity of voices. Diversity in narratives would create more sources of mis-information, bias, and even community-based propaganda. However, with a greater diversity of narratives, citizens would find it easier to create their own comparisons of media accounts of a given event. In effect, the point proposes that

legislators create a greater body of open research like those that media theorists like Chomsky already possess.

### **Reform the International Institutions**

Profoundly reform and democratize international organizations, among them the U.N., insuring the upholding of human, economic, social and cultural rights in concordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This implies the incorporation of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and WTO [in the image] of the decision-making system of the U.N.. Should the US persist in violating international law, it would be necessary to transfer the U.N. headquarters from New York to another place, preferably in a country of the South.

The U.N. could not govern without the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization but these financial institutions are not subject to the democratic processes of the U.N. This proposal calls for the three organizations to become part of the U.N. If the organizations do not join the U.N., then the world should move the U.N. from the United States to a location in the Global South.

This reformist gesture holds within it the potential to reform not only the three financial organizations, but also the control mechanisms of the U.N. This would begin by democratizing financial transactions; but as political realities changed, it would also place the U.N. in a different position from the command center of the vestigial imperialist alliances. Empire would absorb such a reform, but it would also create an inherent instability in the system from which the Movement of Movements could benefit. As Hardt and Negri discuss in *Empire*, any changes to Empire from the periphery jumps to the center and thus makes a horizontal struggle possible (52-59). If the world moved the U.N., it would disrupt the sovereignty of Empire. It would act as the second most powerful reform of the proposal. We can perceive that the proposal seeks to reform the

institutions rather than to rid the world of the system. The U.N. wields more power than its predecessor, the League of Nations, but does not wield power democratically.

### **Conclusion**

The manifesto contributes a powerful rhetoric to the Movement of Movements. It acts as a Public Relations Department for the movement. If we can grasp the contradictions, paradoxes and aporias of a revolution-of-the-common, then we can begin to bring into being a world of abundance. Such a world could help us to understand how a world-wide revolution might function because it would also help us to grasp an economy of abundance from which the common might again become possible.

If the Movement of Movements loses the head of steam that has gathered since 1968, or splinters and stammers, then the movement might collapse and decades will pass before people once again learn the grammar of the multitude. Meanwhile, without a voice, the movement would not grow but would challenge the state before the former has adequately prepared itself, which would allow the state to destroy it. As Slavoj Žižek argues, this we cannot afford. Moreover, if philosophy were to reject all feasible solutions within a world of the post-critical phase, then continental philosophy would risk its relevance against the growing measure of Anglo-Saxon philosophy of measurement and social pragmatism. In short, continental philosophy would see its antagonism against Empire shrink.

Revolution is not a dinner party, not an essay, nor a painting, nor a piece of embroidery; it cannot be advanced softly, gradually, carefully, considerately, respectfully, politely, plainly and modestly.

– Mao Zedong

## CHAPTER 6

### “MONOPOLY ON THE LEGITIMATE USE OF PHYSICAL FORCE”: TACTICS

Those in authority fear the mask for their power partly resides in identifying, stamping and cataloguing: in knowing who you are. . .our masks are not to conceal our identity but to reveal it. . .Today we shall give this resistance a face; for by putting on our masks we reveal our unity; and by raising our voices in the street together, we speak our anger at the facelessness of power. . .

– June 18th, 1999, Carnival Against Capital Handbill

It is certainly true that the serpentine struggles we are witnessing today do not provide any clear revolutionary tactics, or maybe they are completely incomprehensible from the point of view of tactics. Faced as we are with a series of intense subversive social movements that attack the highest levels of imperial organization, however, it may be no longer useful to insist on the old distinction between strategy and tactics. In the constitution of Empire there is no longer an "outside" to power and thus no longer weak links – if by weak link we mean an external point where the articulations of global power are vulnerable. To achieve significance, every struggle must attack at the heart of the Empire, at its strength.

– Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*

When masks are outlawed, only revolutionaries will wear masks.

– Zapatista proverb

Max Weber observes that the state attempts to maintain “a monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force” (29). However, it is not certain how we should view the tactics of mass movements and their relationship with police and guard forces. Nor is it completely clear why tactics, which have been dismissed by Hardt and Negri among others, still continue to haunt us and to captivate the media (*Empire* 58-9, 63).

Moreover, it is not entirely certain what the emergence of “blocs” has meant for the Movement of Movements, or for the promises of Anarchism, Communism, Leninism, and other ideologies. If we cannot address the question of the limits of tactics and their broader meanings for the Movement of Movements, then we may not come to

understand the significance of direct action. Finally, we will be unable to adequately characterize the “Do-It-Yourself” movements at the turn of the last century.

We should view the discussion of tactics through the lens of Donna Haraway’s definition of the human as simian-cyborg: the human-as-primate-who-uses-technology. The primate is the natural portion of the human. In this sense, the primate is the historical human before language and the agrarian movement of approximately 8,000 BCE. But this word, “natural,” is already over-determined. Hardt and Negri have referred to “first nature,” “second nature,” and on to what they name “nth nature.” “First nature” would be the pristine earth, any part of the natural world that remains undeveloped or changed by humans. In this sense, any portion of the primate body that remains primate and cannot be modified by the human remains “first nature.” “Second nature” would be a first intervention of the human upon a natural space. “Nth nature” would be the multiplicity of progressive modifications that the human places upon other human constructions. Language, for example, is of this order. Anything that is of second nature or beyond is technology. The constructed physical world is, of course, already recognizable technology. For Haraway, however, technology is anything that is constructed. This includes language. And from language springs ideas and then social relations.

The cyborg is the portion of the human that stems from technology. The cyborg is this broad technology-user. The cyborg, not the primate, creates the social relations that comprise human culture. Haraway argues that the cyborg modifies its world and in changing the technology that it uses, changes itself. The cyborg is the worker who converts first nature into second, third, and nth nature. As the technology changes, and

thus as the cyborg modifies itself, Haraway argues, the definition of the human necessarily changes. The cyborg suggests the ontology of the possible by creating a space for future cyborgs who might make its own social relations more difficult. We see this in the so-called “generation gaps” of the last century where subjects from younger generations grasped technology that subjects from earlier generations had not grasped. Thus, the younger subjects changed the way of being in the world, and, in extreme cases, their behavior became nearly incomprehensible to older subjects. We could think of these subjects as cyborgs of a more recent iteration. Like the primate, the cyborg is always already historical, but for different reasons. Although the primate’s innovations—called natural selection—move much more slowly through history, the cyborg’s iterations occur at relatively rapid speed and, in some cases, acceleration through history. Its iterations are in a constant state of becoming as is the state of the human.

As Hardt and Negri argue in the epigraph above, in our period, strategy flattens into tactics, or tactics morph into strategy (*Empire* 52-9). On first glance, this seems like a depressing and powerless mapping of the complex realities of globalism. However, I would argue that this occurs in the space of the spectacle and the simulacrum of the image. What in an earlier period would have incredibly limited implications and influence, tactics now have far greater implications for the heart of Empire. As I will suggest below, a mass of protesters with recording equipment who are wearing defensive armoring could take the streets of a tactical position and hold it. This would happen if the police were not willing to stop the protesters with deadly force. Perhaps a future police force would be willing to do this and to risk the quick and repeated airing of

such images of their tactic over telecommunications networks. But if this occurred multiple times within a few weeks, it is difficult to imagine that the publics of the G8 would not begin to more greatly challenge Empire. In this sense, what would be a tactic for the police, and originally for the protesters, could quickly become a strategy. This is a dark example, but it illustrates the relationship between tactics and strategy in the world of the spectacle.

Each of these new subjects is a radically iterated cyborg. The defensively militant protester can resist in ontologically different ways and can instantly transmit herself through images globally. Since the beginning of the Movement of Movements, the riot gear tactical division of the police force has been in an escalation with protesters as we will see below. There is a new subject—the professional witness who documents both through image and narrative. There is, of course, the machinic Public Relations Department of the police force and of the municipality who innovate or iterate the technology of language in ways that George Orwell has called “the defense of the indefensible.”

Both police and protesters often update their tactics, even sometimes relying on each other for such acts. This demonstrates several points about twenty-first century tactics. First, the academic focuses both upon the techniques of black blocing (as part of the anarchist movement) and upon the technique of padded blocing (of the White Overalls), which expose an unconscious desire to compete directly with the police in a non-violent way so as to break free from what Foucault has called the “society of control.” Both blocing techniques are the gathering of the mass in a defensive phalanx against blunt force from batons, percussion grenades, and pushing from the lines of the

police force. The technique of black blocing is anonymous, with masks and uniform alignment that blurs the lines of individual bodies. In this sense, it pastiches swarm intelligence. Subjects look anonymous and uniform and break lines readily to re-integrate at key locations during the site for maximum agitation of less radical protesters. In this sense, they also act as the trainer for the pack. The technique of padded blocing is defensive, and neither uniform nor anonymous. It does not break ranks regularly, and instead maintains the integrity of the phalanx against the line of the police. Its strategy involves overwhelming the line of the police, which is often two or three deep, by holding against that line a phalanx several ranks deeper.

The focus in Italy is on the White Overalls (Tute Bianche) – so-named because of their symbolic ghostly costume – who quickly adopted a padded blocing technique. Meanwhile the focus in the U.S. (Seattle on 30 November, 1999) is on the so-called “Black Bloc” because some anarchists quickly adopted a black blocing technique. We focus upon black blocing and padded blocing because they allow larger more successful protests. Such large protests serve as great pedagogical moments for recognizing exploitation and for noticing the power of numbers that someday might lead to direct action. The purpose of a protest, beyond making voices heard to the state, is to raise consciousness. Tute Bianche tactics and the tactics of black blocs raise consciousness even more immediately than do their parent organizations, Ya Basta and the International Anarchist Conspiracy. Finally, anarchism today in North America and Europe is not the anarchism of the nineteenth century because it is interested in building coalitions.

Thus, with this understanding we can better grasp the places where the Do-It-Yourself movements have begun to interact with the Movement of Movements in productive ways. Moreover, we can grasp the polemics between some of the groups and situate those fractures within the context of the fragmented left after the assassination of Leon Trotsky in 1940. By grasping these polemics within this context, we can understand the ontological horizon and the abundance that the Movement of Movements has begun to bring to these factions.

Although we can rhetorically analyze Tute Bianche and Anarchist manifestos, we will often analyze their polemics instead. Unlike manifestos, polemics do not create coalitions. Much of the work on Tute Bianche involves polemics and discussions with padded blocing and the black blocing of the anarchists. This is rather like the way that the protests of Lenin in 1902 against various groups of differing ideology were addressed. These writings a century later introduce us to characters whom history has forgotten. Polemics then, depict minutiae or grapple with relatively small issues. Today's polemics, although now anonymous and often depicting anonymous subjects, still engage in the political struggles of the day. In a polemic, "The Anarchist Movement, the Black Bloc, and Us," Tute Bianche authors direct their anger against "Movimiento," part of an anarchist group. They distinguish between those who manifest a critical version of the status quo and those who seek an ontologically productive space of community-making: "The people whose identity is based upon aversion to the status quo (rather than upon the joy of community-making), they will always try to stop any social change. This is Movimiento: a sad and gloomy site of putrefaction" (Par 3). The

positive ontology – the moment to replace the critique of the old order – “manifests in this passage for the future of community-making.”

The Ya Basta polemic is more useful when it is read against itself. The polemic negates the “charge” of working with mainstream movements by pointing to the associations of the anarchists themselves:

These slanderers "charge" us with talking to "institutional" leftists and green party activists, "fluffy" non-profit associations (even catholic ones). But they never mention their own surrealistic alliances: in the past year they've rubbed shoulders with some of the very groups that they used to attack as "Bolshevik butchers". Some sections of the Federazione Anarchica Italiana are dangerously close to becoming satellites of the most conservative current of the former Autonomia. (Ibid)

The authors mention the coalition that includes the institutional left, the green party, and non-profits. The anarchists in Italy, too, associate with the most conservative parts of Autonomia. Even the critique about “rubbed shoulders” demonstrates the crossing of the anarchists with older organizations. Although the anarchists and the Tute Bianche are feuding over the degree of involvement with mainstream groups, the fact of involvement at all – coalition-building, co-existence, and negotiations – are all powerful signs of a nascent multitude.

Finally we see a break among anarchists over the strategy of taking state power because inchoate exodus is beginning to take place. In the polemic, of course, the focus is on difference – singular difference – as a way of separating and identifying this particular group of anarchists. However, the discussion of whether to seize power or engage in exodus is exactly the discussion that the multitude will need to have.

These people attack us because we say that we DON'T want to "seize power" or "take over the state", and we mean it, we want to extend networks between grassroots, self-managed communities, we are not interested in nation-states. This is unacceptable for Leninists. Why do

people who call themselves "anarchists" side with Leninists instead of siding with us? (Ibid)

The most conservative current of the former Autonomia mix with the Federazione Anarchica Italiana. However, even the most conservative of such groups recognizes the realities that, in Italy, activists can take for granted. What if people in the United States could also do this? Whether the anarchists and Tute Bianche differ about the methods and goals, two interesting currents emerge – a healthy Leninist movement in Italy along with the legacy of Autonomia. Leninism here is presented as inappropriate, irrelevant, and out-moded. However, the very networks that Tute Bianche attempts to build between self-managed communities serve the function of the vanguard party.

### **Tactics of Defense**

You will do what looks good to you on paper. We will do what we must, must, must, must!

– Fugazi, "Reclamation," 1991.

Slavoj Zizek states that "utopia is a matter of innermost urgency" – a new space that emerges from need. Although we have seen examples of new ontologies, the state's mechanisms block the way to realize them. Since the modern police's rise during the nineteenth century, it has benefited from the continual innovation of weapons. However, what might be less clear is that the police force has used this continual innovation to create a gap between what citizens could deploy and what the police have access to. According to Haraway's definition of the human, the police force is cyborg too. It must keep a weapon advantage in order to overcome larger numbers. Hardt and Negri are clear that they believe that Marx's old mole burrowing underground and waiting for the next moment is no longer an apt metaphor. Instead they claim that the snake is a better

figure as the snake possesses the ability to jump at will to the center of empire (Empire 52-59).

Within the last half century of warfare, sophisticated weaponry and defensive gear have proliferated. Moreover, because of recent wars and with the invention of SWAT and riot police, non-lethal offensive weaponry and more effective defensive gear too have begun to proliferate. Eventually the police weapon advantage will be nullified or liquidated. At that point, the cyborg-citizen-civilian may tactically match the defensive equipment and non-lethal weaponry of the cyborg-police officer. This will enable the sheer numbers of organized protesters to overtake the streets and engage in direct action.

The White Overalls' padded blocing is merely a tactic of the larger Ya Basta Association. The Ya Basta Association was, at the emergence of the White Overalls, the defense group of a "squatted social center" (CSOA) who wore white overalls to evoke the ghost town that the police would create. The black bloc is a tactic of the International Conspiracy of Anarchists. In both cases, it is not the manifesto or strategy that has caught our notice, but rather the tactics of these groups. This is because we recognize in them a revolutionary potential. The text below explains that the Zapatistas in 1998 were being observed by one hundred and forty Italian activists. The Tute Bianche affiliates were expelled from the region by government forces. This demonstrates the direct inspiration that Ya Basta took from the Zapatistas – taking their name directly from the first manifesto's beginning – which is best translated as "enough is enough."

In “The Body as a Weapon for Civil Disobedience,” Jess Ramirez Cuevas reports on what Luca, spokesperson for the Tute Bianche, said to the journalists who had come to Prague:

We are not armed, we are acting as citizens, putting our persons at risk, in order to demonstrate that the democracy of the IMF and the World Bank is tanks and armed police. We are not criminals: they are suppressing citizens exercising their rights. We want to show that it is possible to rebel against the order using our bodies as weapons.

Luca argues that the Tute Bianche rebel used the body as a weapon. This statement is one of the most exciting within the entire work because it is peaceful and engages an armed defensive gear-protected machine.

The simian-cyborg body becomes a weapon with several implications. We recall that Foucault has named today’s administrative paradigm as the society of control — a society in which the subject disciplines herself in her own mind and does not take action that challenges the state’s authority. Before the rise of the police in the nineteenth century, the administrative paradigm was the society of discipline — a society in which the subject could act without mental self-discipline, but would face physical and social discipline from the state (*Discipline and Punish* 25). In the scene of the protests and direct action of the Movement of Movements, the society of control regresses to the society of discipline. First, as a cyborg body, the protester continues to adapt her tactics against the society of discipline. Second, again because of her use of technology, such a protester can “arm” herself with defensive “weaponry.” This “weaponry” is really permutations of the shield. En masse, the protesters can endure the few days of the protest in the same general tactical location. By holding the position without threatening the bodies of the police, the mass can create a dug-in position, a fort, that holds the tactical location throughout. The numbers of the police can never

approach twenty-five percent of the numbers of protesters at such events. If the police will not use deadly force on video, then the very presence of a mass that cannot be moved will change the tactical—and thus in this flat world, strategic—landscape.

There is an irony and cultural diversity to the largely pacifist movement. The irony arrives in a reaction to the comments of the mayor of Milan. The mayor had stated: “From now on, squatters will be nothing more than ghosts wandering about the city.” By appearing in white suits and clear plastic padding, the Tute Bianchi came to physically resemble ghosts. By being present in great numbers and small locations, disappearing, and reappearing in other key locations later in the struggle, the Tute Bianchi imitated ghosts. By representing the relative invisibility of the subaltern subject within global capitalism, the Tute Bianchi created a mimetic logic for the figure of the ghost.

In “Tute Bianche/White Overalls,” the authors create the following preface which explains the symbolism of the white overalls:

September 1994. Italy’s infamous Tute Bianche/ White Overalls is born when the neo-fascist mayor of Milan orders the eviction of the squatted social centre, Leoncavallo, saying: “From now on, squatters will be nothing more than ghosts wandering about the city.” Activists responded humourously dressing in ghostly white overalls and taking to the streets; riots ensue, and the squat is saved. The White Overalls, symbols of the invisibility of those excluded from capitalism, spread across the world from Bologna to Prague and the G8 in Genoa.

They begin, not with the padded bloc tactic, but rather with symbolism: they are the ghosts of capitalist system and representatives of the Zapatistas in Europe. They are literally Marx’s specter haunting Europe – the specter of direct action. They are invisible and excluded from capital, and in this way stand in for an organized lumpenproletariat. This is not as problematic as it might seem because they figure the surplus army of labor.

In one video, there is the symbolic castration of one of the police officers as his nightstick is stripped from him by a member of the Tute Bianche. Later the nightstick reappears inside the pants of the Tute Bianche member who produces a second oblong object – a red canister. The nightstick phallus is an approval-seeking gesture of the desire to be as the police are – intact. The approval-seeking gesture is to remain intact as an integral unit of the phalanx. And simultaneously, the overt dominance of the police formation, which can be read as hyper-masculine, provokes a desire in the disempowered subject to symbolically castrate the male body of the police officer. Two symbolic castrations are at work here. The male protester symbolically castrates the male body of the police officer in front of others as a gesture of shame. Then the male protester parades the nightstick in his pants, again in front of the other male protesters. This gesture emphasizes the castration of the male police officer. But it also implies another earlier castration — that of the male protest subject by a previous authority figure, quite possibly a past male police officer.

Claudio Albertini mentions impressive estimates of digital media that were deployed by the multitude, enabling them to cross barriers of geography and language during the Genoa protest. The multitude crossed national boundaries into Italy, continental boundaries into Europe, and the language barriers that accompany these borders. He observes that the government could access the information as well as how the broadcast in real time was an important innovation. He concludes that we must remember Genoa:

An impressive number – up to maybe one hundred thousand – of microphones, cameras and video-cam recorders were deployed during the demonstrations. This has eased the task of recollection and of critical analysis, even as it played into the hands of the Italian government's ill-

meaning curiosity. Additionally, thanks to the establishment of Radio Gap and its Internet site ([www.radiogap.net/it](http://www.radiogap.net/it)), information was disseminated in real time, making it possible to follow the events in several languages and in all parts of the planet. We have therefore used this material and the testimony of eyewitness participants to the Genoa events. In an age when all certainty seems to have been lost, it is difficult to predict how the anti-globalization movement will develop, but one thing we do know: we won't be able to go forward on the bumpy road of human liberation without remembering Genoa.

Estimates of the protest in Genoa matter, as the multitude replays itself for the world. Virno implies that the multitude, like a young child, seeks to repeat a behavior in the learning pattern that will best allow it to adapt. In this sense, we can perceive a profound optimism about the future of the multitude. Each of these protests in which the police adapt and attempt to contain the creative potential of the multitude acts as a playground for the multitude. And in each case, the multitude learns and adapts. The Autonomia school can remain optimistic about the possibility of the multitude eventually becoming prince. Each event at which the state dominates teaches the multitude and allows it to repeat for mastery.

The multitude needs to meet some needs that best are described by Virno as the learning of grammar the way that an infant repeats, "Again! Again!" For example, the multitude needs to respond to the media in real time being co-opted, especially at radiogap, and recording knowledge of the event as it happens. This is a marked development accompanying the rise of the new technology. Indeed, as Virno argues, the events themselves – Marx's well-grubbed mole – repeat every dozen or two dozen years. This suggests the possibility that the snake may not be the only form, but that the mole too holds importance for ontological production.

Roberto Bui argues that Tute Bianche had reached critical mass in Genoa. He argues that Tute Bianche prevented fiercer carnage and showed their practices to more than 300,000 attendees.

In spite of the mistakes we made, I still think that the way the Tute Bianche had organized and imposed themselves to the public attention – all the while avoiding many traps and ambushes in a media-savvy way – not only prevented even fiercer carnage in Genoa, but also played a key role in building consensus around their practices so that almost 300,000 people decided to join us on Saturday and literally save our asses. Errors were made though: certainly we hadn't expect such a sudden increase of the level of repression, nor had we taken into sufficient account the rivalry between police and carabinieri.

Consensus-building like that of Tute Bianche is another tactic that the anarchists have not yet accomplished. Genoa and Seattle must exist as lessons for the young movement. Worse carnage in Genoa was prevented even though Tute Bianche did not expect the level of repression to increase from that of Seattle.

The first communiqué of the International Anarchist Conspiracy, which exists in video form, begins with snapshots at a certain speed and repeats at faster and faster speeds. We see the Earth Liberation Front mentioned as well as a banner reading, "Fuck the Troops." We see in these polemics that Tute Bianche, the IAC, and Leninism are still in ideological negotiation. These negotiation are fascinating because they would not be possible in North America. Moreover, it seems that the desire is no longer to gain permission from the police to do authorized protests; rather, the goal seems to be to teach through direct action.

The Black Bloc as a tactic was influenced by the Autonomia movement in Italy, Germany, and elsewhere in Europe. In "Autonomia and the Black Bloc," Daniel Dylan Young argues the following:

In November of 1999 the Black Bloc tactic seemed new to many Americans partly because the actions and ideas of the autonomist movement in Europe were mostly blacked out of the American media and have been barely written about at all in English. However, ignorance of the Black Bloc also stems from the fact that most Americans get news of domestic events from a corporate-controlled media that ignores any happenings that don't fit their view and purposes, and which represents every event that takes place as singular spectacle disconnected from past and future, to be forgotten in a blur even when it is only a few months old. (Par 25)

In "On Killing the Cop Within," from the "IAC communiqué number 2," the writer suggests that an irrational belief holds the people back. This exemplifies the society of control:

On the streets many of us have seen unusual things; 3 cops keeping 50 people at bay, even inspiring fear in some of them; a raised bicycle utterly terrifying a mob of would be wizards; a crowd of 300 suddenly neutralized as it hovered menacingly around a recruiting center, on the verge, the utter verge of doing what they knew needed to be done. There is more at work here in these types of occurrences than mere physical matter. Something else is responsible for 300 people not clobbering 50 pigs. A powerful spell is wielded over us all. The cops, the cops that stand in our way on the streets, have gotten into our very minds...

The anarchists argue that small numbers of police officers can "keep at bay" many times greater numbers. Something else is responsible, the IAC claim, something psychological. The physical matter is a poor substitute for the mind control that police now wield.

In the twenty-first century, communication networks have brought greater numbers and would overwhelm a site – a protest or a direct action – with these numbers. Killing the cop within is a form of exodus from the society of control. Exodus is the place where the movement peaks in violence. It is the moment when the state begins to fall apart as its members no longer agree to serve. As individual states begin to fail – in a plethora of ways and under distinct conditions – Empire will attempt to pull itself back together by chasing one failed state after another.

As Mao had noted about the U.S. and its nuclear bomb, it has become too costly to wage war and as such, the U.S. was a paper tiger. “In appearance it is very powerful but in reality it is nothing to be afraid of; it is a paper tiger. Outwardly a tiger, it is made of paper, unable to withstand the wind and the rain. I believe the United States is nothing but a paper tiger.” The paper tiger was the veiled but false threat. This might be the lynch-pin in the morphing of tactics to strategy. It is strategic for the agents within the multitude to use any necessary tactics without the fear that troops will use lethal force. They can bet against local troops firing on the population when the troops know that they are being recorded on video. It is also strategic for agents within the multitude to assume that if troops use the tactic of holding a position by lethal force on video, then the general population might begin to challenge Empire more directly. During the 1960s, many of the instances of lethal force were in poor African-American neighborhoods where the media captured limited footage of the events. Then came Kent State. In this sense, police might threaten to fire on a local crowd when they know that they are on video, but if their own bodies are not threatened, then this threat might be a paper tiger.

In its second communiqué, the IAC critiques the media for the image of the police officer that keeps activists from killing the cop within:

Our nemesis has vast resources. It attempts to shape culture through its media. Through its media, the notion of the invincible cop has spread wildly in the U.S. But there is more to it than the media. The school system and capitalist employers do nothing but ingrain the ideas of authority, hierarchy and regimentation into the minds of the population. There is always someone above you. And they have power over your life. They must be obeyed, whether out of fear or by choice. To disobey is to be attacked by the apparatus that surrounds you. An F on a report card, expulsion, termination, demotion, wage decrease. We are taught to live in dread of those supposedly above us.

This apparatus is biopower – “power over your life.” There is no choice except to obey. IAC includes several examples from school and work to figure the dread that people feel at being caught disobeying.

As Hardt and Negri observe in *Multitude*, the idea of sovereignty or anarchy is a binary into which the multitude will not fit and cannot be understood:

The notion of the multitude based on the production of the common appears to some as a new subject of sovereignty, an organized identity akin to the old modern social bodies such as the people, the working class, or the nation. To others, on the contrary our notion of the multitude, composed as it is of singularities appears as mere anarchy. Indeed as long as we remain trapped in the modern framework defined by this alternative – either sovereignty or anarchy – the concept of multitude will be incomprehensible. We need to break free of this old paradigm and recognize a mode of social organization that is not sovereign. [...] The concept of sovereignty dominates the tradition of political philosophy and serves as the foundation of all that is political precisely because it requires that one must always rule and decide. Only the one can be sovereign, the tradition tells us, and there can be no politics without sovereignty. This is espoused by theories of dictatorship and Jacobinism as well as by all the versions of liberalism as a kind of blackmail that one cannot avoid. The choice is absolute: either sovereignty or anarchy! (208, 329)

This binary creates a problem for anarchism and sovereignty. The interruption of the rule of the one ought to lead toward anarchy. But Hardt and Negri are clear that the multitude will present a non-sovereign social organization to the world. In such an anarchy-free ontology, how is it possible to have the singular subjectivity of twenty-first century anarchists in North America and Europe?

It is in the “becoming-prince” of the multitude that we must look for understanding of the struggles of Tute Bianchi and the Black Bloc. Neither organization seeks to foment chaos. As we have observed above, the IAC presents limited analysis—which might be related to the forty-eight-hour revolutionary philosophy of anarchists in history. However, this limit of the pain of disobedience as the society of control does not simply

mean a forty-eight hour philosophy. It can be used to unhinge the aspect of the society of control that makes much of the public wait for shootings on television before they act. In this way, the “disobediente” of the Tute Bianchi and the IAC mandate about “Killing the Cop Within” overcome a simple anarchism or theory of chaos. Instead, they promote a gradual structural challenge to the ideological interpellation that creates the “Cop Within.”

### **Tactics of Anonymity**

Twenty-first century anarchists differ substantially from both the old political definition of anarchy as non-rule and from the traditions of the nineteenth century. The question becomes whether the twenty-first century anarchist movement against global capitalism could fit within a new framework of coalition and consensus-building and join the multitude. In fact, many of the structures that were created by anarchists and that have led to direct actions and to Do-It-Yourself demonstrate one possible movement toward an ontological horizon in which the multitude will create itself. Whether anarchy can have a non-antagonist place within the multitude is a question that remains unanswered today, but anarchists themselves will play a role in the multitude. In short, the postmodern anarchist movement is multitudinous.

In “Communiqué no. 4,” the anarchists make clear the distinction that Graeber draws between the radical and the liberal. The liberals are effective as a police force in containing the threat of revolution.

Through the Liberals, the enemy has created a defensive wall against the threat of revolution. As long as those who want to change the system believe they CAN change it, they will never revolt AGAINST the system. Anarchists do not believe the system can be changed. The system has to be completely and utterly destroyed in order to save the planet.

The system will never revolt against itself. The liberals are wedded to the idea that change can come from within.

In Communiqué 5, the IAC begins the task of consciousness-raising:

PREFACE: For the second time, the IAC would like to remind you all that it does not exist. The IAC is an illusion perpetuated through the usage of propaganda. It exists solely in your mind. Were it not for the tireless efforts of its creators, you would never have suspected its existence. We have perpetuated this illusion for one purpose: To reveal to you The Shadow. The Shadow is cast by our enemy. The Shadow is the negative, the inverted, the backwards and the dead. The IAC is the Shadow. The IAC is the reflection of everything we wish to rid the world of. If a group like the IAC existed, you should never join it. The IAC uses the same tools as the enemy. It mirrors the movements of the enemy. The IAC is The Shadow.[The IAC is the alpha and omega!] (Par 1)

The IAC makes clear to the world that it reflects the enemy. Deleuze and Guattari remind us to flee, but flee with a weapon. The anarchists then try to explain that they must flee with weapons, albeit in a different mode. The elite will conduct themselves as if they were not an elite, but actually acting in ways that build.

At the end of the film, "*V for Vendetta*," Londoners appear in masks and walk toward the police in such numbers that the police must choose between firing or not. The protesters then peacefully pass between the block of police officers. Glamour is brought to civil disobedience in a way similar to the black bloc tactic. Anonymous militancy greatly limits the police's tactics because each anarchist is an identical match.

Thanks to the civil rights struggles in Northern Ireland, the plastic bullet has replaced the sometimes lethal rubber bullet. This tool, along with the various gases, grenades, and walls or barricades, can limit a protest. But just as Haussmann was over-confident in 1866 about the feasibility of protecting Paris, so too are the police who will be in constant danger of eventually being overwhelmed.

One tendency contains a good deal of promise within both the defensive actions of padded bloc and black bloc techniques: the use of the body as *defensive* weapon to challenge the state policing tactics. This technique of civil disobedience makes the body a defensive weapon because it cannot be killed or hauled off without attracting media attention and criticism. Thus the sleeping dragon can block entrance to the means of production and can successfully stage sit-ins.

Moreover, the techniques can become more mobile and fully tactical with the flak-jacketed protestor, the masked protestor, and the helmeted protestor. In this way, the protestors transform into the direct-action militant who will challenge the authority of the state and its supposed monopoly on tactical brinksmanship. The protestors who use these techniques will bring direct-action to otherwise protest-based demonstrations. Normal protests can begin to challenge the very space that the police occupy. This is a secondary direct action. Such “protests” could become festivals, carnivals, and temporary communes like that most famous event in Paris in 1871.

The ghosts of the city of Milan took their white apparel as a symbolic gesture against the city’s mayor. Similarly, the people of the IAC have attempted to make their actions symbolic as well. The polemic of the IAC argues that their organization does not actually exist. They claim the position of Wizardry:

By wrapping itself in a mythology of spells and sorcery, the fictitious organization known as the IAC set out to destroy the concepts of organization and hierarchy by making a mockery out of itself. To do this, actions were carried out by free human beings in the real world (read: the ONLY world that matters). These actions were witnessed by numerous individuals and were later “claimed” by the IAC. These actions were “claimed” for one reason: to reveal the absurdity of any group “claiming” an action carried out by a diverse collection of human beings. No one can “claim” anything in their name or an organization's name. By “claiming” an action, a group presumes to have been responsible for the action in its

entirety. The reality of these situations is always the opposite: everyone is responsible. (Par 4)

In this way hierarchy in the organization – what the communiqué labels fascism becomes impossible because the IAC is represented only in the “non-place” of the web.

In *Empire*, Hardt and Negri describe this “non-place:”

The concept of Empire is characterized fundamentally by a lack of boundaries: Empire’s rule has no limits. First and foremost, then, the concept of Empire posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or reality that rules over the entire “civilized” world. No territorial boundaries limit its reign. (*Empire* xv)

These wizards of ideology set forth in Situationalist fashion to describe the details of their own political stance.

The communiqué observes that these connections are not only chaotic, but that they cannot be managed even on the micro-level. They are simultaneously above politics and below economics. They are more than the hosts of an event, and yet smaller than such an event. Instead they rip off a certain piece or tactic from the event, but ultimately they could never take full responsibility because of the meaning that such an act would entail. Recognizing the event as total is an impossibility. Thus we have a paradox presented in the communiqué: they plan something that cannot be planned. They organize that which cannot be organized.

As Graeber has observed, the border becomes the central issue for the movement of movements in general and for the anarchists in particular. The wall becomes its symbol:

These connexions – and the broader links between neoliberal policies and mechanisms of state coercion (police, prisons, militarism) – have played a more and more salient role in our analyses as we ourselves have confronted escalating levels of state repression. Borders became a major issue in Europe during the IMF meetings at Prague, and later EU meetings in Nice. At the FTAA summit in Quebec City last summer, invisible lines that

had previously been treated as if they didn't exist (at least for white people) were converted overnight into fortifications against the movement of would-be global citizens, demanding the right to petition their rulers. The three-kilometer 'wall' constructed through the center of Quebec City, to shield the heads of state junketing inside from any contact with the populace, became the perfect symbol for what neoliberalism actually means in human terms. The spectacle of the Black Bloc, armed with wire cutters and grappling hooks, joined by everyone from Steelworkers to Mohawk warriors to tear down the wall, became – for that very reason – one of the most powerful moments in the movement's history. (229)

The wall, according to Graeber, became the symbol for neoliberalism. Neoliberalism displays amongst its qualities the law of the abrogation of cost – cost is placed elsewhere. But in the case of a protest, the abrogation of cost is one of cultural capital: the abrogation means that the human costs – the wailing and the activity and the attempt to place guilt upon the capitalist – is neutralized. The cost of doing business in such locations – the bad publicity, the noise, the chaos, etc.—are simply moved elsewhere, and the cost gets shunted onto the city who then pays its riot police to contain such cultural capital. The destroying of the wall is a powerful moment, according to Graeber, but it is also important to recognize that pulling down a wall is a tactic that does not allow the argument to reach the brokers. This is a problem of creating a false or a second location for all of this – i.e. the wall rather than the FTAA summit.

When contextualized through the simian-cyborg, twenty-first century tactics becomes part of a larger discussion than it might otherwise be. If we do not understand the rising tide of direct action, we will be unable to grasp the evacuation of power that, in the "Communist Manifesto," Marx presciently observed. If we are unable to adequately characterize the Do-It-Yourself movements at the turn of the century, then we will inaccurately diagnose what we see at the first signs of direct civil disobedience.

If we can better grasp the places where the Do-It-Yourself movements have begun to interact in productive ways with the Movement of Movements, then we might also understand what the first inklings of direct action and Do-It-Yourself become as part of a broader exodus. If we read the polemics within the context of the fragmented left, we might be able to understand the singularity that produces a collectivism within the ontological subject of the multitude. If we can grasp the ontological horizon and the abundance that the Movement of Movements has begun to bring to the factions and can combine that with our understanding of the singularities within the multitude then we might better understand the permanent revolution-of-the-common.

I was never the head of a movement. I was part of a movement. All my mistakes I made with other people. I wish I'd had the might to say: "One should do this, not that." Being part of a movement means accepting its weight.

– Antonio Negri, Antonio Negri: A Revolt That Never Ends

## CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

We recall that, in the dominant nations, capital searches for an outside of new markets to combat overproduction. It creates new markets through technological innovation or development of foreign markets. However, it is quite possible to imagine a space in the future where the development of foreign markets would no longer be possible because forces of real subsumption would have already industrialized the entire planet. Technological innovation, which has led to the development of industrialization from steam through information technology, could still create new markets as it further saturated markets in the Global North and developed markets in the Global South. Yet, with one of its sources of new markets gone, capital would find it difficult to grow at its historic pace. Moreover, the current uneven development of industrialization throughout the globe would shift: the Global South would now benefit from the effects of rapid industrialization, while the Global North would see lesser growth and perhaps stagnation. At that point, the mitigation of potential militancy of the Global North would end. The sovereignty apparatus—whether Empire or some permutation—could then no longer rely on its dominant form of pacification: economic growth through new markets.

In this scene, the contours of a revolution would be massive because the real subsumption of capital would have industrialized the Earth and inadvertently aligned workers' needs in the Global South with workers' needs in the Global North. Moreover, the global command structure would become more tenuous. The movements that I have discussed share in common a mandate that Vladimir Lenin observed in 1902 in *What Is To Be Done?*: they attempt to democratize their struggles during times of

relatively low state repression. They publish manifestos, communiqués, and polemics in order to widen the democratic circulation of ideas and to stage a conversation with a vertical audience of both thinkers in history and a potential future audience. Revolutions teach us that the rights that individual societies gain through struggle can never vanish. In a future society that might bear little geographical and cultural resemblance to the present, activists will invoke those rights in their own struggles. It is possible, as Hardt and Negri suggest, that today's struggles are largely not communicable on a horizon. However, I argue, because those gains will become the basis for future disenfranchised subjects, we must still recognize that such struggles are communicable to the vertical audience. And in the long run, this is one of the major groups—this vertical audience or trainer—that has produced progress in social revolution.

In a permanent-revolution-of-the-common, the barrier of temporal and spatial distance between revolutionary gains would approach zero. No longer would the gains in literacy and public discourse of the events of 1649 need to wait until the events of 1789 to be re-iterated and practiced. The need for repetition, what Paolo Virno names “one more time,” is being met at shorter and shorter intervals in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This is the dream of Leon Trotsky's essay published during the Russian Revolution, “Problems of Everyday Life.” As Che Guevara later did, Trotsky imagined a moment in which a fundamental love of humanity that motivated the search for social and economic justice could rise to the surface. This could happen because such love was no longer occupied with general economic inequality. Instead it could move freely into the space of individual and collective libidinal economy—a concern of Bolshevik feminists most commonly represented by Alexandra Kollontai, who sought

sexual equality for women during the revolution. As the epigraph to this chapter suggests, a permanent-revolution-of-the-common would inhabit the space where a revolution no longer focused on politics but on biopolitics—on the transformation of the cyborg (technological and contingent) characteristics of the production of the human. The desire for such a revolution moves beyond the need for justice toward a love underlying that search for rectification.

This movement from political economy to biopolitics reflects Karl Marx's observation that human history can only begin at the point when class struggle has ended—that is when the fundamental dialectic of the scarcity inherent to the political economy of capitalism is obsolete. We can hardly speculate about the contours of a future dialectic of libidinal economy, but we must recognize the impulse to do so as the Lacanian imperative: never forget your desire because it is that part of yourself that you do not already know. The catholic love that the Trotsky of "Problems of Everyday Life" seeks and that Guevara embodied is really recognition of the desire to supplant a political economy with a libidinal one.

The 1981 Hunger Strike, the *Todos Somos* event of 1987-1989, and the Zapatista event of 1994 predate and prefigure the Movement of Movements as represented here partially by the Porto Alegre Manifesto, and the work of the Black Bloc and the Tute Bianchi. I have attempted to highlight a trend in the resistance organizations from hierarchy toward networks, from a division between military tactics and global public relations strategy to a subsumption of that division into flat simulacra and spectacle-based tactical strategy, and from narrow clandestine cells to wide public coalitions. Of the partial mapping of the Movement of Movements in its present form, I

have attempted to show its initial figuration of the contours of an as-of-yet nearly-incommunicable and not-yet-mappable multitude whose horizon is the expansion and widening of democratic, public, network coalitions that might someday institutionalize the gains of a revolution known administratively by Hardt and Negri as the “becoming-prince” of the multitude. It is the potential for this “becoming-prince,” this institutionalization, that could establish a permanent-revolution-of-the-common as a revolution that ends revolution or that ends the time of non-revolution permanently.

In Chapter 2, I attempted to demonstrate that the 1981 Hunger Strike, as reflected in *Skylark Sing Your Lonely Song* by Bobby Sands, is fundamentally about militant hope in the face of trauma and violence of the society of discipline. The regression from control societies to the society of discipline stems from the simian cyborg’s potential for complicity in the administration of biopower, because the technologies of repression are equally fluid, adaptable, and capable of reactive escalation like those of the movement that they seek to contain. These fluid spaces also reflect the space between remunerated life and non-remunerated labor of both the working-class guards and the prisoners. The hunger strike focuses the scene upon the body, and reproduces the society of discipline through torture and assassinations. Working-class bodies discipline other working-class bodies through torture. Escape from torture comes, in part, from regression in the form of grief over the relationship to the mother and the vitality of the childhood body.

Hope emerges from a horizontal milieu of Republican community support outside of Long Kesh and its focus upon the present day: from the milieu within the prison and its coping mechanism for torture, from the grief that is associated with the loss of

childhood and of the mother, from the sentiment of the Bardic tradition and its relationship to a vertical audience, and from the vertical audience of previous hunger strikers. Hope for the future emerges from the vertical audience of socialists like James Connolly. The vertical audience allows the men to persist as non-violently as possible. As reflected in the text, the hunger strike departs from the standard hierarchy of the IRA, but cannot not yet fully democratize. In this sense it does not fully join the democratization of struggle characteristic of the Movement of Movements. The 1981 Hunger Strike event also shares the primacy of the working-class body in common with the Movement of Movements. Furthermore, the primacy of non-violence whenever possible links this event to the Movement of Movements.

In Chapter 3, I have attempted to demonstrate that situated on the banks of the Rio Grande/Bravo along the México/U.S. border in Juárez/El Paso, the *Todos Somos* murals emerge from a Latin American tradition of revolutionary muralism inspired by images of the Cuban Revolution, including revolutionary iconography and the image of Che Guevara and the flat dark images and slogans in thick dark lettering in Cuban poster art of the 1960s, and by the techniques of David Siqueiros. In this sense, they display several qualities of revolutionary muralism because they are outdoor, public, and highly visible in a contested space. They cannot travel on exhibition, be stored, or be displayed in museums or galleries. They cannot be privatized, and hence avoid either the cultural or financial elitism of other art, including other murals. They publicize an image of the border, challenge reified representations of it, figure it differently, and in doing so, offer one way to figure the problem of representing the unrepresentable.

They contribute to the Movement of Movements because they are inspired both by

the Zapatistas' border struggle of the 1980s and the revolutionary tropes at play in that movement. They publicize an image of the border by calling attention to themselves and emphasizing the primacy of place because they cannot be removed without losing their figurative quality of aura. They critique the problem of the border by figuring it in its partial representation and by a deliberate act of refusal of totalizing figuration, which emerges amidst what Fredric Jameson has called the "functions of the enormously complex new international space," in order to reconcile "a multidimensional set of radically discontinuous realities" (Hardt and Weeks 281). They attempt to map the unmappable and their play of figuration highlights the problem of cognitive mapping. They are de-centered and display a polymorphic quality by blending images, forms, and traditions. They manifest an additive quality, consistently adding images from left to right and from top to bottom. They refuse to define their formal boundaries and refuse to be contained. In this sense, they refuse to end the dialogue about the existence of the border.

In Chapter 4, I have attempted to demonstrate that the Lacandon Jungle Communiqués of the EZLN figure the contours of a front that inspires Tute Bianchi and Ya Basta. In this way, the front establishes the origins of the Movement of Movements during the middle of the 1990s. Altruistically, they help to form an early and inchoate international coalition that recognizes common need and promotes catholic love. The common need springs from the "accidentally armed," who are the organic intellectuals in each country. These subjects, who arise from the pack, become trainers of it and join the new proto-coalition for the Movement of Movements. In this sense, "accidentally armed" means that the state has forced the trainer to flee—to practice exodus—with

weapons. Hardt and Negri have argued that the Zapatistas “adopt all the elements of the traditional structure and transform them, demonstrating in the clearest possible terms the nature and direction of the postmodern transition of organizational forms [...] make irony itself into a political strategy,” and never intend “to defeat the state and claim sovereign authority but rather to change the world without taking power” (*Multitude* 85).

The EZLN uses a horizontal or flat network structure—a non-hierarchical organization. In a revolutionary group that successfully challenges the state, this organizational structure could transform agents of power from those that seek to take it to those who seek sovereignty in other ways. The EZLN also exhibits the practice of swarm intelligence, as figured most presciently in the first two communiqués, which allude to the struggle of 1994 and the subsequent peace. The communiqués can help us grasp the potential with which network-based movements struggle against hegemony. Furthermore, the communiqués delineate the contours of a struggle present in the foundation of the Movement of Movements, which makes great use of public relations and media. In this way, they can help us understand the use of spectacle in the broader movement.

In Chapter 5, I have attempted to demonstrate that the Porto Alegre Manifesto emerges in part from the rhetoric of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. However, unlike the U.N.D.H.R., the manifesto promotes positive rights. It is politically constructive and ontologically present. The Porto Alegre Manifesto differs from those manifestos because it is more heavily global. Like the *Communist Manifesto*, the Porto Alegre Manifesto is communicable and global like the U.N.D.H.R. and differs from many local-site manifestos of the 1960s. In a certain sense, the Porto Alegre Manifesto can

better represent the interests of a truly global class than any manifesto that preceded it.

As a genre, a manifesto proposes a workable solution—political, aesthetic, and so forth. However, it refuses both to explain the rhetorical system behind any proposed solution and to justify that solution rhetorically. In this sense, a manifesto attempts to demonstrate what needs to be manifested. But consequently, a manifesto must navigate the alienating effect that it can produce on a general public whose members do not necessarily all comprise the pack audience of that particular manifesto. By omitting warrants, grounds, and backing as well, a manifesto can create an ontological break from the thinking of the general audience-subject who cannot perceive the links between his or her own common-mind and the mind that the manifesto calls into becoming. Similarly, the Porto Alegre Manifesto writers have concisely alluded to many ideas that support the actual proposals, but they have omitted the origins of those ideas and the logistical implementation of the proposals. In this sense, a manifesto acts as a trainer of the pack that it seeks to represent. By transforming members of the pack into trainers, it also acts as a double.

The Porto Alegre Manifesto contributes to a grammar of the multitude by creating a rhetorical language for the Movement of Movements that appeals to a vertical audience. In this sense, the manifesto acts as a Public Relations Department for the Movement of Movements, as it creates trainers from the pack of both its horizontal and vertical audiences. It creates a plan for relatively sweeping reform. It legitimates the ideologies of the Movement of Movements in ways that the movements of Chapter 6 do not because the manifesto stems from the World Social Forum and its ethos. The manifesto also manifests and creates clear language for some of the biopolitical

grievances of the multitude. Some of the grievances whose effect would be to transform the economy would be revolutionary if implemented. However, much of the revolutionary potential is not readily apparent in the few details of these proposals. The proposals that seek to transform civil society present an expansive widening of the democratic circles in a time of relatively little state repression. The Porto Alegre Manifesto gives a voice and legitimacy to the ethical movements that have been building since the revolutionary events of 1968 and which are represented in the Movement of Movements. It requires a voice to avoid splintering, self-inflicted violence, and ill-calculated retribution against the state. Furthermore, scholars who take the Porto Alegre Manifesto seriously will support the new ontologically productive phase of critical thought and will avoid a regression toward the rejection of feasible solutions in favor of a merely deconstructive phase of critical thought.

In Chapter 6, I have attempted to demonstrate how subjects might evacuate the power of the state, which would force it to wither. Similarly, the Do-It-Yourself movements permit us a test case for our theory. That is, the DIY movements engage the dialectic between theory and practice and stand as an early case that will allow new theory to test its own diagnostic powers regarding acts of direct civil disobedience and resistance. The productive place that the DIY movement holds within the Movement of Movements demonstrates the potential for new and interesting theoretical sites of coalition as broader exodus of state power. Furthermore, the factionalism that is present in Chapter 6 and the polemical writing between leftist groups can highlight the radical singularity that is at the heart not only of the Movement of Movements but of the multitude as well. The Movement of Movements has begun to bring an abundance of

biopolitical production and openness to what historically might have been read as factionalism and ideological disagreements.

It is relevant here to reintroduce the degradation of the Trotsky of the “Problems of Everyday Life” from the Trotskyism of the legacies of factionalism within the Fourth International. As Marx said in another context, the first time in history is tragedy; in this sense, the tragedy was Trotsky’s dream for a recovered international, for the dream of a movement toward the problems of libidinal economy, and his brutal assassination. The second time, Marx says, is farce; in this sense, there are the breaks and splits and recantations among and between what could have been vital organizations over minutiae of historical details in which these Trotskyist organizations were never involved. But the Movement of Movements has supplanted this ghost and we are in the space of that difficult becoming for the left—between the traumas of the past and the potentials of a future. This openness and abundance of biopolitical production—and of direct solutions—merges with how we grasp the singularities present in the multitude. At this fundamental nexus between these contagious forces we can imagine a permanent revolution-of-the-common.

“America, when will you be worthy of your million Trotskyites?”

—Allen Ginsberg, “America”

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abbott Jennifer and Mark Achbar. *The Corporation*. New York: Zeitgeist, 2005.
- Albertini, Claudio. "Black Blocs, Tute Bianche and Zapatistas in the anti-globalization movement." Web. 10 Jun 2010. <<http://fsgcasper.net/node/24>>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tute Bianche/White Overalls." Web. 10 Jun 2010. <<http://nadir.org/nadir/initiattiv/agp/free/>>.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Minneapolis: Aunt Lute Books, 2007.
- Badiou, Alain. *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*. New York: Verso, 2002.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Benjamin, Walter. "On the Concept of History." Trans. Dennis Redmond. Marxist Internet Archive. San Francisco: Creative Commons, 2005. Web. 4 Nov. 2009 <[http://www.efn.org/~dredmond/Theses\\_on\\_History.html](http://www.efn.org/~dredmond/Theses_on_History.html)>
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Arcades Project*. Cambridge, MA: Belnap Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Work of Art in the Age of Technical Reproducibility." Ross, S.
- Beresford, David. *Ten Men Dead: The Story of the 1981 Hunger Strike*. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1997.
- Bonaparte, Napoleon. *Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte*. Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 2001.
- Bui, Roberto. "Tute Bianche: The Practical Side of Myth Making (in Catastrophic Times)." Web. 10 Jun 2010. <<http://www.wumingfoundation.com/english/giap/giapdigst11.html>>
- Bush, George W. "New Leadership on National Security." Web. 10 Jun 2010. <<http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd46/46bush.htm>>
- Campbell, Bruce. *Mexican Murals in Times of Crisis*. Tuscon:University of Arizona Press, 2003.
- Chomsky, Noam. "The War in Iraq" in Democracy University, Volume 2. Ralph Cole, dir. New York: Transparency, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media*. Peter Wintonick, dir. New York: Zeitgeist, 2002.

- Connolly, James. *Socialism and the Irish Rebellion: Writings from James Connolly*. New York: Red and Black Publishers, 2008.
- Cuevas, Jess Ramirez. "The Body as a Weapon for Civil Disobedience." Web. 10 Jun 2010. <<http://de.indymedia.org/2009/07/256582.shtml>>
- Cummings, E.E. *Selected Poems*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Ltd., 1994.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- EZLN. *Voice of Fire: Communiqués and Interviews from the EZLN*. Ben Clarke and Clifton Ross. New York: Freedom Voices, 2000.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1995.
- Ginsberg, Allen. "America." *Collected Poems, 1947-1997*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2007.
- Graeber, David. "The New Anarchists." *New Left Review* 13.1 (2002). Web. 20 Dec. 2009. <<http://newleftreview.org/A2368>>
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion, and Desire*. New York: AK Press, 2007. 157-8
- Guattari, Félix and Antonio Negri. *Communists Like Us*. New York: Semiotext(e), 1990.
- Guevara, Ernesto "Ché." "From Algiers, for Marcha: The Cuban Revolution Today." *Che Guevara Reader: Writing on Politics and Revolution*. David Deutschmann, ed. New York: Ocean Press, 2003.
- Haraway, Donna. "The Cyborg Manifesto." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Hardt, Michael. "Interview." *Charlie Rose*. 24 July 2001. Television.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Hardt, Michael and Kathy Weeks, ed. *Jameson Reader*. New York: Blackwell, 2000.

Herman, Judith. *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence from Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*. New York: Basic Books, 1997.

International Anarchist Conspiracy. "IAC communiqué number 2." *The Black Bloc Papers: An Anthology of Primary Texts from the North American Anarchist Black Bloc*. David Van Deusen and Xavier Massot, ed. New York, AK Press, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. "IAC communiqué number 4." Van Deusen.

\_\_\_\_\_. "IAC communiqué number 5." Van Deusen.

Jackson, Ira. "Interview." Abbot.

Jameson, Fredric. "Paradigms of Interpretation." Hardt.

Juarez, Mike. *Colors on Desert Walls*. El Paso, Texas Western Press, 1997.

Keyes, Robert. "Interview." Abbot.

King, Martin Luther. *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: HarperOne, 1990.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*. New York, Harper and Row, 1981.

Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. New York, W. W. Norton and Co., 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Book 1: Freud's Papers on Technique*. New York: Norton, 1988.

Lenin, Vladimir. *State and Revolution*. Whitefish, Montana: Kessinger Publishing, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*. New York: Dover Publications, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: Foreign Language Press, 1975.

Mao, Zedong. *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*. "Kang Chan Ta Hsueh" Nos. 6-8. Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1966.

Mao, Zedong. *Selected Works*. Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1965.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *The Holy Family*. Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Civil War in France*. New York: Dodo Press, 2009.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Communist Manifesto." New York: Filiquarian, 1997.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: Volume 1, A Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Penguin Classics, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Penguin Classics, 1993.
- Maslow, Abraham. "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Negri, Antonio. *Revolution Retrieved: Marx, Keynes, Capitalist Crisis and New Social Subjects, 1967-1983*. New York: Left Bank Books, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Antonio Negri: A Revolt That Never Ends*. Alexandra Weltz and Andreas Pichler, dir. New York: Icarus Films, 2004.
- Nelson, Cary. *No University Is an Island: Saving Academic Freedom*. New York: NYU Press, 2010.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 2009.
- Orwell, George. *The Orwell Reader: Fiction, Essays, and Reportage*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1984.
- Pérez-Torres, Rafael. *Mestizaje: Critical Uses of Race in Chicano Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- Rochfort, Desmond. *Mexican Muralists: Orozco, Rivera, Siqueiros*. San Francisco, Chronicle Books, 1998.
- Ross, Stephen. *Art and Its Significance: An Anthology of Aesthetic Theory*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1994.
- Sands, Bobby. "Diary." *Writings from Prison*. London: Mercier, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *One Day in My Life*. Sands.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Skylark, Sing Your Lonely Song*. Sands.
- Shiva, Vandana. Interview in Abbot.
- Slattery, Patrick and Nancy Langerock. "Blurring Art and Science: Synthetical Moments on the Borders." *Curriculum Inquiry*. 32.3. (2002): 349-56. Print.
- Stalin, Joseph. *Foundations of Leninism*. Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 2001.

- Thatcher, Margaret. "Address to the House of Commons." 1981. Peter Taylor. *Provos: The I.R.A. and Sinn Fein*. London: Bloomsbury, UK, 1998. p. 242-3.
- Trotsky, Leon. *The Permanent Revolution and Results and Prospects*. New York: IMG, 2007.
- Tute Bianchi. "The Anarchist Movement, the Black Bloc, and Us." Web. 20 Dec. 2009. <<http://nadir.org/nadir/initiattiv/agp/free/genova/busload.htm>>
- Virno, Paolo. *Grammar of the Multitude*. New York: Semiotext(e), 2004.
- Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press, 1997.
- Wiesel, Eli. *The Night Trilogy: Night, Dawn, Day*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2008.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *Manufacturing Reality: Slavoj Žižek and The Reality of the Virtual*. New York: Olive Films, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Žižek!* New York: Zeitgeist, 2005.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Michael Rowley received the B.A. in General Studies in the Humanities and in English from the University of Chicago in 1999. He received the M.F.A. in Bilingual Creative Writing (Border Studies Option) from the University of Texas at El Paso in 2003.