



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Política del anonimato en el cine de América Latina

Pradenas Alvarez, R.I.

Citation

Pradenas Alvarez, R. I. (2022, May 31). *Política del anonimato en el cine de América Latina*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304594>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304594>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Propositions

1. The *politicization of cinema* in Latin America names a series of political-aesthetical programs, which since the 1960s-70s were driven by the assumption of the intellectual superiority of the avant-garde over the spectators, while imposing political partisan criteria that restrained the aesthetic potentiality of cinema.
2. The philosophical basis of the discourse on the *politicization of cinema* in Latin America, in the 1960s-70s, consisted of a series of essentialist categories such as *nosotros* [we], *lo propio* [proper being] and *identidad* [identity], introduced by the Latin Americanist intellectuals at the end of the 19th century.
3. The *politics of anonymity* of Latin American cinema is a function of the anarchy inherent in technical images, insofar as they undermine the metaphysical principles of origin, identity, and authenticity that inform the understanding of representation in the tradition of militant cinema.
4. The *politics of anonymity* offers a powerful critique of the idea of the *politicization of cinema*. The first implies an strong link between the aesthetic and political spheres, while the second presupposes a contraposition between politics and aesthetics.
5. The domineering tendency over the people's subjectivity expressed by the Latin American political and aesthetic avant-garde of the 20th century can be traced back to the theological-juridical treatises of Catholic imperial authors of the 16th century, such as Francisco de Vitoria and José de Acosta, in which spiritual guidance serves as the basis for the colonial project.
6. The Aristotelian doctrine of the "natural slave" is one of the central philosophical pillars of the hierarchical distinction between civilization and barbarism. This distinction has been the discursive center of the power of modern government in Latin America from the 16th century to the present.
7. The concept of *pacification* is central to understanding the logic of power and violence in Latin American modern history. However, pacification does not refer exclusively to the realm of war, but mainly to the foundation of governance.
8. In the light of the positivist thought that became dominant in the 19th and early 20th centuries, technical images (photography and film) were understood as instruments for the establishment of scientific truth. However, those images

swiftly surpassed that instrumental function, overflowing into society at large, as a sort of epidemic of now uncontrollable signs.

9. The relationship between *image* and *community* should not be conceived as the *visual representation of communism*. In the first case, the images produce surplus-figures which exceed the account of the hegemonic order, whereas the visual representation of communism produces a closed and hierarchical vision of the social body.
10. *Consensus democracy* is not a democracy in decline, but a governmental device that has taken the old political name of democracy. Its purpose is the technical administration of social life in the light of a strictly economic consideration of politics, but without any relationship to the matrixial subject of politics, namely the *demos*.
11. The logic of *consensus* is the neutralization of politics understood as dissensus (Rancière). In this sense, consensus democracy can be also called post-democracy, which means a system of agreement between political and economic elites that nullify the fundamental power of the *demos*.
12. In post-democracy, only one type of struggle is accepted: the dispute over private interests. For this reason, *homo economicus* is the central subject of post-democracy, insofar as he lives on the premise of ensuring the victory of his private interests over all others.