

Beyond the *need* of the architect and architecture:

Problematizing territorial coloniality and neo-liberal subjectivation in so-called colombia and méxico

A Dissertation

Presented to the Division of Philosophy, Art & Critical Thought of The European Graduate School / EGS

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Art & Social Thought

Felipe Guerra Arjona

June 08 2024

Supervised by Fred Moten

Dissertation Committee:

Stefano Harney

Nemanja Mitrović

Table of contents

Acknowledgments — 8

Introduction - All forms, indeed — 9

En el cemento no hay porvenir

0.1 *Con-movernos*

0.1.1 Bodied and situated research

0.1.2 *Con-movernos* or *if only we knew we could move*

0.2 On habits

0.2.1 Anthology

0.2.2 No-purity, all forms, indeed

0.3 Trans-versal field

0.3.1 Trans-versality

0.3.2 Unusual complicities?

0.3.3 Trans-formation

0.4 Uni-versal amalgam

0.4.1 Imbricate critique

0.4.2 Amalgam

0.5 *Get out of here con eso: Colonial territorial domination*

0.5.1 Colonialism and coloniality

0.5.2 Territorial coloniality or fuck the *arkhé!*

0.6 Logistics of desires, freedom and truth(s)

0.6.1 Logistics

0.6.2 Desires, freedom and truth(s)

0.7 Chapters abstract

Chapter 1 - Within/together and against/apart neo-liberalization — 66

Pure theoretical shit?

1.1 The government of freedom(s)

1.1.1 Liberalism or exit the neutral

1.1.2 New Capitalism

1.1.3 Governmentality

1.1.4 Conduct of conduct

1.1.5 Neo-liberalization

1.1.6 Economization

1.2 Dispositifs and the logistics of neo-liberalization

1.2.1 Logistics of desire

1.2.2 Success as self-realization

1.2.3 The new

1.2.4 Innovation

1.2.5 Creativity

1.2.6 Flexibility

1.2.7 Competition

1.2.8 Metrics, Indicators, accountability and performance

1.2.9 Risk

1.2.10 Resilience

1.3 Neo-liberalization of so-called méxico and colombia

1.3.1 So-called méxico: Neo-liberal by design

1.3.1.1 Montes de Oca and the Austrians

1.3.1.2 Network of educational institutions

1.3.1.3 *Ejid*os and the privatization of communal land

1.3.2 So-called colombia: Neo-liberal by constitution

1.3.2.1 Precedents

1.3.2.2 Gaviria

1.3.2.3 Think-tanks

1.3.2.4 Violence

1.3.2.4 *Economía Naranja*: Coloniality, repetition and neo-liberalization

1.4 Territorial neo-liberalization - Neo-liberal architecture

1.4.1 Spatio-territorial neo-liberalization

1.4.2 Real estate speculation and financialization

1.4.3 Extractivism and violence

Coda

Chapter 2 - Masks and suspects or the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject — 136

Masks and suspects

2.1 Individual by design: The uni-versal individual subject

2.1.1 Uni-versal and the individual

2.1.2 Subjects of whom?

2.2 White by design: Coloniality of being or what does it mean being ¿human?

2.2.1 *Ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia*

2.2.2 Overrepresentation and coloniality of being

2.2.3 Colonial-capitalist unconscious

2.2.4 *Mestizaje* and the political project of/for *blanqueamiento*

2.2.4.1 The case of so-called colombia

2.2.4.2 The case of so-called méxico

2.2.5 The political regime of cis-heterosexuality

2.2.6 Whiteness by design

2.2.7 The *soft* police of power, technocrats and the bourgeoisie

2.3 Neo-liberal by design: Economic subject(ion) Or when are we?

2.3.1 Economo-subjectivization

2.3.2 Homo Œconomicus

2.3.3 Human Capital

2.3.4 Entrepreneur

2.3.5 Consumer

Coda

Chapter 3 - Architectural education: pedagogies of the new, industries of the self — 225

The *central myth-making ritual* of education

3.1 Uni-versal machine

3.1.1 Genealogy of education

3.1.2 Genealogy of the uni-versity

3.1.3 Coloniality of knowledge

3.2 Neo-liberal uni-versity

3.2.1 Modulation by competences

3.2.2 Uni-versity in so-called méxico

- 3.2.3 Uni-versity in so-called colombia
- 3.2.4 Neo-liberal educational spatialities
- 3.3 Architectural pedagogy(s) | Pedagogies of the new**
 - 3.3.1 Professionalization
 - 3.3.2 Form and value is what matters
 - 3.3.3 Cultural colonialism and education as imperialism
 - 3.3.4 So-called méxico
 - 3.3.4.1 Colonial to republican
 - 3.3.4.2 Modern to neo-liberal
 - 3.3.5 So-called colombia
 - 3.3.5.1 Colonial to republican
 - 3.3.5.2 Modern to neo-liberal
 - 3.3.6 Neo-liberal dispositifs
 - 3.3.6.1 *The age of the entrepreneur*
 - 3.3.6.2 Pedagogies of the new
 - 3.3.7 Within and against *las pedagogías de la crueldad*

Coda

Chapter 4 - Exodus, or the Voluntary Workers of Architecture: On the neo-liberalization of the architect — 298

Exodus, or voluntary workers?

4.1 Coloniality of labour

- 4.1.1 Genealogy of coloniality of labour

4.2 Architectural authority from craft to profession

- 4.2.1 Ancient builders
- 4.2.2 See paris and die! Professionalization in italy and france
- 4.2.3 Professionalization in spain
- 4.2.4 Colonial architects in Abya Yala
- 4.2.5 Authority and so-called leadership
- 4.2.6 Manual-intellectual and sexual-racialized division of labour
- 4.2.7 Disabling professionals
- 4.2.8 The genius individual author
- 4.2.9 Patriarchitecture
- 4.2.10 Petite bourgeoisie laments: the architect as artist
- 4.2.11 The venerable calling and labour reluctance

4.3 Re/producing the neo-liberal architect

- 4.3.1 The case of so-called méxico
 - 4.3.1.1 Colonial master-masons, *alarifes* and clergy
 - 4.3.1.2 The peculiar modern character
 - 4.3.1.3 Neo-liberalization of the architect
- 4.3.2 The case of so-called colombia
 - 4.3.2.1 Colonial master-masons, *alarifes* and clergy
 - 4.3.2.2 The peculiar modern character
 - 4.3.2.3 Neo-liberalization of the architect

Coda

Chapter 5 - Learnings and doings, the death of the reign of homo educandus and homo oeconomicus — 363

Autonomy is not a place you enter but a groove that enters you

5.1 Learnings

5.1.1 Beyond-against and beyond education and schooling

5.1.1.1 Education is the re/production of social orders

5.1.1.2 Education is uni-versalization

5.1.1.3 Education is the rule of consumption

5.1.1.4 Education is pre-alienation or the training of: bondage, obedience and labour

5.1.2 Modes of learning and non-hegemonic *modes of study*

5.1.2.1 Learning as unlearning

5.1.2.2 Learning as trans-versality

5.1.2.3 Learning as situated *saberes*

5.1.2.4 Learning as relational *sentir-pensar-hacer*

5.1.2.5 Learning as anarchic trans-formation

5.1.2.6 Learning as study

Coda learnings

5.2 Doings

5.2.1 Beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract labour

5.2.1.1 Labour is the service of humans in bondage

5.2.1.2 Labour is the valorization of life

5.2.1.3 Labour is abstraction

5.2.1.4 Labour is white patriarchal rule

5.2.1.5 Labour is racist colonial rule

5.2.2 No will to work

5.2.2.1 Abolition of labour

5.2.2.2 Against the calling, architectural labour

5.2.2.3 Fugitive deprofessionalization

5.2.2.4 Doing

5.2.2.5 Communal and anti-colonial doings

Coda doings

Coda

Outro, by way of in-conclusions: architecture and the collective practices of inhabiting — 455

Notes — 497

Bibliography and unsolicited collaborations *o como se llamen* — 502

Colophon

Acknowledgments

To Marielsa, the most loving *pareja*, and my best-*enemiga*. For our long shower-talks and *viernes de papitas* problematizing this research, and all our passions. For your loving and supportive hearing, and *conversa*.

A V familia, specially my mother and father, for you unconditional love and support. To my sisters for their love and our sibling complicity. To all, for our continuous openness and effort for mutual understanding.

To all the coopia coompis, for our complicity and commitment to rehearse and imagine ourselves together beyond and against abstract labour, and outside architecture(?) Our woven *sentir-pensar-hacer* is entangled through all these lines.

To all the *amistades*, for your caring reading, insightful critiques and comments. And, specially to *la comadre* for your *afecto* and complicity.

To Fred, for your support, caring/generous reading, listening and stimulating/challenging dialogue.

To those we have stolen from, for the potency of your *sentir-pensar-hacer*, may we continue our unsolicited collaborations.

To Lunes & Martes, for your love and company while hearing me thinking out-loud.

To power thesaurus, deepl and paraphrase tool, may we continue our joint-path of dis/appropriative writing in-trans-lation.

To architecture, for 18 years of education, professionalization, design and teaching labour, fuck you!

To architects, may we stop being architects and stop making architecture.

To *this* world, may it end soon.

To *other*-worlds, may they spread faster.

Yours in the collective struggle

Introduction

All forms, indeed

*Juan Albañil, el edificio que levantaste
Con lo mucho que trabajaste
Está cerrado, está sellado
Es prohibido para ti, Juan Albañil*

*Como es domingo, Juan Albañil por la avenida
Va de paseo mirando cuánto construyó
Hoteles, condominios, cuánto lujo
Y ahora como no es socio, no puede entrar
Juan Albañil, no puede entrar, no puede entrar*

*Juan Albañil, hombre vecino
Cuánto ha soñado con la llamada igualdad
Juan Albañil pero dile a tus hijos
Que en el cemento no hay porvenir*

*Como es domingo, Juan Albañil por la avenida
Pasa llorando, mirando cuánto construyó
Va lamentando la importancia insignificante
Que el que trabaja tiene después que trabajó*

*El que trabaja tiene después que trabajó
Juan Albañil, no puede entrar*

*Pero cuántos condominios ese hombre
Va construyendo
Y mañana es la misma puerta,
De ahí mismo, lo van huyendo
Que sí, que sí*

*Y en los andamios de la vida
Con palaustres de hermandad
Fabricaremos algún día
La casa de la igualdad
Y digo yo*

*Y en esa casa señoras y señores
No habrá distinción jamás
Gente de toditos los colores
Con Juan Albañil, toditos podrán entrar*

*Como es domingo, Juan Albañil pasea
Por todita la ciudad
Y sus nenes le preguntan:
"Papi a ese edificio tan grande
¿Por qué yo no puedo entrar?"*

*La rumba, la rumba y la rumba de la existencia
La baila la humanidad
Aunque le pese la conciencia
Como Juan Albañil
Esta es la desigualdad*

*Bendito obrero, valiente Juan Albañil
Oye, hombre que le mete frente al destino
¡Ese es, ese es, ese es!*

*De siete a cuatro muchachos
Media hora a almorzar
Metiendo molledo y brazo
Las manos bien repletas de callo, ya más*

*Juan Albañil, hoy te digo que ese día ya vendrá
El tiempo será testigo, lo tuyo será tuyo
Mira y de nadie más*

*Definitivamente, Juan Albañil
Por lo menos para mí, tú eres un señor*

Juan Albañil - Cheo Feliciano - 1980¹

En el cemento no hay porvenir

“Trabajo con ideas encontradas en el camino, con diálogos a medio construir, fragmentarios, escuchados al paso” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 9)

“...become a problem by doing the work of problematizing” (Bey, 2019, p. 25)

“Wild tongues can’t be tamed, they can only be cut out” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 54)

“...an idea-thief and shuffler of second hand concepts. Borrowing is not a problem in itself, except on the level of the semantic foundation of a new word” (Guattari, 2009, p. 23)

“I am nothing but a thief stealing shit I vibe with from others and making it do a different kind of work. Hacking already hacked ideas, stealing stolen things and giving them away so others can steal more things. It is an expansive dispersal and unowning of fugitive knowledge that I want you, all of you, to be down with” (Bey, 2019, p. xi)

“...my problem is to extract elements from one domain in order to transfer them into other fields of application. With the risk, of course, that it may miscarry nine times out often, that it may turn out to be a theoretical mess” (Guattari, 2009, p. 23)

“It is not easy writing this letter. It began as a poem, a long poem. I tried to turn it into an essay but the result was wooden, cold. I have not yet unlearned the esoteric bullshit and pseudo-intellectualizing that school brainwashed into my writing. How to begin again. How to approximate the intimacy and immediacy I want. What form?” (Anzaldúa, 1983)

“...since each of us, like anyone else, is already various people, it gets rather crowded” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 7)

“...everything begins in the raging middle of the dividual” (Raunig, 2016, p. 11)

“...living in and with capitalism can be more than just living by and for capitalism”
(Echeverría, 2000, p. 36)

“...workers are expected to be the architects of their own better exploitation” (Henwood, 1997)

“What we are cannot be fixed. We are becoming” (Bey, 2020, p. 106)

“We neither occupy nor have but, rather, *share* spacetime” (Moten, 2017b, p. 6)

“All forms, — indeed, the most varied forms, dictated by circumstances, temperament, and the means at disposal. Sometimes tragic, sometimes humorous, but always daring; sometimes collective, sometimes purely individual, this policy of action will neglect none of the means at hand, no event of public life, in order to keep the spirit alive, to propagate and find expression for dissatisfaction, to excite hatred against exploiters, to ridicule the government and expose its weakness, and above all and always, by actual example, to awaken courage and fan the spirit of revolt” (Kropotkin, 1892)

“Now philosophy has become mundane, and the most striking proof of this is that philosophical consciousness itself has been drawn into the torment of the struggle, not only externally but also internally. But, if constructing the future and settling everything for all times are not our affair, it is all the more clear what we have to accomplish at present: I am referring to a *ruthless criticism of all that exists*, ruthless both in the sense of not being afraid of the results it arrives at and in the sense of being just as little afraid of conflict with the powers that be” (Marx, 1978, p. 13)

“quisiera ver un mundo de regiones, no de naciones, de cuencas de ríos, no de departamentos o provincias, de cadenas de montañas, no de cadenas de valor, de comunidades autónomas, no de movimientos sociales” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 33)

As Frantz Fanon might have said, before beginning our case, we have to say certain things. The analysis that we are undertaking is not philosophical, sociological, anthropological or architectural, or as Félix Guattari would say: “none of that in particular, all of that at the same time” (Guattari & Rolnik, 2006, p. 81). All forms, indeed. The most varied forms.

Since it is considered appropriate to introduce a work with a statement of its methodology. We shall break with tradition. We leave methods to architects and urbanists. There is a point at which methods devour themselves. Many architects will not find themselves in what follows (Fanon, 2008, pp. 4–5).

As José Villagrán García never said, to problematize architecture and the architect is neither the audacity of a more or less ingenious thinker, nor the original discovery of an unthought-of state, but the tragic necessity of whom—held by privilege and persistence—, enveloped in the whirlwind that makes *the* world spin and collapse, tries to find supports or glimpses of other *horizons* (Villagrán García, 2011, p. 613).

Throughout the following, we elaborate a problematization of architecture and the architect, through the fields and forces of the experience of coloniality, situated in the territories now called colombia and méxico. And study particularly, the re/production of the neo-liberal architect—the current modality of the architect—through the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, vocational education at uni-versities and abstract-alienating-subordinated labour, and how it is sustained by/for the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*. What such amalgam produces is the constant (*sub*)valorization of life and the reduction of life to an economic existence and labour identity.

We hold that architecture as a technology, proper to the white bourgeois ideology of design, and fundamental to territorial coloniality dominates the multiple approaches to study, imagine, compose and construct space and form, and *encubre* the diverse inhabiting and constructive cultures, modalities of inhabiting. Architecture pushes constantly towards the violent inseparability of the white-totality of being and the white-totality of inhabiting. “But no apparatus of capture is a totality; no apparatus of capture can indeed succeed in the entirety of its attempted capture” (Bey, 2023, p. 8).

Dis/appropriating Eli Meyerhoff (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 4), as he argues against the *romance of education*, we argue that architecture is just one possible mode of studying, imagining, composing and constructing places—or spatio-territorial trans-formation—among many, alternative modes of inhabitation are bound up with different *practices of world un-making*, as Fred Moten might say (Moten & da Silva, 2021)—ways of rehearsing becomings, spatiality and sociality. We understand modes of inhabitation as ways of composi(t)ng the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation. We argue that *architecture-based modes of inhabitations* sustain *practices of world-making* that are associated with modernist, colonial, capitalist, statist, white-supremacist, cis-hetero patriarchal norms. In the course of political struggles between conflicting modes of world-making, architecture has been presented as the best and only option for spatio-territorial trans-formation. Because it is idealized in

this way, today, the possibilities of alternative modes of spatio-territorial transformation, *practices of world un-making* have become almost unthinkable. Not only architecture is idealized and imposed, but architectural alienation operates by estranging people off the collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world. Against the grain, we take aim at the *romance of architecture*, beyond-against and beyond² architectural alienation.

Contesting the white-north architectural left, as Erik Swyngedouw and Peggy Deamer, who both agree on the “identification that while architecture is what Tafuri claimed it to be—ideology’s pawn—architects are not” (Lahiji, 2016, p. 106). On the contrary, we argue that architects are essential pawns, *lavaperros del poder*, “watchdogs of colonialism” as Césaire would say (Césaire, 2001, p. 55), there is no architecture without architects—which does not mean that all architecture is directly done by architects, we know most architecture is produced without the direct participation of architects, but that rather architects advance either disciplinary or professionally the white bourgeois ideology of design which operates *environmentally* by modulating one hegemonic mode of inhabiting, the *architectural world*—, *architecture is the production of the architect*, as labour is the production of the labourer, the creation of architecture is the creation of the architect, and as Fred Moten and Stefano Harney note, “the worker first produces herself, but in so doing produces not just herself but the very relations of capital” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 132).

Problematizing architecture, then, is always already a critique of the architect. And situating such critique in so-called méxico and colombia, calls to co-move beyond-against and beyond the modality of existence that over-represents the architect, the white-cis-hetero-petty-bourgeois mestizo, the neo-liberal patriarchitect. We ask what/who is an architect? If labour is the key form of capitalist domination (Krisis-Group, 1999), in other words, the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is fundamentally sustained through labour. Through the ontological imbrication of class, race and gender. Then, what we are mobilizing is fundamentally a problematization of the ontology of such thing as *the* architect. The ontological push towards *being* architects. With all the class, race and gender violence this implies. Yet, as Marquis Bey, remarks in *Impossible Life: A Meditation on Paraontology*: we ask *nothing of ontology*. “Ontology is not the thing” (Bey, 2023, p. 19). Because, “the fort is the ontological, the supposed community that comes with being a part of the same race or gender or class” (Bey, 2023, p. 19). Or the fort of the supposed architectural community.

We are elaborating an imbricate and trans-versal—anarchic, anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, anti-racist—problematization of architecture, an abolitionist critique. Which is to say, to co-move beyond-against and beyond the white-bourgeois authority complex of the *patriarchitect*. We hold then, by way of Iván Illich, that there are no alternative architectures, nor alternative modalities of the architect, but what we urgently need are alternatives to architecture, alternatives to the white-authority professional complex of the architect. And, ultimately that a critique of the architect and architecture as white-colonial ideology, means co-

moving towards composi(t)ng and rehearsing the *means* and *relations* of autonomous modes of inhabitation, beyond-against and beyond the need for architecture and the architect. In other words, by way of Moten and Harney, and through Fanon (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 15), we argue, we are co-moving not to end the architect or architecture, but the end of the standpoint from which it makes sense to need the architect and architecture.

Make no mistake, we are all neo-liberal architects. We are not compelled to engage with a *ruthless criticism* of architecture and the architect in order to dissociate and distance ourselves from architecture, and its responsibility. But to recognize ourselves through the violence we sustain as architects and doing architecture, as workers. Because as Guattari underscores, “self-critique is always for theory and organization” (Guattari, 2015, p. 367). And therefore, co-move collective potencies of organization beyond architectural education and labour, against the professionalization of our habitat. Because even if the main axis of critique is architecture and the architect, we do not write only for architects, nor for the discipline or profession. We are not here to convince anyone. But rather to engage and co-move, to *study*, with anyone and everyone willing to re/claim the autonomous potency of inhabitation. To co-move beyond the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject. In other words, to mobilize together beyond-against and beyond architecture. Fuck architecture! There is no autonomy *of* architecture.³ But only autonomy *from* architecture. The autonomy of architecture is whiteness dream. Which is to say, there is no autonomous architecture, but autonomous struggles beyond-against and beyond architecture.

Let go. We must let go the false promise that we need architects and architecture. “To inhabit the world as unfixed requires one to let go profoundly. But this profound letting go is with respect to a profound gaining of something else that might allow us to do things differently” (Bey, 2021, p. 12). “We must let go [...] Letting go allows us to attempt to find ourselves unviolated existences” (Bey, 2021, p. 137). “We become new and different subjects, subjects we could not have been if we had not abolished subjectivity. We become subjectless. For now at least” (Bey, 2021, p. 140).

No matter how much architects want to insist on the possibility of designing and building *other worlds*, this will never happen, not through the white/colonial disciplinary and professional authority and its modern-capitalist-patriarchal project, which will only continue to re/produce the same *architectural world*. Not *behind the white-mask of amiable leadership* (Said, 2003, p. 226). In other words, *the* world the globalitarian modern-eurocentric civilizatory project has imposed over the planet, sustained by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, which has designed and constructed *the* world through violent: enclosures, frontiers, extractivism, dispossession, deterritorialization, codification and discrimination. All to sustain mono-functional modern space—which is to say the spatiality by/for mono-humanism—for the (*sub*)valorization of life. Sustaining such *world* has caused the civilizatory catastrophe, that as Horacio Machado Aráoz argues, is

“not only the material collapse of the world, which it is, the water, energy, and food crisis, but already as a civilizational crisis, which has to do fundamentally with bodies that become incapable of feeling that life is threatened. The civilizational crisis is a crisis of meaning: the inability to feel what is happening at the level of the flows of life; and inability to answer about the meaning of life” (Machado Araújo, 2016, p. 254).

Therefore, no matter how much architecture wears all the masks of inclusion: racial, sexual or class, a mask it will be. This is the challenge, the horizon, because it is not only about negating and refusing the authority and labour identity of the patriarchitect, but most importantly about *co-moving* towards the possibility and potency of imagining and constructing *other worlds, transworlds* (Bey, 2022, p. 96), *rehearsing*, as Saidiya Hartman beautifully notes, other modes of *inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence*, that *the world violently denies us*. Beyond-against and beyond *the architectural world*, we co-move, dream and rehearse towards anarchic worlds, ungovernable modalities of inhabitation, *beautiful experiments in how-to-live*, towards collective trans-formations, and *become ungovernable* (Hartman, 2019, p. 203) (Hartman, 2021, pp. xiii–vi).

Con-movernos

Bodied and situated research

“...it is no longer, or not only, about betraying society or perhaps one’s own class, but about betraying oneself as a bearer of oppression, as a device of authoritarian subjectivation” (Tarì, 2016, p. 139)

“For there are no new ideas. There are only new ways of making them felt, of examining what our ideas really mean (feel like) on Sunday morning at 7 AM, after brunch, during wild love, making war, giving birth; while we suffer the old longings, battle the old warnings and fears of being silent and impotent and alone, while tasting our new possibilities and strengths” (Lorde, 2007, p. 32)

“No, I do not buy all the myths of the tribe into which I was born. I can understand why the more tinged with Anglo blood, the more adamantly my colored and colorless sisters glorify their colored culture’s values-to offset the extreme devaluation of it by the white culture. It’s a legitimate reaction. But I will not glorify those aspects of my culture which have injured me and which have injured me in the name of protecting me” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 21)

“Without falling into the trap of the false dialectic between self-transformation and social transformation” (Tari, 2016, p. 141). We write from the *entrañas* of cis-hetero-male white-mestizo bourgeoisie. Within and against whiteness. Beyond-against and beyond architectural promises and complexes. Is not easy to give an account of the discursive *deriva* that gave form to the text we present today, to delimit a period of entry and exit, because texts only fix certain voices that allow to reach an argument but do not account for the drifts, meanderings, misplaces, falls, and errors that allow to build such an argument.

This process started moving through and around the work of Félix Guattari, even if, at the end, he is not a predominant voice, nor has it been decided to methodologically follow many of his concepts. The thesis was still motivated by/through Guattari’s work. Because as Gilles Deleuze beautifully portrays him in *Three Group-Related Problems*, the Preface for *Psychoanalysis and Transversality: Texts and Interviews 1955-1971*: “A militant political activist and a psychoanalyst just so happen to meet in the same person, and instead of each minding his own business, they ceaselessly communicate, interfere with one another, and get mixed up—each mistaking himself for the other. An uncommon occurrence at least since Reich. Pierre-Félix Guattari does not let problems of the unity of the Self preoccupy him. The self is rather one more thing we ought to dissolve, under the combined assault of political and analytical forces. Guattari’s formula, ‘we are all groupuscles,’ indeed heralds the search for a new subjectivity, a group subjectivity, which does not allow itself to be enclosed in a whole bent on reconstituting a self (or even worse, a superego), but which spreads itself out over several groups at once. These groups are divisible, manifold, permeable, and always optional” (Deleuze, 2015, p. 7).

The initial research question was shaped by the argument held by Guattari that the current crisis of the world is a crisis of the production subjectivity (Guattari, 1984). And we were compelled to study the crisis of the production of neo-liberal architectural subjectivity, and its modulation through the uni-versity and professional labour, in order to cast light on examples that scape the neo-liberalization of education, architecture and labour. No claims or hope for the uni-versity. No hope in labour. No claims or hope for architecture. We are not here to re-form. We are here to make visible and problematize. To “become a problem by doing the work of problematizing” (Bey, 2019, p. 25). We are here to imagine a world without.

Therefore, rather than studying possible modalities, or alternative labour, alternative educations, alternative architectures and alternative modes of being an architect, an abolitionist critique, which is to say an autonomous or anarchic critique is mobilized beyond-against and beyond the need of the architect. And ask, how is it that a conceptualization of humanity, as the uni-versal individual subject, is produced through education and sustained by/for abstract labour? How in particular does this modulation occur to produce something like the architect? And how can we situate this production through the situated and colonial experience of the territories now occupied by the colombian and mexican nation-states?

A great account of this study was guided by the bodied⁴ experience of inhabiting both the architectural discipline and profession through eighteen years, as a student, designer and teacher. And most importantly through the bodied experience of trans-formation, of *fugitive deprofessionalization*. Because as Karen Barad underscores “practices of knowing and being are not isolable; they are mutually implicated. We don't obtain knowledge by standing outside the world; we know because we are of the world. We are part of the world in its differential becoming” (Barad, 2007, p. 185). The same way as practices of inhabiting and existence are not isolable.

We know that for a few, refusal is sustained by privilege, in access. We have been sustained by such privilege. Yet for the many, for those that hegemony refuses, refusal and waywardness have been constantly rehearsed. As wayward r-existences.

The focus in so-called colombia and méxico is not a comparative study, neither a nationalist commitment nor the will to encompass the full complexity of territories limited today by colonial whims. The study is situated in these territories, with particular attention to Muyquytá—so called bogotá—and Tenochtitlan—so called ciudad de méxico—, not because these two are the nation's capitals, but because un/fortunately these are the territories we have inhabited. The situated and bodied research of this project might be close to what Harney and Moten call study, as speculative habits of assembly, of assembling and dis/assembling (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 117). Rather than through an academic and trans-disciplinary approach, research was done close to an interdisciplinary, deprofessionalized and situated mode. If trans-disciplinarity moves through disciplines, the interdisciplinary modality of study cares nothing for disciplines, it has a criminal attitude, it takes what it can. It moves through mistakes, re-conceptualizations, repetitions, translations, through dis/appropriation as Cristina Rivera Garza would say (Garza, 2019).

If the first two years were cultivated through the alternative academic modality of EGS seminars, the following four years, a bodied and situated research was co-moved through various modalities of fugitive de-professionalization or study, such as; the sustained *sentir-pensar-hacer* and cooperative effort and experimentation with coopia, a cooperative experiment for the trans-formation of the territory compelled to multiple doings through learning and inhabiting; popular assemblies during the 2019 *Paro Nacional* in so-called colombia with *Arquitectura al Paro*; militant experiences through/with anarchist organizations as CATL, *Coordinadora Anarquista Tejiendo Libertad*; active un/learning of/with autonomous and indigenous experiences in so-called méxico; active un/learning of/with anti-racist and sexo-generic dissidences; multiple autonomous study groups; and the on-going complicity of/with loved *amistades*.

Also, not only research was done through trans-lation between spanish and english, both imperial languages, but, in/through transit, between so-called colombia and méxico. Forever grateful to so-called méxico for its generosity and autonomous-rebel potency.

Con-movernos or If only we knew we could move

“We are not destined to our lodgings, fixed from without, immutably. We are not only what they say we are. The criteria used to classify is insufficient, the taxonomy rife with fissures through which we can, blessedly, fall. I am ever romantic about the ways we move within restraint, a captive capacity that dissolves the captivity, letting us become in ways that might, who knows, unshackle the fetters fashioned by the captors. If only we knew we could move” (Bey, 2022, p. ix)

As Kool Haerck says, *It's about a we thing*. So, rather than promote certain struggles, experiences or even theories, this text is meant for *con-movernos*, beyond-against and beyond architecture. To gather, dream together and apart, and rehearse “another life into existence” (Hartman, 2019, p. 20) other modalities of inhabitation. *Practices of possibility* (Hartman, 2019, p. 203).

Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar and Gustavo Esteva by way of Ivan Illich explain that *conmover*, *con-mover* in Spanish is, to move-with, like dancing with all our stomachs and hearts, and tune in together. “Instead of promotion (which operates under the assumption that people are paralyzed or are moving in the wrong direction), [we rather] speak of co-motion—moving with people, rather than moving people. In Spanish, the word *conmover*, *conmoción*, is instructive and strong in its denotation. *Conmoción* means not only to dance with the other a common tune (which does not necessarily define a common conscience). It also denotes moving together with the heart and the stomach, not only with the brain, with rationality. The real plurality of the world is thus manifest in a pluralist attitude, fully respecting both the radical otherness of the other and their own visions and initiatives” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 9). “What do we wish to express when we use it? *Con-mover* is to move (*mover*) together (*con*). It is a constellation of words. It is related to tuning in, to acquiring a similar pitch, to resonate, that is, to vibrate in unison if we think of sound as wave emission. These two elements inhabit the word *conmover*” (Gutiérrez Aguilar, 2021, p. 10).

“It is a matter of co-moving, not of developing, raising awareness, unleashing the process of change, bringing about awakening, organizing people... moving is a nice word. It means to move with the other, as in a dance, and to do it with everything [...] And commotion operates by contagion” (Ornelas Bernal, 2013, p. 181). However, we rather follow Suely Rolnik, and propose that co-motion does not operate by contagion but by pollination, “the term ‘pollination’ was suggested to [Rolnik] by Rolf Abderhalden, [who] points out that the word ‘contagion’ has its origin in medicine and it is from this field that sociology extracted it. Bearing in mind that the term contagion refers to the ‘contamination’ of diseases, [Rolnik] reserves both terms to qualify

the phenomena of proliferation of reactive politics of desire, keeping the notion of ‘pollination’ only for the phenomena of proliferation of active politics of desire” (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 81). For trans-formation.

So, we co-move, we move together and apart, we move through, against and beyond, or as Raúl Zibechi notes, we dance as *puentes*, “bridges between experiences. [...] It is not enough to have a bridge that transmits a vision of what has been learned. We do not want an official truth, but *puentes* where different views and different interpretations can fit, *porque el mundo son muchos mundos*” (Zibechi, 2015a, p. 331). Or as Moten and Harney suggest, to bridge “when we move we move to access, which is to say we assemble and disassemble anew” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 37). *Puentes* as Tito Mitjans proposes through, *La Puente Afrotransfeminista*, by way of a black-trans-feminist praxis, that generates imbricated complicities, by disrupting essentialisms present in discourses and political practices (Mitjans, 2020, p. 69).

We co-move beyond-against and beyond architecture and architects, but not only with architects, with everyone compelled and willing to do the work, to imagine and rehearse other modalities of inhabitation and forms for existence, other *spaces offfor becomings*, as Bey might say. Because as Douglas Spencer holds, architecture is imposed as an “ubiquitous condition of everyday experience. We live in it, enjoy it, suffer from it. It shelters us and it shapes us [...] More than an academic field or an artistic practice, architecture matters to everyone. Our lives are wrapped up in it. So stop policing who does or doesn’t get to speak about architecture, where they write about it, or what they should or shouldn’t be saying about it. This is not your castle. We are not your subjects” (Spencer, 2023).

We co-move towards and ask: “What might occur if we imagine, and indeed enact, ourselves and sociality through an insistent beyond? That is, so often moves that valorize the beyond are cast as ahistorical or refusing to grapple with the present conditions. This is sensible, perhaps, because the beyond is often brandished by those on the political right who wish to move ‘beyond race’ and ‘beyond identity politics,’ rubbing leftists wrongly, justifiably so. The intent here, however, is to dwell in the beyond: truly, to *dwell* in the multiplicitous beyond, to inhabit the beyond as a place where one can move and stretch, a place where one stays and creates a livelihood. The beyond that abolitionists seek to bring about, in echoing reverberation with the ‘after’ that generates radical sentiments seeking to abolish the terrors of this world, is fundamentally a black feminist metaphysics, in Gumbs’s terms. Black feminist metaphysicians examine and assess the beyond; indeed, find in it a place where we might wish to live” (Bey, 2021, p. 129). If only we knew we could rehearse the potency to move *together*, as “*becoming-together in differentiation*” (Bey, 2021, p. 155). “Together we come out wrong, which is more important than coming out right or just or correctly revolutionary” (Bey, 2021, p. 179).

On habits

Anthology

“To the extent that [*we*] said anything or that [*we*] have something to say, that’s because a whole bunch of people, a whole bunch of history, a whole bunch of things sent [*us*] to say it” (Moten, 2015)

“This almost finished product[?] seems an assemblage, a montage, a beaded work with several leitmotifs and with a central core, now appearing, now disappearing in a crazy dance. The whole thing has had a mind of its own, escaping me and insisting on putting together the pieces of its own puzzle with minimal direction from my will. It is a rebellious, willful entity, a precocious girl-child forced to grow up too quickly, rough, unyielding, with pieces of feather sticking out here and there, fur, twigs, clay. My child, but not for much longer. This female being is angry, sad, joyful, is Coatlicue, dove, horse, serpent, cactus. Though it is a flawed thing—a clumsy, complex, groping blind thing—for me it is alive, infused with spirit. I talk to it; it talks to me” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 66)

“Better an errant path than the known world. Better loose than stuck” (Hartman, 2019, p. 61)

We are no writers. Or at least not the conventional kind you likely think, which is likely the only writer you think there is—*there is another way, are other ways*, to write, and *we roam there*. We are *idea-thieves*, stealing shit that resonates, *stealing stolen things* with no *fidelity to a perceived original intended meaning* (Bey, 2021, p. 68). We honor and dis/appropriate with care and acknowledgement, from one place to another in order to run the risk of compos(t)ing a theoretical mess. As Johan Mijail writes, we should “write to get away, to build a return ticket, an escape” (Mijail, 2022, p. 45).

The dis/appropriative habit of writing cultivated throughout the text is an effort of refusal of academic individuation, beyond-against and beyond the constant push towards finding one’s *voz*, towards completion. As speculative habits of assembling and dis/assembling, this is rather a collection, an assemblage of texts, an anthology, an anthological *sancocho*, that together might compose an argument, but apart might sustain other. It “must be taken in bits and pieces, like a montage or installation of the cogs and wheels of a machine. Sometimes the cogs are small, miniscule, but disorderly, and thus all the more indispensable” (Deleuze, 2015, p. 21).

There is no novelty in the coming pages. Nothing new under this sun. *For there are no new ideas*. There are only *different* modes of compos(t)ing them and examining how they feel (Lorde, 2007, p. 32). The habits of writing cultivated through this text, are a collection of *voces* and modalities of writing, compos(t)ing this text through different forms: sometimes essay, sometimes literature review, sometimes collection of fragments, sometimes collection of epigraphs, sometimes quote, sometimes song, sometimes poem, sometimes fiction, sometimes contradictory arguments, sometimes repetition of arguments *in as many ways as possible* and many-times conventional academic writing, because as Gloria Anzaldúa underscores, “we have not yet unlearned the esoteric bullshit and pseudo-intellectualizing that school brainwashed into our writing” (Anzaldúa, 1983). But always *voces que con-mueven fuerzas*.

This dis/appropriative text, is then more like a *dérive*, a multifarious dialogue written by/through multiple hands with/through a multiplicity of references, experiences, observations, intuitions and mistakes, mostly mistakes. We steal and compos(t)e along *la calle del error* (Roca, 2019, p. 59). Towards a *communitarian writing* (Raunig, 2016, p. 15). Having done the best to keep track of the multiple voices/collectives/practices/discourses/experiences/singularities that compose this text, nonetheless a few non-cited dis/appropriations might exist. There are no regrets for this, *cuando “es difícil* differentiating between *lo heredado, lo adquirido, lo impuesto”* (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 82).

As Deleuze notes regarding the collective writing with Guattari: “It’s a strange business, speaking for yourself, in your own name, because it doesn’t at all come with seeing yourself as an ego or a person or a subject. Individuals find a real name for themselves, rather, only through the harshest exercise in depersonalization, by opening themselves up to the multiplicities everywhere within them, to the intensities running through them. A name as the direct awareness of such in tensive multiplicity is the opposite of the depersonalization effected by the history of philosophy; it’s depersonalization through love rather than subjection. What one says comes from the depths of one’s ignorance, the depths of one’s own underdevelopment. One becomes a set of liberated singularities, words, names, fingernails, things, animals, little events. [...] So they try to disentangle inseparable elements and identify who did what. But since each of us, like anyone else, is already various people, it gets rather crowded” (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 6–7).

Some notes on the modality of writing we try to rehearse. And that sometimes we strepitously fail. We do not ascribe to specific theories or schools of thought. As Moten and Harney argue, that today the only relation to the uni-versity is a criminal one, we say that the only relation to critical thought today, through the fields and forces, under/by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is a criminal one. There is no exhaustive track of the *emphasis* added by the sources of the fragments, nor are there mentions of the *emphasis* we added. But just one mention, along the text the use of male/masculine pronouns within dis/appropriated fragments have not been changed, rather just emphasized as a way to point the regime of

phallogocentric writing. As a way of disavowing the individuation of academic writing, most of the text is an assemblage of fragments from others. So there are long fragments that are just extracted and re/assembled, and others are paraphrased with the citation at the end of the paragraph(s). We are *idea-thieves*. We take what we can. Whatever serves. But we take with care. We honor. We take because many have written before and in better form. Actually, cuadernos de Negación said it better: “others have said it before us and in an accurate way, therefore, we will continue overusing quotes” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 29). So we take. And hope you readers re/take and repeat as well. We take, repeat, re/assemble, through an intellectual compos(t)ing, as a habit of refusal of the constant individuation that academic writing imposes. We refuse the supposed *voz* we have inherited from whiteness. Beyond-against and beyond the false promise of finding our *own voz*. Against the privatization of the wor(l)d. Against owning wor(l)ds. We do not have *una voz*. Pero “oye como ladra: *el lenguaje de la frontera*” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 55). *We don’t make sense on our own*. Hoping these “are words that do not merely describe, as if they could; they are words that, as words do, inaugurate worlds” (Bey, 2022, p. x). We babble in chorus.

No-purity, all forms, indeed

No purity of references. No *fidelity to a perceived original intended meaning* (Bey, 2021, p. 68). We do not engage with the work of neither bell hooks, nor Paulo Freire—for several reasons that might, or might not, be explained further on. Nonetheless the answer hooks provides in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* when problematizing her own engagement with Freire, is enlightening, as a cautionary note, for the following dis/appropriative exercises. In the chapter titled *Paulo Freire*, hooks, unravels a playful dialogue between her/selves, Gloria Watkins, talking with bell hooks, her writing voice. At the beginning Gloria Watkins asks bell hooks:

“So you see no contradiction in your valuing of Freire’s work and your commitment to feminist scholarship,?” to which hooks, replies:

“It is feminist thinking that empowers me to engage in a constructive critique of Freire’s work (which I needed so that as a young reader of his work I did not passively absorb the worldview presented) and yet there are many other standpoints from which I approach his work that enable me to experience its value, that make it possible for that work to touch me at the very core of my being. In talking with academic feminists (usually white women) who feel they must either dismiss or devalue the work of Freire because of sexism, I see clearly how our different responses are shaped by the standpoint that we bring to the work. I came to Freire thirsty, dying of thirst (in that way that the colonized, marginalized subject who is still unsure of how to break the hold of the status quo, who longs for change, is needy, is thirsty), and I found in his work (and the work of Malcolm

X, Fanon, etc.) a way to quench that thirst. To have work that promotes one's liberation is such a powerful gift that it does not matter so much if the gift is flawed. Think of the work as water that contains some dirt.

Because you are thirsty you are not too proud to extract the dirt and be nourished by the water. For me this is an experience that corresponds very much to the way individuals of privilege respond to the use of water in the First World context. When you are privileged, living in one of the richest countries in the world, you can waste resources. And you can especially justify your disposal of something that you consider impure. [...] Many people purchase special water because they consider tap water unclean—and of course this purchasing is a luxury. Even our ability to see the water that come through the tap as unclean is itself informed by an imperialist consumer perspective. It is an expression of luxury and not just simply a response to the condition of water. If we approach the drinking of water that comes from the tap from a global perspective we would have to talk about it differently. We would have to consider what the vast majority of the people in the world who are thirsty must do to obtain water. Paulo's work has been living water for me" (hooks, 1994, pp. 49–50).

Neither hooks, nor Freire are necessarily living water for us. But this comment on the imperative of the purity of references is very potent, since we do not engage here with a single, author, material-discursive practice, ideology, theory, etc. We drink contradictorily from many waters and take care of our thirst through multiple forms and sources. Still *cuando "es difícil* differentiating between *lo heredado, lo adquirido, lo impuesto*" (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 82).

Trans-versal field

Trans-versality

"...we have to move [*through*] several worlds at the same time" (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 90)

"What transversality means is simply continual movement from one 'front' to another" (Guattari, 1984, p. 257)

"Rigidity means death. Only by remaining flexible is she able to stretch the psyche horizontally and vertically. La mestiza constantly has to shift out of habitual formations; from convergent thinking, analytical reasoning that tends to use rationality to move toward a single goal (a Western mode), to divergent thinking, characterized by movement away from set patterns and goals and toward a more whole perspective, one that includes rather than excludes" (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 79)

“In Fanon, blackness is transversality between things, escaping (by way of) distant, spooky actions; it is translational effect and affect, transmission between cases, and could be understood, in terms Brent Hayes Edwards establishes, as diasporic practice. This is what he carries with him, as the imagining thing that he cannot quite imagine and cannot quite control, in his pathologizing description of it that it—that he—defies. A fugitive cant moves through Fanon, erupting out of regulatory disavowal. His claim on this criminality was interdicted. But perhaps only the dead can strive for the quickening power that animates what has been relegated to the pathological. Perhaps the dead are alive and escaping. Perhaps ontology is best understood as the imagination of this escape as a kind of social gathering; as undercommon plainsong and dance; as the fugitive, centrifugal word; as the word’s autointerruptive, autoilluminative shade/s. Seen in this light, black(ness) is, in the dispossessive richness of its colors, beautiful” (Moten, 2018b, p. 180)

This thesis emerges from the *mutually illuminating intra-action*⁵ of a diversity of archives and *material-discursive practices*⁶ that compose a *trans-versal field* for work, towards *unusual complicities* that might yield potent *trans-formations*. A profound *anarchic* critique traverses the whole research, because as Catherine Malabou by way of Reiner Schürmann, regarding the *archic paradigm*, notes, “kings, magistrates, and governors are, first and foremost, architects: ‘Magistrates, kings, and tyrants are named under the same rubric as the architectonic arts.’ (Schürmann, 1987, p. 103). The archic paradigm is an architecture in the true sense of the word, for, in a single edifice with its sloping walls, it holds together the attributive schema, the concept of cause (*aitia*), the teleocratic link, the techno-poetic schema, and political hegemony” (Malabou, 2024, p. 44). Which is to say that the mobilization of a problematization of the architect, is always already a critique beyond-against and beyond the *archic paradigm*, domination, and the ontological regime of whiteness sustained by/for its authority/leadership complex (Fanon, 2008, p. 73). In other words a critique of the architect and architecture as bourgeois-western ideology, means co-moving towards autonomous inhabitations, pluri-versal *forms for existence*. We will try to repeat this *in as many ways as possible*.

Thus, the *trans-versal field* of work we compose, sometimes contradictory, provokes illuminating *intra-actions*, through *material-discursive practices*, *world un-making* practices with *anarchic affinities*, that put at the center and as a horizon a profound autonomous critique of domination, in all forms, beyond-against and beyond the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, today governed by nation-states, and imagine and practice other modalities of existence, other becomings, *through an anarchy of becoming* (Bey, 2020, p. 68) towards *other* worlds. This assemblage of material-discursive practices, point to the inseparability

of modes of *inhabiting* earth and *forms for existence*, beyond *the* architectural world. Beyond the western-liberal notion of society, because as Moten, reminds us, “society is not friendly association with others; it’s friendly association without others, in the absence of the other, in the exhaustion of relational individuality, in consent not to be a single being, which is given in the sharpness of a differentiating touch, in the movement of hands, in *caminhando*.” (Moten, 2017a, p. 282).

We owe much to anarchism, autonomist and open marxism and communization, but it has been our reading and experience of/through; autonomous and anti-colonial movements in Abya Yala; *comunalidad* in so-called México; the black radical tradition; and sex-gender dissidences, that the critique that co-moves us has been potently re/articulated. The trans-versal field of work, rather than a methodological frame, is like a web, or a symbiotic relation as mycorrhiza, or is it like a delta? A diffuse field which refuses a single stream and moves through meanders that sometimes meet and sometimes each moves in a different direction. The trans-versal field allows us to problematize the production of the neo-liberal architect, co-move and study, through/with, *by way of them, in their wake, under their influence, protection and against the grain* (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 126), of these material-discursive practices and their mutually illuminating intra-actions.

Moving (*through*) some words by Marquis Bey, if “anarchism allows for nothing but what is unallowable” (Bey, 2020, p. 74) then this is about what autonomous and anti-colonial movements in Abya Yala; *comunalidad* in so-called México; blackness; transness; sex-gender dissidences; “does to and through anarchism, not against it. We need anarchism’s musings and movement strategies, so it would be antithetical to radical world transformation to jettison anarchism’s gifts. Too, though, anarchism cannot simply do what it has always done (which is itself a multifarious enterprise) as such has been predicated on, in part, an elision of the weight of white (and cis male) supremacy. That is, we cannot just add in racial and gendered perspectives to an already-functioning anarchism; we cannot, also, simply throw out anarchism on the grounds of these elisions. The task is to mobilize the effects” of autonomous and anti-colonial movements in Abya Yala; *comunalidad*; blackness; sex-gender dissidences “and anarchism colliding in harmoniously complex chaos.” Bey, calls the mobilization of blackness and anarchism, *anarcho-Blackness*, and borrows *anarchaos*, “a beautifully apt lexicon from Christopher R. Williams and Bruce A. Arrigo (Williams & Arrigo, 2001)” (Bey, 2020, p. 18). We call this mobilization of *material-discursive practices* through/with anarchism, and their mutually illuminating intra-actions: *trans-versality*.

Trans(*verse*)ality, through verses, through many discourses, through many *voces*. We do have something to thank to architectural modulation, and, that was learning the openness—irresponsibility? —to play with form, to *compose*. Trans-versality is here derived from the work of Guattari. Our intention has been to work in a trans-versal manner, meaning we will not be limited to disciplines neither inter/trans-disciplinarity but will cross/intersect and compose assemblages of *material-discursive practices*, in a non-categorical in-disciplinary

manner, questioning disciplinary categories towards a practice of epistemic dis/obedience. Movement across *material-discursive practices* “capable of traversing heterogeneous fields and carrying the strongest charges of *transversality*” (Guattari, 2009, p. 23).

By trans-versality Guattari proposed “a dimension that tries to overcome both the impasse of pure verticality and that of mere horizontality: it tends to be achieved when there is maximum communication among different levels and, above all, in different meanings” ((Guattari, 1984, p. 18) (Guattari, 2015, p. 113)). And as David Cooper emphasizes in the introduction of *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics*, transversality, “also connotes an intellectual mobility across discipline boundaries and above all the establishment of a continuum through theory, practice and militant action” (Cooper, 1984, p. 3). Initially, from an intention of institutional transformation, Guattari proposed trans-versality to replace the “ambiguous idea of institutional transference” and to question both verticality, as a pyramidal hierarchy, and horizontality, in the sense of groups or things that are organized, distributed, fitted together and “sectorized” in the best way depending on the situation. As Éric Alliez and Andrew Goffey remind us: “Guattari characterized himself as a ‘specialist in transversality,’ in the precise sense that he could only validate an idea—or, more than an idea, what he called a ‘concrete machine’—on condition that ‘it be able to traverse different orders,’ in a sort of constant work in progress. But transversality as an ontologico-political foundation for an in-disciplined transdisciplinarity is a bit more than just a question of method—it is an affair of becoming, of a becoming that does not ignore history . . . but tends in fact to subvert it” (Alliez & Goffey, 2011, p. 7).

Gary Genosko points to an important connection between Guattari and Illich, and notes that, “transversality needs tools. But not any tools. Those tools sitting on the shelves in your local hardware store are not the ones at issue. Rather, tools for transversality need to be forged, that is, invented for the work of institutional change. [And notes] the connection between tools for transversality and those for conviviality, to the extent that Illich wrote of fundamental institutional change—removing the managerial class— through the use of tools that fostered autonomy, creativity, and shareability of meanings, against the dull thuds of ‘large tools for lifeless people’ imposed by and shackled to the industrial model of production. Both Illich and Guattari were quick to distance themselves from the single and simple recipe for happiness that an increase in transversality or conviviality may be thought to bring to group relations. Likewise, neither thought that the same tools were applicable to different institutions at different points” (Genosko, 2009, p. 55).

Unusual complicities?

“Waywardness articulates the paradox of cramped creation, the entanglement of escape and confinement, flight and captivity. Wayward: to wander, to be unmoored, adrift, rambling, roving, cruising, strolling, and seeking. To claim the right to opacity. To strike, to riot, to refuse. To love what is not loved. To be lost to the world. It is the practice of the social otherwise, the insurgent ground that enables new possibilities and new vocabularies; it is the lived experience of enclosure and segregation, assembling and huddling together. It is the directionless search for a free territory; it is a practice of making and relation that enfolds within the policed boundaries of the dark ghetto; it is the mutual aid offered in the open-air prison. It is a queer resource of black survival. It is a beautiful experiment in how-to-live. [...] Waywardness is an ongoing exploration of what might be; it is an improvisation with the terms of social existence, when the terms have already been dictated, when there is little room to breathe, when you have been sentenced to a life of servitude, when the house of bondage looms in whatever direction you move. It is the untiring practice of trying to live when you were never meant to survive” (Hartman, 2019, p. 203)

The trans-versal field might also be a cartography of *complicidades insólitas*—unusual complicities. We understand unusual complicities through the notion of *alianzas insólitas*—unusual alliances—, by Mujeres Creando and María Galindo, and complicity by Moten and Harney. Mujeres Creando and María Galindo, co-move their anti-patriarchal praxis through the notion of *alianzas insólitas*, as “the unusual and subversive alliance with which [they] have always acted, an alliance that no patriarch can bear, an alliance of *indias*, *putas* and *lesbianas* against all forms of racism and authoritarianism” (Mujeres Creando, 2005, p. 125). Towards, forbidden alliances that subvert the patriarchal order of the system, forbidden and persecuted alliances that subvert the mercantile order of the system, and forbidden and condemned alliances that subvert the moral order of the system (Mujeres Creando, 2005, p. 125). For Moten and Harney complicity “indicates a kind of falling into something and not being able to disentangle what you see as yourself from the institution and its (anti-)sociality. [...] To be complicit with others, to be an accomplice, to live in ways that always provoke conspiracy, a conspiracy without a plot where the conspiracy is the plot. [...] This use of complicity emphasizes our incompleteness—when you see us you see something missing, our accomplices, or something more, our conspiracy. It’s all good, it’s just not all there. We don’t make sense on our own. There must be more of us, more to us. On our own we don’t add up. And that is what we are, [...] complicit with others who are not

there [...] That kind of complicity can be deepened even as we deepen our place in, as we dig down through. [...] Our complicity refuses the purposive as its own reward and the more it grows the more the underlying entanglement of the institution overwhelms its strategy. We will have been violent to, or malignant in, the institution, cutting it together apart into nothingness, as Karen Barad might say. [...] Complicity is the already given give-and-take of incompleteness. [...] To feel complicit all by yourself is to be a good employee. It is also to be a good citizen, to vote strategically, to make policy, to feel bad about loving your city. But to feel complicit in all our incompleteness is to be revolutionary—so much so you might even call it otherwise than being. To enter with accomplices, to work with unseen friends, to plan everyday with someone, to be with someone, is so much more than being someone in being less than someone [...] Accomplices disrupt the individuation of the complicity we feel in the organization. But the organization, too—the museum, the hospital, the school—constantly interrupts and violates the complicity we build. And yet, the more we deepen our complicit, collective, uncorrected friendships, the more the individuation machine and its ‘strategic career in and out of the institution’ malfunction. [...] As we hold on tighter to our complicities, the two can’t hold. Neither can you. Neither can [we]. Something’s gotta give and what gives is what gives. You and [we] are not complicit. We feel—we share—complicity” (Moten & Harney, 2021, pp. 124–133). So... how do we honor and feel—share—*tejer complicidades insólitas y prohibidas?* (*Mujeres Creando*, 2005, p. 83).

In the coming chapters we aim to co-move a *ruthless criticism* of architecture and the architect, by way of this trans-versal field and engage with/through and honor *complicidades insólitas*, that in the end they seem to leave not much to salvage from architecture nor the architect. This does not mean that we will problematize everything through all the archives and material-discursive practices that compose the trans-versal field, but rather, each archive will be mobilized for and/or against according to the pertinence of the moment, which is also to say, that we un/learn through the specific struggles and potencies of each archive. Some brief notes on the archives that compose the trans-versal field:

We understand anarchism as a loosely entangled assemblage of autonomous praxis, committed to the problematization of all forms of domination. If the anarchisms of the XIX century first assembled against the state, the church and capital, passing through the XX century, today anarchisms assemble against the state, capital, colonialism and cis-hetero-patriarchy, to name the main struggles against domination. But, most importantly anarchisms are committed to prefiguration, that is, to imagine, rehearse and give form, here and now, to *other* anarchic worlds, to other environmental and social relations. As *Mujeres Creando* note, *cuida el presente que creas, porque debe parecerse al futuro que sueñas*—take care of the present you create, because it must resemble the future you dream of. Anarchists are not waiting for *the* revolution to come, because, there will never be *a* revolution. The struggle is constant. We are also compelled to anarchisms because, perhaps more than any other anti-systemic praxis, it has constantly questioned abstract-alienating-subordinated labour and

the role of educational machines, and has engaged in multiple pre-figurative transformations through diverse modalities of learning practices. This is in part because, for anarchists, education “has never been simply a means to achieve a new social order. It has been, rather, part of the very practice” (Mueller, 2012, p. 14) of anarchism’s main axis, that as Ani Pérez Rueda gathers by way of “Silvio Gallo, Ana Sigüenza, Francisco José Cuevas Noa and Emili Cortavitarte” and “propose the following [...] basic sociopolitical approaches of anarchism: anti-authoritarianism, integral education, self-organization, solidarity and mutual aid, and co-education” (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 60), and we would add autonomy, pre-figuration, internationalism and direct action.

We understand autonomist communism also as a loosely entangled assemblage of autonomous marxian praxis, from italian *autonomia* to open-marxism, libertarian communism, and communization. Or, through the words of *cuadernos de Negación*: “‘anarchic communism’ is the theoretical definition we find best for the conditions that revolution should generate. To say that we are for communism and anarchy may be understood by some only as communism, others as anarchy, others as communization and a great majority simply as a vague need for freedom and emancipation. The important thing is to emphasize that it is not an ideology as an alienated and dogmatic positioning and, even less, an ideological synthesis of two currents. We do not want to re-found the anarchic communist current, but to be part of the revolutionary movement to live a human community” (*cuadernos de NEGACIÓN*, 2020a, p. 24).

When we refer to autonomous and anti-colonial movements in Abya Yala, we are co-moving through the *sentir-pensar-hacer* of the loosely entangled assemblage of autonomous experiences that weave the anti-colonial struggles in so-called latino américa, from the black *palenques*, the *caracoles* Zapatistas, the *Proceso de Liberación de la Madre Tierra* of the Nasa peoples, the Quechua and Aymara’s *ayllus*, to the Mapuche *Wallmapu*, and many many more *r-existencias*. As Vilma Almendra Quiguanás underscores, “for the communities and their *pueblos* with their constant struggles it has been practical to know that the verbs resist and autonomize go together, they are compatible, they need each other, they are reciprocal; because without resistance there is no autonomy and vice versa. Let us begin then by repeating and insisting that autonomy, as well as resistance, is something very simple, this is how *Tejido de Educación ACIN lo siente*, when they tell us that ‘it is to live as we like and not as they impose on us. To lead life where we want to and not where the *patrón* says, whoever it may be. But we cannot live *autonomy* without recovering a territory. And there can be no territory without *Madre Tierra*’ (*Tejido de Educación ACIN*, 2015, p. 15)” (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, p. 272). The common of autonomies imbricates indigenous, *campesina* and black experiences, as *pueblos en movimiento*, as “collective subjects that make up different *pueblos* and are recognizable by these differences” that “settle in dissident and resisting territories, those who sustain their own authorities, build non-state powers and a whole network of non-market social relations to [learn], heal and resolve conflicts” (Zibechi, 2022, p. 12).

Comunalidad, as Carlos Beas Torres, member of the coordination team of *la Unión de Comunidades Indígenas de la Zona Norte del Istmo* (UCIZONI), notes that, “in the *Sierra Norte de Oaxaca* was born in the early 80’s of the last century, a proposal, which without identifying with anarchism, claims the values of the community. Values that, without a doubt, any anti-authoritarian would identify with. This proposal called *comunalidad* vindicates the assembly as a collective space for decision making, the *lagozona* and *tequio* (forms of community or family work); the organization of the *fiesta* in charge of the *mayordomías*; the forest and water as common properties, non-partisanship, federation (Assemblies of Authorities) and self-determination, among others” (Beas Torres, 2023, p. 5). “Two indigenous intellectuals, Jaime Martínez Luna, *zapoteco*, and Floriberto Díaz, *mixe*, independently coined the term *comunalidad*—communality—to share with others their way of being and show how, from it, they organized their resistance and their processes of transformation of a way of life that continues to be theirs and is always open to interaction with others. Communality defines a set of practices formed as creative adaptations to resist old and new colonialisms and at the same time a mental space, a horizon of intelligibility: how the world is seen and experienced from an Us. The foundation of communality and its central root is: i) the communal territory, in which ii) authority fulfills an organizational function that begins with iii) communal work and iv) festivals, which create a world of their own through v) the vernacular language” (Esteve, 2013, p. 175). Martínez Luna, notes “we are communality, the opposite of individuality; we are communal territory, not private property; we are sharing, not competition; we are polytheism, not monotheism. We are exchange, not business; diversity, not equality, although in the name of equality we are also oppressed. We are interdependent, not free” (Martínez Luna, 2010, p. 17).

According to María Galindo, feminist struggles, are first and foremost depatriarchalization struggles (Galindo, 2015, 2018, 2022). Various feminists in Abya Yala have denounced that feminism is a white-western colonial ideology, still from such argument, many have co-moved through/by/for potent feminisms as the autonomous feminists, decolonial feminists, black feminists, lesbian-feminists, and communitarian feminists. We will drift through some of these material-discursive practices along the chapters, while considering transversally Galindo’s depatriarchalization proposal, as a loosely entangled assemblage of anti-patriarchal experiences. For Galindo, “depatriarchalization is not framed within the enunciation of identities, nor within the inclusion of women through rights within any patriarchal masculine project” (Galindo, 2018, p. 55). “Depatriarchalization is presented as a conceptual theoretical alternative to the logic of inclusion, to the logic of identity and also to solipsism, which are the three tendencies in which feminism has become mired; depatriarchalization is presented as a different theoretical approach capable of setting other challenges, which starts from another analysis and, from a creative and renewed reading of the universe of women, installs new transforming and subversive horizons” (Galindo, 2018, p. 140). Depatriarchalization designates the “struggle from the ‘outside’ which is where we have placed ourselves. It serves to designate the place, but also, and at the

same time, the horizon because from—outside—we do not fight to enter, but to break down the door” (Galindo, 2018, p. 175). It “is the opportunity to be able to understand and comprehend ourselves, not as isolated subjects in solitary conflict against the world, but as companions in the task of liberation” (Galindo, 2018, p. 179). “This proposal allows us to situate the feminist struggle in this part of the world as part of the struggle for decolonization and at the same time to question the assumptions of decolonization based on the proposal of depatriarchalization. It seems a play on words: just as one cannot decolonize without depatriarchalizing, one cannot depatriarchalize without decolonizing” (Galindo, 2015, p. 40). For Galindo “depatriarchalization as a horizon inspires us and imposes the revision of the political subject of feminism no longer as the woman in general. We replace the woman by the fugitive who is able to flee. We replace woman with the disobedient woman who chooses her own path. We substitute the woman for the conflictive woman who generates problems wherever she is. We substitute the woman for the economic exile who is capable of going out in search of subsistence, facing a condition of pariah. We replace the woman in the abstract by the *abortera* and the *abortienta* who face the mandate of motherhood every day. It is about a fertile and inexhaustible series of women figures who are not heroines, but who are pointed out for their behavior, for their rebelliousness” (Galindo, 2015, p. 44). A rebellious feminist praxis that, as Mitjans underscores, weaves and rehearses *La Puente Afrotransfeminista*, by way of a black-trans-feminist praxis, that generates unusual complicities, by disrupting essentialisms present in discourses and political practices (Mitjans, 2020, p. 69).

We co-move trans-versally through the black radical tradition, particularly how blackness as Moten and Harney underscore is a concept “without a master(y)” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 81), and articulates diverse modalities of refusal, negation, rehearsal and praxis towards anarchic forms of inhabitation and other-forms for existence (Hartman, 2022, p. 489). Through Moten and his understandings of blackness, by way of Nahum Chandler, Édouard Glissant, Cedric J. Robinson, Sylvia Wynter, Sora Han, Saidiya Hartman and many more, and underscores, that “ultimately, the paraontological force that is transmitted in the long chain of life-and-death performances with which black studies is concerned is horribly misunderstood if it is understood as exclusive. Everyone whom blackness claims, which is to say everyone, can claim blackness. That claim is neither the first nor the last anticipatory reorientation but is, rather, an irreducible element of the differentially repeating plane that intersects and animates the comparativist sphere” (Moten, 2018a, p. 159). Marquis Bey on the paraontological, notes that if, “the fort is the ontological, the supposed community that comes with being a part of the same race or gender or class. The paraontological abolishes the fort too, even if—or when—the fort is all we are said to have” (Bey, 2023, p. 19).

Blackness for Moten might be referenced as fugitivity, black study, the displacement of being and singularity, as escape from subjection, as attempts to fail to individuate, to become unfit for subjection, as

“consent not to be one: not just to be more + less than one but the mobilization of that indiscretion and incompleteness against or ‘otherwise than being’” (Moten, 2018a, p. 242).

Together Harney and Moten observe that, “we fall so we can fall again, which is what ascension really means. To fall is to lose one’s place, to lose the place that makes one, to relinquish the locus of being, which is to say of being-single. This radical homelessness—its kinetic indigeneity, its irreducible queerness—is the essence of blackness. This refusal to take place is given in what it is to occur” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 45). Against completion, Harney and Moten note that, “blackness is the meaning of life. Partial, held secret, held out to all but not all there for those who hold, not ours and all we got and here it go, all incomplete” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 166). To embrace incompleteness. Fugitive planning by/for the undercommons.

We also move trans-versally, through/with various black anarchists, that have written recently on black anarchism, Anarkata, anarcho-Blackness, black in anarchy, the anarchy of blackness, or Black anarchic radicals, as Atticus Bagby-Williams, Nsambu Za Suekama, Zoé Samudzi, William C. Anderson, Marquis Bey, and Black Rose/Rosa Negra Anarchist Federation, who have been re/articulating black anarchism by way of Lorenzo Kom’boa Ervin Ashanti Alston, Kuwasi Balagoon, Martin Sostre, and Ojore Lutalo, amongst other (William C. Anderson, 2021, p. 66), *by way of them, in their wake, under their influence, protection and against the grain*, when read through the mutually illuminating intra-actions of the black radical tradition as Hartman, Harney and Moten.

Our attention to working through/by/for blackness, and black anarchy, which is to say the black radical tradition, points, as Hartman notes, regarding the compositions by Torkwase Dyson that accompany *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*, “attend to the histories of forced migration, captivity, enclosure, and death, while tracing lines of fugitive and stealth movement, dwelling and maroonage, black ecologies of inhabitation [...] always already inhabited and transformed by blackness, so the lines of confinement and enclosure expand and collapse, as those forced to stay put and those in flight inhabit and negotiate space and time in its manifold dimensions. These compositions offer provisional [insights] as to how we might live; they imagine an existence within and outside the hold [...] for inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence” (Hartman, 2022, p. 489).

Ultimately, what we aim through the trans-versal field and its unusual complicities is to honor: anarchisms, autonomist communism, autonomous and anti-colonial, indigenous, *comunalidad*, depatriarchalization and anti-patriarchal, blackness, black anarchy, and transness, archives. Because *to honor these archives is to shift everything. To abolish* (Bey, 2021, p. 193). So, we co-move beyond-against and beyond *the architectural world, to dream and rehearse* “how we might live otherwise in the present and break with the fatal terms of the given, the brutal imposed order of things [...] The goal is transformation, to become ‘ungovernable’ (Hartman, 2021, pp. xiii–vi).

Trans-formation

“...trans is an aspiration toward the unrecognizable rather than from already-disclosed, recognizable places. The trans is the crossing, and it is not always an identifiable mobility across established geographies that require economic and sociocultural dexterity and privilege. The crossing can and must happen even when we go no where, even when we get to others (‘the crossing isn’t over’), because there are many, many oceans between us and within us” (Bey, 2021, p. 133).

“What would it mean to pour into, not blackness, but the honoring of blackness? The honoring of transness and gender nonconformity? The honoring of blackness and transness concedes that we cannot ‘be’ in our ontological totality black and/or trans but, rather, as with all types of identities, do them, rummage around in them, deploy them, dig into them. In other words, honoring them is what we can and must do, venerating and amplifying them through us so they can turn the world inside out. Our attention should be paid to these modes of living and to those who are continually forced into, given into, these modes of living. Those folks who are told they are nothing” (Bey, 2021, p. 192)

“To honor blackness and transness (or gender nonconformity) is to shift everything. To abolish” (Bey, 2021, p. 193)

“Passage, itself, moves through the narrow straits of epistemology and ontology. Epistemology and ontology are, at the same time, in a complex ensemble of times, in a radical dislocation of time, lost in passage. Out of joint, where the joint is jumpin.’ refugees study the sacred profanities and eloquent vulgarities of passage in order to articulate the Earth at the end of the world.” (Moten, 2018a, p. 211)

Under—*beyond-against and beyond*—the monopoly and captivity of existence. We understand trans-formation by way of Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar, Huáscar Salazar Lohman and Marquis Bey, as processes and potencies of change through/against/beyond/by/for *form*. As possibilities of imagination and rehearsal, from prefigurative potencies. Trans-formations that allow the emergence and composition of other modes of

inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence, not mediated by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial power relations of domination.

Gutiérrez Aguilar and Salazar Lohman, argue that “the prefix ‘trans’ etymologically refers to a ‘beyond’ or ‘on the other side.’ then trans-forming refers to the capacity to produce form beyond-against and beyond the given. Social trans-formation thus becomes the unfolding of the human capacity to produce and reproduce collective forms of inhabiting the world from a place other than that of domination, exploitation and dispossession” (Gutiérrez Aguilar & Salazar, 2015, p. 19). And, “maintain that the issue of transformation does not consist, neither principally nor solely, in the outline of an abstract future horizon, but is a systematic flow of actions of resistance and struggles in the present that defend and expand the concrete possibilities of reproduction of life—human and non-human—as a whole” (Gutiérrez Aguilar & Salazar, 2015, p. 17).

Through the field that Bey draws from the *mutually illuminating intra-action* of blackness, transness and feminism—anti-patriarchal, material-discursive practices—, we co-move and underscore the question asked: “what happens, though, when we take seriously the knowledge taking hold in trans studies that trans denotes less a specific gendered body and more a movement away from an originary, imposed starting point? Transness manifests, in the first instance, as an elusive capacity that cannot be discerned by making recourse to the visual or normative. Reified definitions of trans and cis, even Black and white, and so on, cannot hold indefinitely and have no clearly discernible threshold of distinction. Transness, as not solely or in the first instance about the material gendered body, might mark a way of relating to which transgender people have an ‘(under)privileged’ access” (Bey, 2019, p. 111). “Blackness and transness assert radical invention, so much so that what is invented cannot abide grammars of intelligibility in this terrain. There is then a transitivity and transversality of blackness and transness, wherein making (sense of) the text requires contravening commonsense notions of the body—in other words, blackness and transness do not ‘look’ like a particular thing; rather, they dislodge the logics that structure lookedness. Indeed, they assert other ways to be that do not quite ‘look’ like anything in particular” (Bey, 2022, p. 24).

As Bey, we honor trans lives and are compelled to imagine and rehearse, “where the radicality of radical politics begins to lose some friends. We must remember that cisness is not simply a possessed identity or fixed location on the body; it is determined as well by relative effect. So when [we as Bey] write [by way of Bey] about trans subjectivity as cis(-ish) [men, we] may, maybe, perhaps, be undoing that ‘cisness’ by virtue of thinking with trans because the effects of [our] cisness are unsuturing the seams of that cisness and cishnormativity. [Our] cisness, especially in [our] writing, does not stay in the proper place of cisness—it has and must continue to have a disruptive effect that undoes cisness itself. Cisness, and transness, can ‘speak out of character,’ a necessity for dismantling the reified statuses these identities exude, which are the result of cishnormativity fixing identities into unchanging hierarchical castes. And further, because many trans folks do

not undergo surgical intervention, which would mark a clearer (though still flawed) distinction between trans and cis, it is still unsettled where cis ends and trans begins. Blurring an already blurred line makes for some gender trouble. And this, to [Bey], is always to say that gender loses its coherency when Blackness shows up to the party, which is to say it has always already showed up to the party, acting a fool and getting buck. (Addendum: The production of cisgender, too, disallows nuanced conversation about the complexity within it. A question or two: If Blackness is always already queer, [is Bey a] ‘proper’ cis subject? If Black [cis] women have long been disallowed the category of ‘woman,’ is a [cis] Black woman wholly and fittingly within that category?)” (Bey, 2019, p. 112).

“But why? Why seek to broaden what so rightfully belongs to certain identifiable people? Why try to take this too from people historically marginalized? Part of [Bey’s] insistence, an insistence that leads to [certain] iconoclasm and controversiality [...] comes from C. Riley Snorton, who asserts unwaveringly that *one should not readily imagine that gender, in this instance (or any, for that matter), can be adjudicated by making recourse to the visual* (Snorton, 2017, p. 2). If we are to commit to gender selfdetermination, which is a condition of queer, abolitionist emergence, and if we are to commit to a radical world (dis)order in terms of gender, which necessitates the overthrowing of hegemonic gender impositions, we must refuse to assume that we can detect, before its revelation, another’s gender simply by looking at them” (Bey, 2022, p. 65). So, “unable to say, in not so many words: yes, but no; not the kind of trans you likely think, which is likely the only trans you think there is—there is another way, are other ways, to do and be trans. And [we] roam there” (Bey, 2022, p. 74).

“It would be ethically suspect [...] to just go along with the thinking that [we’re] trans, as [we] do not and have not had the experiences commonly attributed to transgender people: undergoing medical and psychological scrutiny and surveillance, having legislation passed to invalidate [our] (gendered) existence, encountering violence and its various specters on the street because [our] voice or [our] body or [our] gait does not ‘match’ assessed gendered cues. These are not experiences [we] can claim as [our] own, wholly—experiences that very often go under the banner of ‘being transgender.’ And yet [we] so badly want to live an intellectually rigorous and constituent life. [We] want to take seriously the words of the thinkers and [militants we] so dearly respect [...]. They have edified [us], maybe even corrupted [us], to think in a way that expands the capacity of ‘trans’ to hold so much more than it is believed to be able to hold. [We] want to stand firm, courageously, in the thinking of the prefixal trans, the trans that has the capacity to mean not only those who have undergone the aforementioned experiences but also those who deploy their (un)gendered embodiment, (un)gendered intellectual apparatuses, and (un)gendered politics in ways that do the work of transing—a practice that takes place within, as well as across or between, gendered spaces, a practice that fucks with gender and disassembles/reassembles what gender and subjectivity can mean; trans as a mode of analysis rather than a (mere) identity

category. What would that entail? What kind of rethinking would we have to undergo if that were taken brutally, terrifyingly seriously?” (Bey, 2022, p. 93).

Trans-formation moves through threatening the normalized order. “To be a Menace, to menace, from the Latin *minae*: to threaten. To be a Menace is to threaten the order, to threaten organization, to be a menace to the binary, whether you look like this or that; it is about how you menace the regulative regimes that say you must look like this or that. Those regimes demand so many contortions into nonchosen categories, and that is the issue here. So, since even such ‘hard’ categories as gender, race, sex, and orientation are not causes of our oppression but its effects, we need a new kind of political struggle, one that seeks not just to overthrow the oppression, but the categories as well. We need a movement without identities, Wilchins says. We need abolition. That is what trans moves toward” (Bey, 2022, p. 81). So, we are compelled to “fucking this whole shit up because this whole shit is fucked up. so what does that look like? in a word, it is radical trans politics, it is radical black trans feminist politics toward racialized gender abolition. (Well, that’s more than ‘a’ word.) all of this entails so much more than wearing ‘the future is female’ shirts, wanting women ceos & presidents & representation representation representation, or ‘celebrating’ women’s ‘empowerment.’ We are not about fighting for discrete, individual rights or insertion into a representational logic that is never neutral & always coded along racial & gender lines; we are about fighting the very machinery that doles out rights & is coeval with violence. the politicality to which we must ascribe is to fight this cultural machinery which categorizes, stigmatizes, & then marginalizes minorities, so it is not a matter of simply being pro-woman, pro-black, pro-lgbt. much of what has come to pass as feminist discourse & activism, as well as black liberation & freedom struggle, has been in fact to foreclose liberatory avenues. We have come to fixing and stabilizing the identity of woman [&, too, black, trans, queer] even more firmly than before. what if, & [we’re] just spitballing here, the engine of our politics followed Riki Wilchins, that treacherously menacing transsexual radical, if they forged an unruly beast of a movement with the unapologetically black and unapologetically transgender Marshall Green? This is to say, [we] want a subjective politicality that emerges at the nexus of Wilchins, who writes, Some women become indistinguishable from men. Some women become more distinguishable from women. Some fall of that specious male-female spectrum entirely, becoming totally new genders we haven’t yet named. Possibilities which our original feminism could not have foreseen or anticipated are created. Fluidity is transformed into a key feminist goal and an important liberatory tactic” (Bey, 2022, p. 110).

So, “the aim is not just for men to ‘become’ women. ([we] think ‘women’ should also be in quotes...) [We] do not want to become a woman; that, to [us], is not what gendered liberation looks like, nor is it what must occur for [us] to ‘be’ trans. ‘Woman,’ categorically, is also a violence. Not of the same register and tenor of ‘man,’ sure, but a violence nonetheless. In [Bey’s] younger years, when, naïvely, thought that maybe life would be better as not a girl, but, not a boy, [Bey] was reaching for something else. But maybe all [Bey] had then was

a hope that ‘the other’ gender would not constrict my airways as much, or would constrict them differently, a difference that would be welcomed if only because it might tap other pathways that might feel gentler. But now, in not wanting to be a man, not wanting to bound about the world launching masculinity’s archive ahead of [us], [Bey] neither wants to be a woman nor to proliferate, necessarily, femininity. [We are] certainly, by most metrics, not feminine. (Perhaps the issue is with metrics themselves?) At least not corporeally or sartorially. Though [Bey] suspects there might be a realm in which femininity treads that is not simply about the visual, a realm inclusive of other modalities of relation. But that’s the thing: Why must [we] be a gender? Must [we] be woman, feminine, if not man, masculine? If [we] assert another posture for [our] body and extra-/nobody, will it inevitably be inducted into the closest category we have? It feels like [we’re] in pursuit of becoming something else entirely by seeking, first, now, to be nobody. And that requires no spectacular alteration, it requires no passing of a threshold in order to enter into valid unterrain. [We] wish not to be anybody, really, for to be somebody is subject to the extant registers that cannot hold breadth. While being nobody—not yet a blown up somebody but perhaps a somebody with ticking timebombs strapped to it, impending doom lived ebulliently—[we’re] chillin’ with ghosts and specters who, too, are nobodies, having no gender because they never lived and were not subject to this world’s grammars, and thus never really died either. [We] would like some other kind of being, ungendered or nongendered or too enthralled with something else there is no time to consider gender. And [we] would like to not have to die to get there. Or maybe [we] must die to get there. And then [we’ll] finally be able to live” (Bey, 2022, p. 91).

Bey’s invitation means “trans ways of life can be shared by people who may not have undergone affirmative surgery, who may not dress as the gender ‘opposite’ to that which they were assigned, who may not use pronouns that ‘clash’ with their natal assignation of what others might expect. As way of life, trans opens up affiliation with it on deeper grounds than the corporeal; as way of life, trans yields something radical in the relational, in the ethical and social, the ontological and epistemic. Trans offers variegated ways to emerge into oneself. Those variations of a self [we] knew not, a self that was foreign to [us] but deeply felt as kin, are what intrigue [us] now, and what continue to haunt [us] in ways removed and intimately visceral” (Bey, 2022, p. 8). “We will go where trans* takes us, looking not for trans people (or people who have legally changed their sex) but for a politics of transitivity (Halberstam, 2018)” in (Bey, 2022, p. 58).

Ultimately, what we mean through trans-formation is then the inseparability of space and becoming, because “we neither occupy nor have but, rather, *share* spacetime” (Moten, 2017b, p. 6). The inseparability of sociality and spatiality, of the other-*spaces of becomings*, of forms of inhabitation and forms of existence. “For trans is an itch that things are not enough, a project of undoing, be it gender, institutions, the fabric of the social world; trans is a project that cannot be haunted because it never tries to build a house” (Bey, 2022, p. 3). The *space of becoming* is always already more than the body. The space of becoming are bodies intra-acting. So,

we mean through trans-formation, the rehearsal and unfolding of potencies to re/produce non-normative, fugitive modalities of inhabiting the world beyond-against and beyond the amalgam, and the rehearsal and unfolding of potencies to *body* non-normative, fugitive modalities for existence. In other words, the trans-formation of *life(s)*. Of *other worlds* that are already here, and *yet to come*. Undeterminate, unrecognizable and unintelligible trans-formations that are always already modes of inhabiting and modes of existence, that rehearse by/for/through the *spaces of becomings*. Not only a *form-of-life*, but *more + less*, form(s)-for-life(s).

If we problematize professional identities, as the architect, as racist, sexist and classist categorizations, modes to comply, modes to secure the authority complex proper of whiteness. And, if we are compelled to a *trans-versal* and *imbricated* critique, then professional identities must be questioned through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. Because problematizing architecture is not only about space and form, but most importantly the modes of production that sustain the architectural world, the spatiality and sociality that it re/produces, and by whom. Therefore, if we hold on to the imbrication of the amalgam, imagining and rehearsing the end of architectural labour, and the architect, as a professional identity that sustains such labour, through its abolition we are also rehearsing the end of the overrepresentation by white-cis-hetero-bourgeois-men, in other words we are co-moving beyond-against and beyond class, race and sex-gender domination. Towards, “trans/figuration” as “fashioning new and hitherto unknown ways of becoming” (Bey, 2021, p. 104).

“We are called by radical political allegiances [and unusual complicities]—by black radicality, by queer insurgents, by trans and feminist killjoys—to be bad cis subjects and articulate a counter-reckoning with cisgender. There is ebullient liberation in conceding that neither cisgender nor transgender identity are natural facts but political and politicized names for how we enact our subjectivities and engender the world for ourselves and others. The cisness of ‘being a man’ and ‘being a woman’ is compulsory, which means that it is a violation of ontological proportions. The only ethical relation to have, then, is one of impropriety toward cisgender” (Bey, 2022, p. 42).

Trans-formation co-moves un-certainty, *abrazar y con-mover la in-certidumbre* as the *coopia compas*⁷ would say, rather than the colonial anxiety of not knowing, of not having certainty, “transness marks primarily a movement away from an imposed starting point to an undisclosed (non)destination,” (Bey, 2021, p. 44), undoing certainties, un-certainty. *Unbecoming* (Bey, 2022, p. 87).

Because as Bey writes: “If we wish to make the world anew, to dislodge all the normative, and hence violent, frameworks from their hold over us, then we must commit to the terrifying work of radical thinking. Such a radically undone world would necessarily look very different than it does now. Refusing to open ourselves to the openness of gender and racial self-determination—both of which refuse the normativity of pragmatism and live freedom in a radical trans politics—can only be a troubling attempt to hold on to

normativity when it seems convenient or less scary. Only in the unrecognizable and unintelligible do we have chances to escape the grasp of captivity. It is captivity and the subjugation to legible logics from which we are running, after all. Living in the space of becoming other than what we were is where living unbounded happens” (Bey, 2021, p. 103).

“Come, radically imagine with us, with black trans feminism. Radically imagine what a world and our relation to others could be if we did not predicate sociality on transactional exchanges or violent presuppositions or ontological foreclosures or skewed life chances (indeed, life chances, chances for ways of being a life). Imagine what abolition will feel like, that world in which prisons and logics of captivity—all forms of captivity—are, by definition of the existence of such a world, impossible. Imagine the kinds of beings we might dream ourselves into becoming when we do not have to adhere to such narrow templates to even be given acknowledgment. Imagine that. Hmm, imagine that. My, my, my . . .” (Bey, 2021, p. 228)

Uni-versal amalgam

Imbricate critique

This research situates through an *imbricate* critique of the architect and architecture, one that considers and aims to uncover how “there are imbricated regimes of power” and “structures that support it imbricately” (Espinosa Miñoso, 2016, p. 154), that re/produce the need for architecture, the neo-liberal architect, architectural authority and the architectural world.

Various feminist and anti-patriarchal thinkers, as Yuderkys Espinosa Miñoso, Ochy Curiel Pichardo, María Lugones, Mara Viveros Vigoya, Astrid Cuero and Valeria Angola, amongst others, have advanced an “imbricate analysis of oppressions and the colonial matrix” (Espinosa Miñoso, 2016, p. 154), through a problematization of the limits of intersectionality.

Ochy Curiel Pichardo has pointed how, “without using the concept of ‘coloniality,’ racialized, afro-descendant and indigenous feminists, since the 1970s, have delved into the patriarchal and capitalist power framework, considering the *imbrication* of various systems of domination (racism, sexism, heteronormativity, classism) from which they have defined their political projects, all based on a postcolonial critique. These voices are very little known, because despite the effort of certain sectors in the academic and political sphere to try to open gaps to what is called ‘subalternity,’ this is done from elitist positions and, above all, from masculine and androcentric visions” (Curiel Pichardo, 2007, p. 93).

Acknowledging the important work of Kimberlé Crenshaw and Patricia Hill Collins regarding intersectionality, María Lugones has noted that “Crenshaw and other women of color feminists have argued that the categories have been understood as homogenous and as picking out the dominant in the group as the norm, thus ‘women’ picks out white bourgeois women, ‘men’ picks out white bourgeois men, ‘black’ picks out black heterosexual men, and so on. It becomes logically clear then that the logic of categorial separation distorts what exists at the intersection, such as violence against women of color. Given the construction of the categories, the intersection misconstrues women of color. So, once intersectionality shows us what is missing, we have ahead of us the task of reconceptualizing the logic of the ‘intersection’ so as to avoid separability. It is only when we perceive gender and race as intermeshed or fused that we actually see women of color” (Lugones 2008, p. 82) (Lugones, 2016, p. 17).

Yuderkys Espinosa Miñoso argues, that “there are imbricated regimes of power, there are structures that sustain it imbricatedly, there are bodies marked with less or more intensity, or better [Espinosa Miñoso] should say, in the end every body *is* marked within this multiplicity of fractures between bodies that hold power in some instances of the social, bodies that never hold it... and there are, finally, processes that lead to consciousness through which a political will is assumed to face these marks, or better, to face that which produces the marks (and produces the subject that suffers and/or holds it)” (Espinosa Miñoso, 2016, p. 154).

By way of Danièle Kergoat, Mara Viveros Vigoya argues that “the term ‘intersectionality’ assumes the existence of groups at the intersection of sexism, racism and classism, and does not allow us to think of a changing and historical relationship of domination. Intersectionality stabilizes relations in fixed positions and sectorizes social mobilizations, in the same way that the dominant discourse naturalizes and encloses subjects in pre-existing identities of otherness” (Viveros Vigoya, 2016, p. 8).

All this is why, as Valeria Angola argues (Angola, 2021), considering that “intersectionality emerged in a liberal” and legal context, this “approach has led to the understanding that oppressions are cumulative and hierarchical” and notes how Curiel Pichardo, “insists that intersectionality is a politics of the recognition of difference that is attached to the multicultural logics of the state, because it is interested in recognizing differences, but not in understanding why and for what they were created” (Angola, 2021). “Thus, while intersectionality posits that systems are separate, the idea of imbrication speaks of fusion, confluence, coexistence” and that “viewing the world through the lens of intersectionality prevents us from seeing that there are no groups that are ‘more oppressed’ than others: the experiences that black women and black men go through are differentiated manifestations of the same interweaving that builds patriarchy, racism and capitalism.” Hence, “challenging the fragmented and hierarchical model of intersectionality is imperative in these times [...] if we understand oppression separately, our organizational and political response will be fragmented” (Angola, 2021).

Through this imbricate critique we co-move with what Curiel calls, *anthropology of domination*, “which consists of unveiling the forms, modes, strategies, discourses that define certain social groups as ‘others’ from places of power and domination” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 27). And use it reversely, in order to unveil the forms, modes, strategies, discourses that define certain social group, as the architect, from places of power and privilege and authority. Imbrication is used then, to better understand, unveil and struggle beyond-against and beyond asymmetric power relations, this means that not only oppressions are experienced in an imbricated manner, but that power and privilege are sustained in an imbricated manner, if domination is exerted imbricately, then the authority to dominate is also sustained imbricately. And the architectural world is sustained imbricately.

Amalgam

“I hear the storm. They talk to me about progress, about ‘achievements,’ diseases cured, improved standards of living I am talking about societies drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, [...] I am talking about millions of men torn from their gods, their land, their habits, their life-from life, from the dance, from wisdom” (Césaire, 2001, p. 42)

“The predominance of the modern is a fait accompli, and a decisive fact. Our life unfolds within modernity, immersed in a unique, universal and constant process which is the process of modernization. Modernization which, moreover—it is necessary—, is not a program of life adopted by us, but seems rather a fatality or an unquestionable destiny to which we must submit” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 135)

“...the definitive universalization of the extent to which it is a shared occurrence, thanks to the triumph of capitalist modernity as a universal civilizing scheme” (Echeverría, 2000, p. 20)

“The concept of progress is to be grounded in the idea of the catastrophe. That things ‘just go on’ is the catastrophe. It is not that which is approaching but that which is. Strindberg's thought: Hell is not something which lies ahead of us, — *but this life here*” (Benjamin, 1985, p. 50)

“I was one of the two billion of us who became underdeveloped on January 20, 1949, when President Truman coined the word “underdevelopment” and began the campaign to develop us” (Esteva, 2022, p. 21)

“...if we wish to escape the dictum which says that the world as it is presented is true, and if we do not want to accept the permanence of its misleading perception, then we should consider the existence of at least three worlds in one. The first would be the world as they make it seem: globalization as fable; the second would be the world as it is: globalization as perversity; and, the third, the world as it can be: an other globalization” (Santos, 2017, p. 1).

Co-moving through an imbricate critique, that as Angola argues, implies fusion, confluence, and coexistence, we move yet to another notion, the *amalgam*. What the open-marxist sociologist and militant Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar names the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination* (Gutiérrez Aguilar, 2020, p. 6), as the imbrication of inseparable violent dominations. We aim particularly to problematize labour as the key form of capitalist domination, in other words, how the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is fundamentally sustained through labour. Throughout the text we will mobilize an imbricate critique of the amalgam, which is not only reduced to these three axes, but implies also the imbrication of: racism, cis-heteronormativity, modernity, uni-versality, progressivism, and globalitarianism, and others that might escape now from our gaze.

Some brief notes as departure points for studying the amalgam, and how we understand capitalism, colonialism, patriarchy, modernity, uni-versality, development and globalitarianism:

The amalgam departs from the understanding that capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy are first and foremost social relations. “Capitalism is a historically constructed way of *ser-estar en el mundo* that has changed our mentality and our dreams. So if we understand capitalism as the relations, we weave every day with our consumption and labour, and if we understand the means of production that dispossesses the workers as the means of constructing life, and if we procure our own means of life, we affect not only the means of production and production itself, but the system” (López, 2016, p. 270).

“Capitalism as a social relation, and not only as a category, is the generalized mercantile society, a society in which all production is commodity production, and consumption is limited to commodity consumption, a society where everything is produced for exchange. But this is not inevitable... this is the capitalist way of doing things, not the only way. In short, capitalism is the totalitarian and generalized

dictatorship of the law of value against human beings. Where to live you have to consume, to consume you have to buy, to buy you have to have money and to have money you have to work. And here we object to easily and lightly categorize this society as a 'consumer society.' when in fact it is a society determined by the production of value" (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 5).

Bolívar Echeverría, argues that "human life in its 'value form' is like a 'double' or a 'phantom' of what it is itself in its 'natural form;' it is an objectified projection of its own process of reproduction in what it has, among other things, of capacity for the creation and destruction of economic value within the world of capitalist commodities or, what is the same, in what it has, abstractly, of sufficient vehicle for the process of self-valorization of capitalist value or process of capital accumulation [...] The subsumption of the 'natural form' under the 'value form' can be related as the permanent 'effort' of the 'phantom' to maintain and assert its dominion over the real being: *Le mort saisit le vif*, as Karl Marx liked to say. Nothing is produced or consumed in purely modern society if its production/consumption is not the vehicle of capital accumulation. As far as social life itself is concerned, this subsumption consists in the phenomenon of 'alienation:' the *sujecidad*—subjection—of that life, its political capacity to identify itself or decide on itself, on its form, is replaced by its ghostly representative, by the 'will' of self-valorization that is in the economic value of the world of capitalist commodities, 'will' that acts automatically, 'from the things themselves.' which acquire for this reason the function of 'fetishes.' of objects that 'miraculously' socialize the private owners, who would be asocial by definition. As far as the world of life or the world of 'earthly goods' is concerned, it consists in the substitution of the 'natural' design of use values by an 'artificial' design, or one emanating from the pure requirements of capitalist valorization" (Echeverría, 2008, pp. 48–49).

As Robin D.G. Kelley, notes, "Césaire demonstrates how colonialism works to 'decivilize' the colonizer: torture, violence, race hatred, and immorality constitute a dead weight on the so-called civilized, pulling the master class deeper and deeper into the abyss of barbarism. The instruments of colonial power rely on barbaric, brutal violence and intimidation, and the end result is the degradation of Europe itself. Hence Césaire can only scream: 'Europe is indefensible'" (Césaire, 2001, p. 8). Rivera Cusicanqui on her part, recognizes racist "colonialism as a structure, an ethos and a culture that reproduce themselves day by day in their oppressions and silencing, in spite of the successive attempts of radical transformation proclaimed by the political/intellectual elites, be it in liberal, populist or indigenist/Marxist versions. In Latin America, the context of discovery of the colonial problematic was, not by chance, contemporary to the gestation of a new device of world domination in the ideology of 'development'" (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 49). And drawing from the work of Pablo González Casanova she notes that the notion of internal colonialism (González Casanova, 2015), explains "the profound heterogeneity of our societies and the existence of very old structures of domination,

which were particularly functional to the neocolonial, oligarchic and capitalist exploitation of the indigenous peasantry in vast rural areas of” Abya Yala (Rivera Cusicanqui & Barragan, 1997, p. 44).

Following Claudia von Werlhof we understand patriarchy as those relations of domination and violence that structure and organize both the socio-ecological relations and the production of our habitat, towards the separation of all modes of existence, through the civilizing project that yearns, as von Werlhof argues, to divest from the mother and become independent from nature. This system of violence is spatialized in our *bodies-territories* through capitalism, colonialism, racism, capacitism, adultocracy, technocracy, individualism, professionalization of knowledge and gender binarism, among other violences that surely escape our gaze.

According to von Werlfof (von Werlhof, 2015, p. 41), patriarchy can be understood as a societal ideal that centers around the concept of the father, rather than the mother, being the ultimate source of life. This concept is often associated with an abstract notion of 'paternity.' which can be linked to a divine figure or a supposed natural law. Patriarchy is a complex and abstract claim, detached from the realities of everyday life, and goes beyond a simple envy of the power to give birth. Its aim is to transform the female body into a reproductive machine, replacing the role of the mother with something non-corporeal and non-feminine. This desire for replacement extends to *Mother Nature* and the *Earth* itself. “Thus, patriarchy manifests itself as a ‘society without nature and without a mother’ that culminates in the politics of trying to replace the concrete mother/nature with the abstract father/‘second’ nature” (Bruiger, 2006). The process of patriarchal dominance “begins with matricide and the conscious killing of animals” (Weiler, 1996) (Tazi-Preve, 1992) (Wolf, 1994), followed by the subjugation of maternal culture and nature, and culminates in the desire to replace them with a social and artificial ‘design.’ This indicates a successful replacement of society and nature with a ‘system’ and a ‘machine’ (Merchant, 1987) (Genth, 2002) in (von Werlhof, 2015, p. 41).

Echeverría dedicated most of his work to the study and problematization of the imbrication between modernity and capitalism, according to him, “modernity should be understood as the peculiar character of a historical form of civilizing totalization of human life” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 139). Echeverría paraphrases Marx and notes that “europe is not modern ‘by nature’; modernity, on the other hand, is european ‘by nature’” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 168) and through colonial violence, “the definitive universalization of the extent to which [modernity] is a shared occurrence, thanks to the triumph of capitalist modernity as a universal civilizing scheme” (Echeverría, 2000, p. 20). Modernity is sustained by/for several myths, violences and distinct traits, some of the myths according to Echeverría are: revolution, nation, democracy, justice and equality. The violences or distinct traits of modernity are humanism, progressivism, urbanism, individualism, economism, and we could add uni-versalism, binarism and the objectification of nature. Echeverría considers three as the most important characteristics of modernity: scientific technology, the secularization of politics and

individualism (Echeverría, 1995) (Echeverría, 2009, p. 8). From these three, scientific technology and individualism are fundamental to understand the modern project of the architect and *the architectural world* it has produced.

For Echeverría, “the modern resides in a confidence in the immediate (‘earthly’) efficiency of technique; a surrender that disregards any mediate (‘celestial’) implication that is intelligible in terms of a mathematically rationalizable causality. It is a phenomenon that is extended and complemented by other equally modern appearances, as would be, for example, the ‘progressive’ experience of the temporality of life and the world, that is, the empirical conviction that the human being, who would be on earth to dominate it, increasingly exercises his capacity to conquer it, increasing and extending his dominion with time, following a straight and ascending temporal line: the line of progress. A spatial or geographical version of this progressivism is presented in another modern phenomenon: the determination of the city as the proper place of the human” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 9). Architecture has been structural for the spatialization of such modern project.

According to Echeverría, individualism, “in the practical social behavior presupposes that the atom of human reality is the singular individual. It is a characteristically modern phenomenon that implies, for example, egalitarianism, [...] It is a modern phenomenon that is always in the process of imposing itself on the ancestral tradition of communitarianism [...] Individualism is thus one of the major modern phenomena; it introduces an unprecedented form of practicing the opposition between singular individuality and collective individuality” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 11).

But, Echeverría warns us by saying that, “the first thing to note about modernity as a structuring principle of the ‘really existing’ modernization of human life is that it is a civilizing modality which, although it dominates in real terms over other non-modern or pre-modern structuring principles it encounters, is nevertheless far from having annulled, buried and replaced them. Modernity presents itself as an attempt that is always in the process of overcoming them, but as an attempt that is not fully achieved, that must be maintained as such, and that must therefore coexist with the traditional structures of this social world. In this sense—more than in that of Habermas—, it can be said that the modernity we know so far is ‘an unfinished project.’ always incomplete; it is as if something in it were incapable of being what it pretends to be: a civilizing alternative ‘superior’ to the ancestral or traditional one” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 12). Therefore, if modernity is an unfinished incomplete project and is based on its impossibility, this means that the three characteristics of the modern are also unfinished and are based on their impossibility, such as the individual subject, this is why capitalist modernity is always violently imposing itself towards completion, against its own impossibility.

It might seem obvious, but we feel the need to underscore that there are no uni-versals. Too much violence has been inflicted in the name of uni-versalism. Fernando Garcés, insists on writing “uni-versal and uni-versality because of the etymological evocation it implies: one verse, one discourse—and only one—that

displaces all the others” (Fernando Garcés, 2007, p. 220). For the past seventy years, development has been the fundamental trope for the uni-versalization of modernity as a civilizatory project. Development and its proxy progress, are violent tropes for new and improved modalities of extraction, capture and control. As Ellen Meiksins Wood, writes, regarding the principle of improvement and the agrarian origin of capitalism, “improvement meant, fundamentally, new forms and conceptions of property [...] The ethic of ‘improvement’ in its original sense, in which production is inseparable from profit, is also the ethic of exploitation, poverty and homelessness” (Wood, 2002, pp. 107, 194).

Esteva observes that (Esteva, 2009, pp. 1–21) (Esteva, 2013, p. 144), since 1949, “development has connoted at least one thing: to escape from the undignified condition called underdevelopment. [...] It was between 1759 (Wolff) and 1859 (Darwin) that development evolved from a conception of transformation that moves towards the appropriate form of being to a conception of transformation that moves towards an ever more perfect form. During this period, evolution and development began to be used as interchangeable terms by scientists. The transfer of the biological metaphor to the social sphere occurred in the last quarter of the eighteenth century” (Esteva, 2009, p. 4). The development enterprise has been based on a uni-versal definition of the good life associated with the average condition of so-called developed countries, particularly the now named united states of américa. This definition was initially accepted by even the strongest opponents of imperialism but soon became clear that it was not viable or environmentally wise for all so-called underdeveloped areas to adopt such lifestyles. Although in the 1970s the focus shifted to guaranteeing certain basic needs for all, the uni-versal definition of the good life still influenced social goals and the definition of those basic needs. This approach continues to shape government policies worldwide, regardless of ideological differences. However, as “the Zapatistas have pointed out since 1994, it is now a matter of building a world in which many worlds fit. Instead of continuing to dissolve peoples and cultures in order to integrate everyone into a universal and uniform design, it has become a priority to explore forms of harmonious coexistence of the different” (Esteva, 2013, p. 144). This mindset looks beyond the nation-state, redefines struggles, and embraces multiple definitions of the good life that emerge from autonomous experiments. This is the autonomous horizon beyond-against and beyond the amalgam that co-moves this research.

In one of his last books Milton Santos, *Por uma Outra Globalização*, published in 2000, “we find the most current and combative formulation of his geographical theory of society” (Arroyo & Silveira, 2022, p. 9). In chapter 3, *A Perverse Globalization* Santos proposes the term *globalitarian*, and notes that, “among the constitutive factors of globalization in its present perverse form are both the way by which information is offered to humanity and the emergence of money in its pure state as a motor of economic and social life. These are two central forms of violence, foundations of the ideological system that justifies hegemonic actions and leads to the empire of fabulations, to fragmented perceptions, and to the single discourse of the world. This

discourse is the basis of these new totalitarianisms—in other words, of *globalitarianisms*—that we are now observing” (Santos, 2017, p. 16). Santos, continues and notes that, “today, violence is an insistent subject, normally understood almost as a state of being, a situation that is characteristic of our time. However, the greatest part of the forms of violence we are speaking about is made up of derived forms of violence, while attention is turned less to what we prefer to call structural violence. This structural variety is the basis of the production of other forms and constitutes the original central violence. This is why we in fact end up condemning only particular peripheral forms of violence. As it appears to us, structural violence is a result of the presence and joint manifestation, in this era of globalization, of three factors: money in its pure state, competitiveness in its pure state, and power in its pure state. The association of these three factors leads to the emergence of new forms of totalitarianism and justifies the thought that we now live, indeed, in an epoch not merely of globalization, but of *globalitarianism*. Moreover, we are moving from a situation where perversity manifests itself in an isolated form to another in which it is installed as a system of perversities. This system is at the same time a result and a cause of the legitimation of money, competitiveness, and power in their pure states, thus consecrating the end of ethics and of politics” (Santos, 2017, p. 25).

These are some of the imbricated axes that re/produce *the* world by/for the uni-versal amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, *one* world that the architect and architecture, ultimately, have been instrumental in its construction, *the architectural world*. In other words, by way of Edizon Muj Cumes through the work of Aura Cumes, and how she understands the *mundo de uno* “as a system of colonial domination, which places western corporealities as universal subjects with pretensions of the totalization of the world based on their specific reality, that is, a skin color, a language, a truth and a way of understanding the world; therefore, only one way of creating knowledge” (Cumes Simón, 2019; Muj Cumes, 2023). To which we expand the *mundo de uno*, not only as the “only way of creating knowledge,” but as the *only way of creating world*, as the imposition of the *only* way to inhabit and exist.

Get out of here con eso: Colonial territorial domination

Colonialism and coloniality

*En el mil cuatrocientos noventa y dos
Llegó un tipo que dijo que descubrió
La Quisqueya mía, Ave María
Get out of here con eso
Taíno indio, caribeño
Él fue que diseñó a su pueblo
Él fue que compuso su ritmo
Merengueao, ripeao pa su hijo
Guallando - Fulanito*

“...that very idea of humanity might lie at the heart of our worst decisions, justifying a great deal of violence. The notion that white Europeans could jump in their ships and go colonizing the rest of the world was based on the premise that there was an enlightened humanity that had to go in search of the benighted humanity and bring those savages into their incredible light. This call to civilization was always justified by the idea that there is a right way of being in the world, one truth, or concept of truth, that has guided the choices made down through history” (Krenak, 2020, p. 13)

Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui keenly underscores that, “the decolonial is a fashion, the postcolonial is a desire, and the anticolonial is a daily and permanent struggle” (Rivera Cusicanqui & Federici, 2018). Anticolonial struggles have articulated through diverse paths how colonialism started with the conquest and dispossession of Abya Yala and pervades until today “as a structure, an ethos and a culture that reproduce themselves day by day in their oppressions and silencing” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 49). This structure did not end with the supposed bourgeois *independences* that liberated territories from european imperial colonialism, but continues through the imbrication of globalitarian colonial power and internal colonialism, sustained by racist nation-states.

One of these articulations of anticolonial struggle was advanced by Aníbal Quijano, according to him, “with the conquest of the societies and cultures that inhabited what today is called América Latina, began the formation of a world order that culminates, 500 years later, in a global power that articulates the entire planet” (Quijano, 1992, p. 11). This global power is still articulated, Quijano noted, through coloniality

(colonial+modernity), and refers with this to the way in which the axes of power that began with modern colonialism in Abya Yala, and how this 'spatio-temporal matrix' articulated “work, knowledge, authority and intersubjective relations [...] through the global capitalist market and the idea of race” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007b, p. 131).

Coloniality of power according to Quijano is sustained by four main axes: “1) A new system of social domination, founded on the basic and universal social classification of the world population on the basis of, and around, the idea of ‘race.’ [...] 2) Associated with it, the formation of a structure of control of labor, its resources and products, which articulated all historically known forms (slavery, serfdom, small independent mercantile production, reciprocity and capital), around and under the predominance of the capital-wage relation and of the world market. [...] 3) The division of the globe into regions identified, first, according to their place in the coloniality of power, ‘whites’/Europeans, dominant and ‘colored,’ dominated. Secondly, according to their place in the world structure of capitalism, between imperial centers and dependent regions. And, third, its eurocentrism, that is to say, the formation of western Europe as the seat of central control over the whole of this world power structure. 4) Eurocentrism as the dominant perspective of intersubjectivity—historical/social imaginary and memory and knowledge—a mode of producing and controlling subjectivity and intersubjective relations, an instrument of the coloniality of power” (Quijano, 2013, pp. 145–146).

Although coloniality begins with the project of territorial conquest—and everything that happens in these territories at the environmental, social, cultural level—and the implementation of a mode of domination, these structures of exploration, appropriation, dispossession, discrimination, exploitation, profit and control endure even with the passage of the processes from European colonial domination and *in*dependence of the territories under the nation-state model. Coloniality “is kept alive in literacy and learning manuals, in the criteria to determine what is a good academic work, in the patriarchal and Eurocentric definition of culture, in the common sense of the universal citizen, in the image that peoples project of themselves—a strange mimetic reminiscence of coloniality and of that superior European other—, in the aspirations of the subjects” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007b, p. 131).

di mackin symbols af independence (Johnson, 2006, p. 77)

Get out of here con eso...

Fuck power, and lets just take care of each other (Zephaniah, 2019)

Territorial coloniality or fuck the arkhé!

“What has been given to us as the totality of the world is not, in fact, the totality of the world” (Bey, 2021, p. 115)

“Much emphasis is placed on the unsustainable nature of widespread architectural, urban and territorial practices, but these continue to be reproduced” (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2012, p. 144)

“A society colonizes, when itself having reached a high degree of maturity and of strength, it procreates, it protects, it places in good conditions of development, and it brings to virility a new society to which it has given birth. Colonization is one of the most complex and delicate phenomena of social physiology. [...] Colonization is the expansive force of a people; it is its power of reproduction; it is its enlargement and its multiplication through space; it is the subjection of the universe or a vast part of it to that people’s language, customs, ideas, and laws. [...] A people which colonizes is a people which projects into the future the foundations of its grandeur and eventual supremacy” (Leroy-Beaulieu, 1882, pp. ii, 605, 606) cited in ((Murphy, 1968) and (Said, 2003))

“This is [*not*] a simulacrum. Just because [*architecture*] reflects aloud on its colonial legacy, it does not make it anti-colonial” (Contranarrativas & Villegas, 2023)

“A message to the academic architectural critic:

Architecture is a ubiquitous condition of everyday experience. We live in it, enjoy it, suffer from it. It shelters us and it shapes us. It makes our cities liveable or unliveable. We fight for or against its construction, preservation or demolition. More than an academic field or an artistic practice, architecture matters to everyone. Our lives are wrapped up in it. So stop policing who does or doesn’t get to speak about architecture, where they write about it, or what they should or shouldn’t be saying about it. This is not your castle. We are not your subjects” (Spencer, 2023)

Let’s ask the obvious, *qué mierdas es* architecture and the architect, situated through the fields and forces of the experience of coloniality, in the territories now called colombia and méxico? As Le Corbusier never

said, architecture is the masterly, correct and magnificent uni-versalization of eurocentric-modern spatiality, brought together by the amalgam of patriarchy, capitalism and coloniality under globalitarian domination. And the architect today, the current modality, the neo-liberal architect, as Alberti also never said, seems to be whom by sure and economic reason and method, knows both how to devise through its own mind and energy, and to realize by construction, whatever can be most efficient to state control and profitably fitted out for the needs of white-mestizo bourgeoisie, real estate and financial capitalism, by the production of new forms. To do this, architects must be: entrepreneurial, competitive, flexible, resilient, original, innovative and creative. This is the ethos the neo-liberal architect must self-cultivate, these ‘qualities of self-conduct’ should be learnt by the neo-liberal architect in order to succeed, these are the *semantic dispositifs* of success. As Spencer reminds us, according to neo-liberal truth games, there is no choice for the individual-subject, “politically or ontologically, but to govern itself, and to have itself governed, according to these imperatives” (Spencer, 2016, p. 23).

Architecture is not an a-historical nor uni-versal practice—although it violently claims and wants to be—, the discipline and profession we know today has just a few centuries and hopefully will not last much more. As Yasser Farrés Delgado argues in Abya Yala, “the territory is a field little studied from a decolonial interpretation, despite the fact that it is par excellence the physical support for ‘(the) relations with other forms of life and with the rest of the universe (nature)’ referred to by Quijano ((Quijano, 2001) in (Quintero, 2010)) as one of the areas of human social experience to be decolonized. Current territorial problems can be understood, in fact, as a tangible reflection of the hegemony of the epistemic model deployed by the West in the modern/colonial world system” (Farrés Delgado, 2019, p. 56).

Starting in 2012, Farrés Delgado, through his doctoral research in granada, spain, supervised by Alberto Matarán Ruiz and Ramón Grosfoguel, proposed and started working through the concept of *colonialidad territorial*—territorial coloniality—, in order to “interpret the power relations that underpin modern and contemporary widespread territorial praxis” (Farrés Delgado, 2019, p. 56). In 2012 in *Colonialidad Territorial: Para Analizar A Foucault En El Marco De La Desterritorialización De La Metrópoli. Notas Desde La Habana*, together with Matarán Ruiz, they first proposed the term *colonialidad territorial*—territorial coloniality—, that Farrés Delgado would later expand through his work. In this first text, they point to the “restraints of Foucault’s theory on space, where knowledge and power are pivotal categories, but it has a scant or null allusion to issues on the coloniality of being exerted by the Western subject,” by way of Deleuze, Guattari and Alberto Magnaghi they argue against the deterritorialization caused by hegemonic and homogenizing architectural, urban and territorial praxis (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2012, p. 145). Farrés Delgado and Matarán Ruiz, argue that architectural, urban and territorial praxis, not only manifest the productivist, developmentalist and economicist reason, but also eurocentrism, hence, “it makes sense to defend that the homogenizing praxis *obeys the hegemony of the epistemic model deployed by the West in the modern/colonial*

world system. From this perspective, it is possible to follow the general concept of coloniality offered by Castro-Gómez (Castro-Gómez, 2007) and define territorial coloniality, a particular manifestation of it, as the set of power patterns that in territorial praxis serve to hegemonically establish a conception of territory over others that are ‘interiorized.’ Likewise, to refer to the triangular structure between territorial knowledge, territorial power and territorial being” (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2012, p. 152). Territorial coloniality is based then, on a triangular structure sustained by; coloniality of territorial knowledge, as professional practices in which certain knowledge hegemonically dominates decisions on how to conceive and inhabit the territory, the city and architecture; coloniality of territorial power, as the sphere of intersubjectivity in which a certain group of people defines what is territorially correct and, therefore, holds the power of enunciation; and coloniality of territorial being, as the hegemony of the ‘urban being’ over the rest of the non-urban forms of human existence (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2012, pp. 152–153).

Farrés Delgado in his doctoral dissertation, *Críticas decoloniales a la arquitectura, el urbanismo y la ordenación del territorio. Hacia una territorialización de ambientes humanos en cuba*, presented in 2013, follows a strict reading of the modernity/coloniality group and argues that the hegemonic civilizatory model of the west, guided by “ideas of modernization, development and growth are still at the center of territorial discourses,” and expands on the notion of *territorial coloniality*, in order to uncover how the, “hegemonic discourse of the western civilizational model takes shape in the configuration of the spaces of human life, that is, in architecture, the city and the territory” (Farrés Delgado, 2013, p. 108).

Together, again, Farrés Delgado and Matarán Ruiz write in 2014, *Hacia una teoría urbana transmoderna y decolonial: una introducción*, in which, through the notion of territorial coloniality, they argue “that the global impacts caused by the homogenisation and loss of identity tendencies in architecture and planning will be only overcome if recognizing them as part of the world westernization and if a decolonial attitude is promoted for leading the urban-architectural theory through ‘transmodernity’ by means of the ‘ecology of knowledge’ including the experiences that modern thinking marginalized” (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2014, p. 339). They note that, “since 1492, there has been an epistemicide of territorial, urban and architectural knowledge that has impacted on ancestral knowledge in the colonized territories” of Abya Yala (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2014, p. 353). And argue that they, do not intend to propose “‘a new’ urban theory or ‘a new’ working method as universalist projects for urbanism, but rather to vindicate the need for a ‘decolonial attitude’ in relation to the critique of the processes of homogenization and loss of identity in architectural praxis, urban and territorial that opens spaces within the academy for ‘other urban theories’ that are not ‘new’ but have remained in a marginality product of the coloniality exercised by hegemonic knowledges despite the fact that they have existed and sustained the generation of other spatial conceptions both outside

modernity (absent spatial epistemologies) and within it (emergent epistemologies)” (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2014, p. 355).

But it is Farrés Delgado’s solo-work that has delved deeper into the notion of *territorial coloniality*. In the 2016 text, *Arquitectura y decolonialidad: algunas ideas sobre la Escuela de Artes Plásticas de Ricardo Porro*, he proposes a multi-scalar approach to territorial coloniality, through the overlapping of “architecture, the city and the territory as manifestations, at different scales, of a category of greater generality (the built environment),” and asks: “what can a decolonial architecture be?” According to Farrés Delgado, “it would be that which is opposed to hegemonic visions, to the coloniality of architectural knowledge, architectural power and architectural being. Paraphrasing the definition of the Argentine semiologist Walter Mignolo on the decolonial, decolonial would be an architecture whose point of origin is in the subalternized spatial conceptions” (Farrés Delgado, 2016, p. 186).

Later in 2019, in the text *Dialogar con Quijano: la colonialidad como categoría para comprender el ambiente construido en el sistema-mundo moderno/colonial*, Farrés Delgado continues the argument from 2016 on the built environment as a spatial notion developed in London at the The Bartlett School of Architecture, and argues that “with the notion of the coloniality of power, Aníbal Quijano opened a perspective of analysis on the reality of the modern world-system whose potential exceeds the limits of reflection outlined by him” and notes “the relevance of applying such a perspective to the understanding of the modern and contemporary built environment, [...] centered on the notion ‘territorial coloniality’” (Farrés Delgado, 2019, p. 49), as the spatial dimension of coloniality (Farrés Delgado, 2019, p. 60). And, points to the overlapping with other studies on the relation between coloniality and the territory, as: bio-coloniality of power (Cajigas-Rotundo, 2007), coloniality of nature (Alimonda, 2009) and coloniality of seeing (Barriendos, 2011).

We understand territorial coloniality—as Farrés Delgado also suggests—as the spatio-territorial dimension of coloniality, as dominant power relations that started in colonial times and perdure until today, and determine and impose patriarchal-colonial-capitalist *means* and *relations* of modes of inhabitation, of transforming the territory. Which is irreducible to constructive practices, but encompasses all the material and symbolic practices to sustain and transform life, pointing to the inseparability of modes of inhabitation and modes for existence. In other words the coloniality of inhabitation (González Bracco & Laborde, 2021).

We acknowledge the important and potent work of Farrés Delgado, however we part ways, due mainly to three reasons. First, his reading of the modernity/coloniality group is too strict, too rigid, and as Rivera Cusicanqui notes regarding *Mignolo and company*, their “work since the 1990s has been to create academic satrapies in the most elitist universities of the north, selling the idea of decolonization to their new audiences, rebranded as the ‘post-colonial.’ or the ‘*de(s)colonial*’” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 51). Second, there is a lack of attention to the architect and too much attention to architecture as an ideological superstructure, through his

work. And third, there is an implicit essentialization and uni-versalization of architecture as a globalitarian spatial practice, as, when saying: “since 1492, there has been an epistemicide of territorial, urban and architectural knowledge that has impacted on ancestral knowledge in the colonized territories” of Abya Yala (Farrés Delgado & Matarán Ruiz, 2014, p. 353), or by suggesting that a decolonial architecture “would be that which is opposed to hegemonic visions, to the colonality of architectural knowledge, architectural power and architectural being” (Farrés Delgado, 2016, p. 186). He ends up uni-versalizing that which he is critiquing as a homogenizing territorial praxis, meaning architecture. Farrés Delgado is not able to let go of the discipline nor the profession, such is the decolonial turn.

We argue that there is not necessarily architectural coloniality, but, that architecture is a fundamental dispositif of territorial coloniality, as such, architecture through the colonial experience in Abya Yala, cannot be equaled to the production of space, nor to spatial thought, or to the trans-formation of the territory, *por más que la arquitectura nos quiera convencer*. We can feel it coming. *Allá viene*, the wave of decolonial architecture.⁸ There is no, nor will there ever be such thing as decolonial architecture, but only de/anti-colonial *alternatives to architecture*. Alternatives that already exist, and others yet to come, that architecture through its uni-versalizing practice *encubre*—conceals. As Rivera Cusicanqui, underscores “colonialism has a very peculiar function for words: words do not designate, but *encubren*—conceal” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010a, p. 19). Such is the case with the word architecture and its professional practice, what architecture *is*, does not matter solely for what it signifies, but most importantly for what it *encubre*, for all the modalities of inhabitation that it conceals. To speak of architecture is proper to white-bourgeois aesthetic-spatial ideology. Architecture does not exist as a uni-versal practice, as a uni-versal mode of inhabitation: what exists are diverse modes of inhabitation, placemaking and territorial trans-formation. No apparatus of capture and *concealment* is a totality; no apparatus of capture and *concealment* can indeed succeed in the entirety of its attempted capture” (Bey, 2023, p. 8). Yet architecture is constantly and violently imposed in/through the world, as the *one* and *only* mode of re/producing the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation.

Architecture seems to be an *amoeba word*, as Illich notes, some words become so flexible like an amoeba that they fit into almost any interstice of language (Illich, 1971, p. 25). Today architecture signifies from a discipline, a profession, built form, space, to any structure, hence we have concepts as website architecture.

Make no mistake. We are also not promoting a reconfiguration of categories such as the built environment or spatial practices. No. We are not promoting anything. *Nada en promoción por acá*. We are compelled to rehearse a mode of critique that co-moves towards other modalities of inhabitation and other modalities for existence, beyond-against and beyond the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, which is to say, beyond class, race and gender, as structuring signifiers. Beyond the professionalization and disciplinarization of inhabitation. We also do not pretend to propose or coin a new

modality of inhabitation. No. Nor do we co-move towards decolonial architecture, not even anarchitecture. We write this in order to co-move, hear and un/learn from existing modalities of inhabitation and forms for existence, that architecture violently *encubre*, and hopefully rehearse together ungovernable modalities of inhabitation.

We will not engage in yet another pseudo-poetic-phenomenological uni-versal attempt to define architecture. Situated in Abya Yala through/from the experience of coloniality, we understand architecture, plain and simple, as a violent eurocentric spatial technology with uni-versal claims that sustains and constructs the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, re/producing constantly class, race and gender power relations of domination. This spatial technology is not only composed by buildings, spatial commodities, but also by habits, images, as construction drawings and renders, by texts, as books and manuals, and depending on the scale it claims and has influence also on “topographies, cities, streets, houses, schools of architecture and technical colleges, rooms, lintels, lavatories, windows, lamps, escutcheons and nail heads” amongst other (Adler, 2016, p. 179). To say that there is white-colonial architecture is a pleonasm. Architecture is always already a white-colonial technology. Architecture is a material-discursive dispositif, it is a technology that constantly constructs structural discrimination through violent: enclosures, property, frontiers, extractivism, dispossession, deterritorialization, codification and discrimination. All to sustain mono-functional modern space—which is to say the spatiality by/for mono-humanism—for the (*sub*)valorization of life. It is one of many colonial technologies of territorial control, exploitation, dispossession and modification. Hence, there cannot be anti-de/colonial architecture, there can only be other modes of inhabiting, other modalities of socio-spatial expression. Not defined by colonial power relations of domination.

We can feel it coming. -This is too totalitarian: we know many architects that do incredible things for other people. -There is beautiful architecture. -We are not all the same. -What about, vernacular architecture, popular architecture, communitarian architecture, participatory architecture, queer architects, feminist architects, and many other. We hear you. But as we have already said: let go. We must let go the false promise that we need architects and architecture. We know the anxiety, the un-certainty. We feel as if we are *losing ourselves* (Esteve & O'Donovan, 2014). But we must lose ourselves, because we owe us the possibility of *un-doing ourselves*, becoming otherwise, of not being modern-individual-subjects, of becoming un-fit for professional subjection. Because we must struggle to *become uneconomic* (Federici, 2021, p. 21). As Ailton Krenak invites us “the question we need to ask is: Why are we so afraid of falling when fall is all we’ve ever done?” (Krenak, 2020, p. 33). If “we fall so we can fall again, which is what ascension really means. To fall is to lose one’s place, to lose the place that makes one, to relinquish the locus of being, which is to say of being-single” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 45). Why are we so afraid of becoming incomplete and unfit for subjection? As Moten and Harney potently invite us. When incomplete is all we’ve ever been. When subjection

is not only a promise but a violent imposition. So, yes, we hear you. Yes, this is not an exhaustive study of singular architects and if they may have good intentions. No, this is not a totalitarian stance. When we say architecture, situated in Abya Yala through/from the experience of colonality, is a violent eurocentric spatial technology with uni-versal claims that sustains and constructs the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, re/producing constantly asymmetric powers of class, race and gender, we mean it. We live it. We all live it. Again: “architecture is a ubiquitous condition of everyday experience. We live in it, enjoy it, suffer from it. It shelters us and it shapes us” (Spencer, 2023). It is imbricated. It is violent.

Edward Said notes that “advanced” cultures have offered only “imperialism, racism and ethnocentrism for dealing with ‘other’ cultures” (Said, 2003, p. 204). The definition of architecture we put forward allows to differentiate and acknowledge that the planet counts—ahead, now and then—with multiple approaches to study, imagine and construct space and form, though diverse inhabiting and constructive cultures, modalities of inhabiting, and that architecture constantly tries to impose over these, assuming a uni-versal hierarchical position. But inhabitations do not fit into architecture.

Logistics of desire

Logistics

More and more, as we will see in the coming chapters, *human* conduct is not governed through direct disciplinary power or control, as Foucault and Deleuze suggested, but through logistics. And, as Rolnik argues, “power uses desire as its main weapon” (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 70). Moten and Harney argue that, “with the rise of logistical capitalism, it is not the product that is never finished but the production line, and not the production line, but its improvement. In logistical capitalism it is the continuous improvement of the production line that never finishes, that’s never done, that’s undone continuously. The sociologists caught a glimpse of this line and thought that they were seeing networks. The political scientist called this line globalization. The business professors named it and priced it as business process re-engineering” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 36).

“Logistics is a subdiscipline of operations management, which moves objects, moves itself with objects, moves all the way through objects. The contemporary history of logistics begins with containerization, with the expanded value chain of global markets” (Raunig, 2016, p. 132).

Logistics is understood broadly, as the efficient circulation of commodities, that is the effective storage and delivery of commodities—products, services and bodies. Logistics encompass all the strategies for the process of efficient delivery of commodities from the place of production/extraction to the point of consumption/transformation. “The term ‘logistics’ derives from the Greek verb *logizomai* meaning to calculate,

to reckon, to organise rationally, to *plan*. As first systematised by Antoine-Henri Jomini and Carl von Clausewitz in the early nineteenth century, logistics deals not only with the organization of armies and supplies on a battlefield but with everything necessary for reducing friction in the actualization of a strategy. Over time the military knowledge of logistics was reformulated as a technology of governance, to modulate trade relations and organise territories in peace time as well. In the aftermath of [European war of 1914–1945], logistics turned the whole world into a smooth surface for exchange: into a unique ‘floor’ for production” (Bensi & Marullo, 2018, p. 1) As Moten and Harney underscore, once an abstract notion, “logistics is no longer content with diagrams or with flows, with calculations or with predictions. It wants to live in the concrete itself in space at once, time at once, form at once” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 88). No longer content solely with the efficient circulation of *objects*—although it has always dealt with the movement of more than objects—, now logistics modulates all spheres of life. Logistics deals from the efficient movement of commodities, from the racial migratory regime, to the whiteness of/for desire.

Desires, freedom and truth(s)

Logistics operate through “a whole labour of rationalization extending to the most intimate dimension of the subject: a rationalization of desire. Rationalization of desire is at the heart of the norm of personal enterprise. As underlined by one of its technologists, Bob Aubrey, a Californian international consultant, ‘to speak of personal enterprise is to express the idea that everyone can have a grip on their life: conduct it, manage it, control it in accordance with their desires and needs by developing appropriate strategies.’ As a way of being of the human ego, personal enterprise is a way of governing oneself according to principles and values. Nikolas Rose (Rose, 1996) identifies some of them: ‘energy, initiative, ambition, calculation and personal responsibility.’ It is the efficient, competitive individual who seeks to maximize *his* human capital in all areas, who not only seeks to project *himself* into the future and calculate *his* gains and losses like the old economic *man*, but above all seeks to work on *himself* so as constantly to transform *himself*, improve *himself*, and make *himself* ever more efficient. What distinguishes this subject is the very process of self-improvement to which *he* is prompted, leading *him* incessantly to perfect *his* results and performance. The new paradigms covering the labour market, like education and training, life-long learning and employability,’ are significant strategic modalities of it” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 264).

The game of freedom is at the heart of the neo-liberal governmental reason that Foucault described (Foucault, 2008, p. 83). But what is freedom? Foucault, observes that “we should not think of freedom as a uni-versal which is gradually realized over time, or which undergoes quantitative variations, greater or lesser drastic reductions, or more or less important periods of eclipse. It is not a uni-versal which is particularized in

time and geography. Freedom is not a white surface with more or less numerous black spaces here and there and from time to time. Freedom is never anything other—but this is already a great deal—than an actual relation between governors and governed” (Foucault, 2008, p. 63). But as, Hartman, notes through the *burdened individuality of freedom*, the black experience of enslavement and the *nonevent of emancipation* in the so-called united states of america, “the entanglements of bondage and liberty shaped the liberal imagination of freedom, fueled the emergence and expansion of capitalism, and spawned proprietorial conceptions of the self” (Hartman, 2022, p. 201). “The traversals of freedom and subordination, sovereignty and subjection, and autonomy and compulsion are significant markers of the dilemma or double bind of freedom. Marx, describing a dimension of this paradox, referred to it with dark humor as a double freedom-being free to exchange one’s labor and free of material resources” (Hartman, 2022, p. 202). “The nascent individualism of the freed designates a precarious autonomy, since exploitation, domination, and subjection inhabit the vehicle of rights” (Hartman, 2022, p. 203). “Freedom, although a release from slavery, undoubtedly imposed burdens of another order. The body no longer harnessed by chains or governed by the whip was instead tethered by the weight of conscience, duty, and obligation.” (Hartman, 2022, p. 238). “Freedom through work was never the slave’s cry but we hear it all around us today” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 41).

Spencer, argues that, Foucault “examined the operative nature of the neoliberal truths of subjectivity, the truths put about through which architecture has legitimated its post-critical and projective turn as progressive and emancipatory. ‘Truth games,’ [Foucault] said, are implements in the production of subjectivity. They legitimate forms of power that operate on and through the constitution of the self. They are also themselves produced—constituted and constructed by interested parties—before being put into play as techniques of power. The rules of the truth game, though, require that the contrivance of its truths be concealed from the players. This rule maintains the operative capacity of the truths constructed, that they are accepted as the given conditions that determine how things must, of necessity, be managed. Truth games do not rule from outside or above, but by embedding themselves in forms of common knowledge and practice. As Dardot and Laval write in *The New Way of the World* (Dardot & Laval, 2013), ‘The truth cannot be resisted; it can only be approached. For it does not command, but imposes itself by getting itself acknowledged’ [...] Neoliberalism is a truth game. Its accounts of human knowledge, social complexity and the economic market legitimate its management of individuals” (Spencer, 2016, p. 9).

And lastly, Fanon argued that colonized people had the desire to become white (Fanon, 2008). We argue that through the logistics of desire, truth and freedom, these three notions are imbricated through/for the re/production of; the desire to be an architect, which is to say, to have architectural authority; construction of architectural truth, as the one and only modality to trans-form the territory; and freedom as if architecture could bring emancipation. Logistics operates by/for/through the desire of being architect, a white-original-

leading-genius-creator of space/form. And, as Fanon also argued, whiteness is sustained by narcissism and a leadership or authority complex (Fanon, 2008, p. 73). It is through the imbrication of the logistics of desire, truth and freedom, the leadership/authority complex and the accumulation or fear of losing narcissistic capital—as Rolnik would say—that the coloniality of being operates in order to re/produce the neo-liberal architect. Because as Moten and Harney argue, “the world is posed as the way to live on the earth as the individual is posed as the way to live in the world. To live in the world as an individual is therefore to be logistic, and to be logistic is to settle into a rhythm that kills, to beat out that rhythm over the undercommon track that keeps (giving away) its own measure” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 57).

If living in the world as an individual means to be logistic, it is through education—for abstract-alienating-subordinated labour—in all its phases from kinder to post-doctorates, that we are schooled, violently modulated by/for the logistics of desire, truth and freedom. And particularly through the uni-versity as a site of labour modulation.

Chapters abstract

The first chapter, *Within/together and against/apart neo-liberalization*, draws a general field of how neo-liberalism has become a mode of life, that is, a form of reproducing materially and symbolically a specific existence, centered on an economic/market-based existence. Through the chapter, we argue five points. First, following Foucault’s governmentality and technologies of the self, we need to focus diverse readings of neo-liberalism as modes of government of freedom through the conduct of conduct. Second, following Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell, that neo-liberalism is an unfinished and ongoing project, hence we need to rather situate and problematize the particularities of neo-liberalization in so-called colombia and méxico. Third, following Pierre Dardot and Christian Laval, neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life and a ubiquitous form of our existence (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 3), we must problematize such production of subjectivity, as a regime of life and the false promise it sustains of the individual economic subject, *homo æconomicus*. Fourth, we must problematize the particular neo-liberal semantic dispositifs, and its logistics. Fifth, situating such processes and dispositifs, asks to problematize neo-liberal territorialization through the *longue durée* of territorial coloniality, and the current territorial neo-liberalization.

The second chapter, *Masks and suspects or the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject*, problematizes the re/production of the uni-versal individual subject. We are not compelled to problematize the metaphysics of the subject, as self/ego/identity/consciousness but rather to refuse the push towards completion, the modulation of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject. And, problematize the individual

subject considered as a labouring-body, a working-citizen. The second chapter is divided in three sections: the first section, *Uni-versal by design: The individual subject*, draws a general field and problematizes the individual and the subject. The second section, *White by design: Coloniality of subjectivity or what does it mean being ¿human?*, composes an argument through the coloniality of being, *ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia*, and the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious, as a means to situate the colonial process of *mestizaje* and its imbrication with the regime of heterosexuality and whiteness. All these meanderings, in order to better understand through the fields and forces of coloniality and the experiences in so-called méxico and colombia, how the architect is overrepresented by mestizo-white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies, through the inseparability and imbrication of class-gender/sex-race asymmetric relations of power. The last section, *Neo-liberal by design: Economic subject(ion) Or when are we?*, asks: if the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination ask of us to become economic existences, to become fit for labour subjection, which is to say, to become white. What are the current technologies, the modalities and the logistics of the neo-liberal re/production of subjectivity, if neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life as a ubiquitous form of our existence?

The third chapter, *Architectural education: pedagogies of the new, industries of the self*, asks, how has the labouring architectural subject been produced through education, through the fields and forces of the uni-versity, through architectural education? Regardless of the system used to define the subject, what the subject is, education as an assemblage of power, as a site of re/production, is fundamental in the modulation of labouring subjectivities, labouring selves, labouring bodies. Specially education under neo-liberal rationality, under the regime of contemporary capitalism. What the subject signifies, could be a contested site, but that education is a primary site of production of whatever the subject is, this is not easily contested. This chapter presents a genealogy of education under/for territorial coloniality. It begins with an introduction to the uni-versity as a uni-versal machine for the modulation of life and the coloniality of knowledge that still operates through Abya Yala. It then discusses the neo-liberalization of the uni-versity in so called colombia and méxico, focusing on the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject under the regime of competences. The chapter traces the neo-liberalization of architectural education through professionalization, fetishization, commodification, financialization and cultural colonialism or education as imperialism, in order to provide a situated critique of architectural education in so called colombia and méxico. It considers the influences of global modulation apparatuses such as the UIA-International Union of Architects through the fields and forces of coloniality. After these accounts, the chapter briefly discusses neo-liberal dispositifs related to entrepreneurialism and the new, and how they operate through architecture and the building industry. Finally, the chapter closes with three examples of struggles *with and for*, or within and against the uni-versity and architectural education in so-called colombia and méxico.

The fourth chapter, *Exodus, or the Voluntary Workers of Architecture: The re/production of the neo-liberal architect*, focuses on the production of neo-liberal architectural subjectivity, through professionalization. It moves through the impossibility, incompleteness of such modulation and its violent constant effort to pursue completion through the re/production of architectural authority, which is sustained by: professionalization, manual-intellectual division of labour, *sexual-racialized* division of labour, hierarchization, individual authorship, creative genius, mono-functional modern space, and colonial impositions of progress at large. The chapter is distributed through three sections: the first section draws a brief account of the coloniality of labour. The second section, draws a brief genealogy of the transition of architecture from craft to profession, considering the fields and forces of coloniality, and focuses on the figure of the architect as an eurocentric construct from the greek *architektōn* until the spanish colonial *architecto*, through a, non-exhaustive, study of the features of the architect and how architectural authority is sustained, through: the leadership complex, whiteness, manual-intellectual division of labour, *sexual-racialized* division of labour, individual authorship, creative genius, and patriarchy. The third section moves through a situated genealogy, of so-called colombia and méxico, and shows how architecture and architects have always been technocrats at the service of power, and today under/for neo-liberal capitalism.

The fifth and last chapter, *Learnings and doings, or the death of the reign of homo educandus and homo æconomicus*, takes the “the all-too-familiar tale of education [and labour] and stands on its head” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 3) and *co-moves* from professionalizing education to autonomous learnings, and from abstract labour to autonomous doings. And, asks, what are some of the modes of learning and doing that co-move and put at their center the potency of imagination and rehearsal of *other worlds*, other modes of *inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence*, beyond-against and beyond the architectural world that sustains by/for the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*? The chapter is distributed in two sections: learnings and doings. The first section, on learnings, emerges from the *mutually illuminating intra-actions* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular learning praxis, and how these move beyond-against and beyond the *education-based mode of study* and schooling. All these learning modalities have in common a fundamental focus on problematizing the coloniality of being, the colonization, monopoly and captivity of our modes of existence, reduced, and homogenized to that of the modern individual-subject, through education and schooling, and move towards other modes of becoming, modes that put learning at its center as a collective, autonomous activity to sustain life. The first part *Beyond-against and beyond education and schooling* of the section on learnings first outlines, through the work of kalicabra (kalicabra, 2019), in which they understand education—managed “learning” or education-based mode of study—as; a product to be consumed, pure imposition, standardized violence, an unequal system and a method of standardization. And we understand education as: the re/production of social orders, uni-

versalization, the rule of consumption and pre-alienation or the training of: bondage, obedience and labour. Followed by a second part *Modes of learning and non-hegemonic education*, which outlines, also following kalicabra, and how they understand self-organized learning as; collective process, contextualization of *saberes*, critical thinking, unlearning and as emancipating responsibility; and we understand learning as: un/learning, trans-versal processes, situated *saberes*, relational *sentir-pensar-hacer*, anarchic trans-formation and *study*. The second section, on doings, problematizes the coloniality of labour, that is how abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour has captured life. To the point in which we live to work, rather than work to live. And outlines an abolitionist critique of labour by way of the *mutually illuminating intra-actions* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular material-discursive practices, and how these move beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. The first part of this second section, *Beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract labour*, problematizes abstract labour as: the service of humans in bondage, the valorization of life, abstraction, white patriarchal rule and racist colonial rule. The second part *No will to work* of the section on doings, engages forwardly with an abolitionist critique of abstract labour and outlines the struggle against labour through: abolition of labour, against the vocational calling of architectural labour, fugitive deprofessionalization, doings, and communal and anti-colonial doings. Ultimately the abolition of both education and abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour and the professional identities it re/produces, as the architect, is an invitation to fall, to lose ourselves and imagine otherwise, beyond-against and beyond life as labour.

Through the words of Carlos Beas: “*Final. A manera de inconclusiones*” (Beas Torres, 2021, p. 326). The outro, is not a conclusion. It is not a final statement at the end our *study*. Instead, it is a continuation of our thoughts, a way of “disavowing the conclusion.” We do not attempt to bring things to a close; we strive to keep them open, and rehearse imagination. We strive to *let our relation change; let our relation fade* “into an entanglement that lets difference run even faster. Revision is keeping it open, seeing it again, letting it see, remaining at sea, in passage. Revision is rehearsal, hearing it again, playing it again. Practicing. Practice thinking because that is the practice of thinking. So let’s share our files, share our objects and some moments of our ongoing, revisionary relations to them” (Moten, 2018a, p. 231). The outro, is not a conclusion. But rather multiple exits. Exits to many coming-paths, rather than the conclusion of one. These are scattered and entangled notes of practices of refusal of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, architecture, the architect and territorial coloniality at large. *Outro, by way of in-conclusions: Architecture and the collective practices of inhabiting*, mobilizes and rehearses, the modality of writing we are ultimately compelled to cultivate, one that moves through essay and fiction. The text is a dis/appropriation an unsolicited collaboration with Mixe linguist Yásnaya Elena Aguilar Gil, and the text by Redes Comunes Mixes *El arte, la literatura y las estéticas colectivas*

de la tierra—Art, literature and the collective aesthetics of the land (Aguilar Gil & Redes Comunes Mixes, 2021). The text outlines the distinction between the *collective aesthetics of the land*, with art and literature as colonial and capitalist manifestations, in 2172 after the Capitalist Night. We dis/appropriate her text and compose a similar argument in order to outline the distinction between the *collective practices of inhabiting* and architecture as a manifestation that spatialized the, disarticulated, amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination by 2323. The outro moves through alternative modalities of inhabiting and becoming, not in order to point the “the modernist notion that new physical structures would yield new patterns of socialization” (Corner, 2006, p. 28). No. We are not saying, we first need new spatialities that will yield new socialities. But altogether. What we are underscoring is rather the inseparability of spatiality and sociality, hence the importance of rehearsing both, *none of that in particular, all of that at the same time. All forms, indeed. The most varied forms*. The challenge now—that as Moten notes, *now* operates within a longer trajectory of history against subsistence (Moten & MAKC, 2023)—, while still inhabiting the *architectural* world, which violently denies us these possibilities of rehearsal, is how to *renew and refine our anticolonial practices*? (Moten & MAKC, 2023).

Esta tesis presentación no será un esfuerzo educativo “surgido como brillante conclusión de un grupo ideológico, [...] no nos interesa lanzar al mundo una nueva obra pues creemos que en éste mundo la única obra faltante es su destrucción” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2011, p. 4)

Chapter 1

Within/together and against/apart neo-liberalization

Pure theoretical shit?

The story I am going to tell you came to me the other day. It is the story of a small beetle who wears glasses and smokes a pipe. I met him one day as I was looking for my smoking tobacco and I couldn't find it. Suddenly, on one side of my hammock, I saw that a bit of tobacco had fallen and formed a small trail. I followed it to see where my tobacco was and to see who the hell had taken it and was spilling it. A few meters away, behind a rock, I found a beetle sitting at a little desk, reading some papers and smoking a tiny pipe.

[...]

"And you, what is your name?" I asked him.

"Nebuchadnezzar," he said, and continued, "but my friends call me Durito. You can call me Durito, Captain."

[...]

Durito went on smoking, and waited for me to finish telling him everything that had happened in the last ten days. When I finished, Durito said,

"Wait here."

And he went under a little leaf. After a while he came out pushing his little desk. After that he went for a little chair, sat down, took out some papers, and began to look through them with a worried air.

"Hmmm, hmmm," he said with every few pages that he read. After a time he exclaimed, "Here it is!"

"Here's what?" I asked, intrigued.

"Don't interrupt me!" Durito said seriously and solemnly. And added, "Pay attention. You have the same problem as many others. It refers to the economic and social doctrine known as 'neoliberalism'..."

"Just what I needed now...classes in political economy," I thought. It seems like Durito heard what I was thinking because he scolded me:

"Sssh! This isn't just any class! This is a treatise of the highest order."

That bit about "a treatise of the highest order" seemed exaggerated to me, but I got ready to listen to it. Durito continued after some "hmmm, hmmm."

"It is a metatheoretical problem! Yes, you start from the idea that 'neoliberalism' is a doctrine. And by 'you,' I am referring to those who insist on frameworks that are rigid

and square like your head. You think that ‘neoliberalism’ is a capitalist doctrine to confront the economic crises that capitalism itself attributes to ‘populism.’ Right?”

Durito doesn’t let me answer.

“Of course right! Well, it turns out that ‘neoliberalism’ is not a theory to confront or explain the crisis. It is the crisis itself made theory and economic doctrine! That is, ‘neoliberalism’ hasn’t the least coherence; it has no plans or historic perspective. In the end, pure theoretical shit.”

“How strange... I’ve never heard or read that interpretation,” I said with surprise.

“Of course! How could you, if it just occurred to me in this moment!” says Durito with pride (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 53)

Let’s problematize Durito’s view of neo-liberalism as the crisis itself made theory and economic doctrine, by way of Santiago Castro-Gómez through Foucault, who argues: neo-liberalism is primarily a rationality of government, which means that it is not a “disorganized capitalism” (Lash & Urry, 1994). It involves reorganizing political rationality, which includes governing not only economic life but also social and individual life. The state is not eliminated but is rather transformed into a tool for promoting market autonomy. The concept of the “withdrawal of the State” should be understood as a product of rational government technology rather than an irrational occurrence (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 177). Durito indeed shares potent wisdom from Chiapas, but neo-liberalism is so entrenched in everyday life and its intellectual networks have been so pervasive that we cannot just call it pure theoretical shit, although it is a *mierda de ideología*.

Neo-liberalism is a term that is commonly used in Abya Yala to describe a set of policies that have had a significant impact on the continent. As Véronica Gago underscores, international financial institutions, corporations, and governments have been experimenting with policies, such as privatization, reduced social protections, financial deregulation, and labor flexibility, at national scales since the 1970s, after revolutionary movements were defeated. “However, thinking of neo-liberalism as a mutation in the ‘art of government,’ as Michel Foucault (Foucault, 2008) proposes with the term governmentality, supposes understanding neo-liberalism as a set of skills, technologies, and practices, deploying a new type of rationality that cannot be thought of only from above. Moreover, this rationality is not purely abstract nor macropolitical but rather arises from the encounter with forces at work and is embodied in various ways by the subjectivities and tactics of everyday life, as a variety of ways of doing, being, and thinking that organize the social machinery’s calculations and affects. Here neo-liberalism functions immanently: it unfolds on the territorial level, modulates subjectivities, and is provoked, without needing a transcendent and exterior structure” (Gago, 2017, p. 1).

We would like to argue five points: First, following Foucault's governmentality and technologies of the self, we need to focus diverse readings of neo-liberalism as modes of government of freedom through the conduct of conduct. Second, following Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell, neo-liberalism is an unfinished and ongoing project, hence we need to rather situate and problematize the particularities of neo-liberalization in so-called colombia and méxico. Third, following Pierre Dardot and Christian Laval, neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life and a ubiquitous form of our existence (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 3), we must problematize such production of subjectivity, as a regime of life and the false promise it sustains of the uni-versal individual economic subject, *homo œconomicus*. Fourth, we must problematize the particular neo-liberal semantic dispositifs, and its logistics. Fifth, situating such processes and dispositifs, asks to problematize neo-liberal territorialization through the *longue durée* of territorial coloniality.

As Donna Haraway emphasizes, "single vision produces worse illusions than double vision or many-headed monsters" (Haraway, 1991, p. 154). This is not another attempt to pin down a single vision of what neo-liberalism is, neither an exhaustive study of multiple visions. The following chapter entangles some examples that study neo-liberalization as a regime of life, as a mode of existence modulated by the market economy. Because as Durito highlights, "it turns out that 'neoliberalism' is not a theory to confront or explain the crisis. It is the crisis itself made theory and economic doctrine! That is, 'neoliberalism' hasn't the least coherence; it has no plans or historic perspective. In the end, pure theoretical shit" (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 53). Let's review some of its shit.

Neo-liberalism is a mode of life, that is, a form of reproducing materially and symbolically a specific existence, centered on an economic/market-based existence, as such it depends on the daily-life reproduction of the market as Fredy Perlman (Perlman, 2018) might say, or "following Dardot and Laval, it is a regime of 'practical normativity' (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 9), "which sees itself quite self-consciously as a strategy of everyday subjectification" (Kiersey, 2016). In this respect, neo-liberalism does not only entail specific state control and regulations but socialities and spaces, space is neo-liberalized and in return our modes of living are neo-liberalized. As Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot note regarding the inseparability of modes of inhabitation and modes of existence: people "and environments are co-produced [...] we dress our interior environments (which in turn dress us)" (Frichot & Runting, 2016, p. 231).

As the architecture critic and teacher Douglas Spencer notes, following Philip Mirowski (Mirowski, 2014), neo-liberalism is not an extreme and uncontrolled form of capitalism, but an ideology, that is an "ideology of no ideology." The neo-liberalization of common knowledge, achieved through multiple events, think-tanks and policy units, has been very successful. According to Mirowski, neo-liberalism has become so ingrained in everyday life that it is almost considered an ideology without a specific ideology (Spencer, 2016, pp. 3–4).

Let's briefly summarize seven different understandings of neo-liberalism, the first four are outlined by, the anarchist geographer, Simon Springer in *The discourse of neoliberalism: an anatomy of a powerful idea* (Springer, 2016b, p. 37):

1. "Neo-liberalism as an ideological hegemonic project." Through the capacity to project and circulate the neo-liberal program controlled by a group of powerful individuals and organizations with a global reach. They are able to promote a unified vision of the world to others, and this is not just due to coercion but also "involves a degree of willing consent." The focus is on the individuals and ideas that constructed neo-liberalism and those who currently implement it in different parts of the world (see (Cox & Schechter, 2003) (Duménil & Lévy, 2004) (Harvey, 2005) (Peet, 2002) (Plehwe et al., 2007)).

2. "Neo-liberalism as policy and programme." This perspective centers on the shift of ownership from the state or public entities to the private sector or corporations, requiring a reconsideration of the meanings associated with these terms. The basis of this understanding is the belief that allowing market forces to influence commonly held resources results in improved efficiency. Conventional approaches to implementing this policy include privatization, deregulation, liberalization, depoliticization, and monetarism (see (Brenner & Theodore, 2002) (Klepeis & Vance, 2009) (Martinez & Garcia, 2000)).

3. "Neo-liberalism as state form." Viewed as a procedure that governments intentionally undertake to maintain economic competitiveness among similar-minded states on a global level. This process involves both quantitative destruction and discrediting of state capabilities and qualitative construction and consolidation, which encompasses the implementation of revised institutional mediations, economic management systems, and invasive social agendas focused on urban order, surveillance, immigration, and policing (see (Peck, 2001) (Peck & Tickell, 2002)).

4. "Neo-liberalism as governmentality." Following Foucault, he means three things by governmentality:

A. "The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security."

B. "The tendency that, over a long period and throughout the West, has steadily led toward the preeminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, and so on) of this type of power— which may be termed "government"— resulting, on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of knowledges [*savoirs*]."

C. “The process or, rather, the result of the process through which the state of justice of the Middle Ages transformed into the administrative state during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and gradually becomes ‘governmentalized’” (Foucault, 2001, p. 219).

5. Neo-liberalism as rationality. Dardot and Laval note that Foucault developed the concept of “political rationality” in connection with his research on governmentality. In his course summary of *The Birth of Biopolitics* he presented the “level of analysis” used to study neo-liberalism, which involves studying the types of rationality implemented in directing human conduct through state administration. This type of rationality is considered a “governmental” rationality, which refers to the activity of governing people’s conduct within the framework of a state, rather than the institution of government itself. Foucault emphasizes that government is an activity and refers to techniques and procedures intended to direct human conduct. The term “governmentality” was introduced to refer to the various forms of activity used by individuals to conduct the conduct of others (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 4).

6. Neo-liberalism as pure theoretical shit and fourth world war. The Zapatistas view of neo-liberalism emphasizes it as the violent modality of contemporary capitalism. In June 1997, the then Subcomandante Marcos and now Capitán Insurgente Marcos, wrote *Siete piezas sueltas del rompecabezas mundial* (Sup Marcos, 1997), and emphasized the main characteristics of neo-liberalism. Such as globalization based on technological advances in communication, liberalization of trade and finance, the dominance of financial markets, loss of state sovereignty, the increasing influence of large transnational corporations, and the outrageous power of international institutions like IMF, WB, and WTO. Furthermore, it also highlights the privatization and dismantling of social policies of the welfare state, accentuation of social inequalities, overexploitation of labor combined with the fall in real wages and the rise of unemployment and precariousness, and the increase in the number of displaced persons, refugees, and migrants. Lastly, it mentions the integration of organized crime and drug trafficking activities into the global financial system (Baschet, 2018, p. 154). As a fourth world war Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos in his participation for the *International Civil Commission of Human Rights Observation in La Realidad, Chiapas* on November 20, 1999, in the letter 5.1 *Chiapas: the War: 1, Between the Satellite and the Microscope, the Other’s Gaze*, notes: “Fourth World War, from the unipolar world to globalization. Neoliberalism. The double couple destruction/depopulation and reconstruction/reordering, the financial bombs. The destruction of national states and what is inherent to them (language, culture, politics, economy, social fabric). Homogenization and hegemony begin to produce and encourage the growth of their opposites: fragmentation and the multiplication of differences” (Sup Marcos, 1999).

7. Neo-liberalism as unconventional forms of exploitation. According to Horacio Machado Aráoz from a political ecology standpoint, situated in Abya Yala: the defining characteristic of neo-liberal capitalism is the emergence and prevalence of non-traditional forms of exploitation that are connected to the exhaustion of vital

energies, both bodily and territorial. The underlying situation is the depletion of life sources, which is caused by the history of exploitation. This leads to the introduction of unconventional exploitation of both bodies and territories. Nowadays, there are new methods of controlling, appropriating, and utilizing the workforce, which results in an increase and diversification of violent practices that serve the accumulation of abstract value (Machado Araújo, 2016, p. 243).

From all the truths that neo-liberalism pursues, the most violent are: the notion of freedom through the individual subject and the supposedly minimization of the state in order for the market to move freely. On this last one, Vladimir Safatle poignantly observes through the Chilean case:

“At one point, when the interviewers ask Pinochet's future Minister of Economy, Mr. Sergio de Souza, about what he felt when he saw *Palacio de La Moneda* being bombed by military planes until the death of then President Salvador Allende, he says: ‘an immense joy. I knew that this was what had to be done.’ In other words, this is an explicit image of the way in which market freedom could only be implemented by silencing all those who do not believe in it, all those who question its results and its logic. That would require a strong state with no limits to its fury to silence society in the most violent way. Which explains why neoliberalism is actually the triumph of the State, not its reduction to a minimum” (Safatle, 2023a, p. 7).

Regarding the Chilean case, and the use of violence to ensure permanence, Suely Rolnik argues that, neo-liberalism is not moving towards neo-fascism, but that neo-liberalism is always already fascist, which explains why the first experiment at a national level was violently imposed through Pinochet's dictatorship, and the current rise, or rather unmasking, of the right in Abya Yala (Suely Rolnik, 2023). In a similar line, Harney and Moten, note that it is difficult for those coming out “of the black radical tradition to embrace the currently popular timeline on fascism. If fascism is back, as the common sense in Europe and the United States seems to insist, when did it go away? In the 50s with Apartheid and Jim Crow? In the 60s and 70s?—not for Latin Americans. In the 80s?—not for Indonesians or the Congolese. In the 90s?—the decade of intensified carceral state violence against black people in the United States? [They] don't mean to deny fascism's particular mix of lingering and resurgence in Europe, which became the supposed anti-fascist's attitude as soon the immigrant began the task of rebuilding Europe in the wake of the last of its racial capitalist self-destructions; but [Harney and Moten] do want to say something about the fundamental difference between a common life and undercommon living because [they] adhere to the black radical tradition's expanded sense of fascism's historical trajectory and geographical reach” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 121).

The government of freedom(s)

“The promise of emancipation of the singular individual, which was suggested as a possible response to neo-technics, has been realized, but has become the opposite: the use of freedom as an instrument of a totalitarian constriction of the horizon of life for each and every human being” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 29)

“There is in the air the muttering of a message that is trying to get through to us, it is repeated over and over again as if by stealth, there is in the air the impossibility of capture and yet in that same polluted, poisoned, dominated and capitalized air by white supremacy the false idea of freedom is administered” (valencia sepúlveda, 2022)

Jason Read argues that “neo-liberalism entails a fundamental reexamination of the tools of critical thought, an examination of how freedom can constitute a form of subjection” (Read, 2009, p. 25).

According to Castro-Gómez, Foucault became interested in the issue of practices of freedom in the late seventies, studied in his courses *Security, Territory, Population* and *The Birth of Biopolitics*. His studies on liberalism and neo-liberalism are considered as initial attempts to grasp how freedom is a part of a technology of the *conduct of conduct*. This does not involve the use of force to dominate others, but rather seeks to direct behavior effectively with the consent of the governed, which presupposes their freedom. Foucault was fascinated by how liberalism and neo-liberalism could create an ethos where individuals feel free, even if their conduct is determined by others. The relationship between power and freedom is the central theme underlying the “history of governmentality” project (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 12).

What freedom are we talking about here? Castro-Gómez notes that “without freedom, or better, without a production of conditions of freedom, there can be no liberalism” (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 169). And observes that on this respect Foucault wrote, as we have mentioned: “that we should not think of freedom as a uni-versal which is gradually realized over time, or which undergoes quantitative variations, greater or lesser drastic reductions, or more or less important periods of eclipse. It is not a uni-versal which is particularized in time and geography. Freedom is not a white surface with more or less numerous black spaces here and there and from time to time. Freedom is never anything other—but this is already a great deal—than an actual relation between governors and governed” (Foucault, 2008, p. 63).

The fundamental novelty of neo-liberalism for Foucault, according to Gago (Gago, 2015, p. 22), is that it is a form of governing through the promotion of freedoms, which may seem contradictory at first glance, but is actually a sophisticated, novel, and complex way of intertwining technologies, procedures, and emotions

to encourage free initiative, self-entrepreneurship, self-management, and responsibility. This rationality is not purely abstract or macro-political, but is put into practice through the subjectivities and tactics of everyday life. Neo-liberalism becomes an immanent dynamic that modulates subjectivities and is provoked without the need for a transcendent and external structure. To understand neo-liberalism, we must consider how it has captured, provoked, and interpreted modes of life, tactics of resistance, and popular modes of inhabiting that have struggled against, trans-formed, benefited from, and suffered from it.

We do not live in a society that is open or libertarian, as claimed by the defenders of neo-liberalism. Instead, we live in a society where freedom is the means by which control is achieved, which is paradoxical. The decrease in disciplinary and punitive measures in modern democratic societies is not attributed to the success of libertarian humanitarianism, but rather to the use of environmental governance technology to modulate behavior (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 216). Control is realized through freedom.

Sally Weller and Phillip O'Neill note how Mitchel Dean, “usefully observes that neoliberalism is a ‘doctrine of double truths.’ constructing one truth—about freedom, self-expression, self-reliance, and so on—for general public consumption; and another truth—about the means to expand capital at the expense of working people—for its privileged knowledge community. This duality enables authoritarianism to thrive in the name of freedom” (Weller & O'Neill, 2016, p. 90) (Dean, 2014, p. 154).

Safatle, regarding the notion of freedom⁹ and the state, emphatically argues in *Neoliberalismo como gestão do sofrimento psíquico*, that “relative to classical liberalism, neo-liberalism represented much more state intervention. The real question was: where did the state really intervene? In fact, it was no longer an intervention in the realm of coordination of economic activity. In fact, what neo-liberalism preached was direct interventions in the configuration of social conflicts and in the psychic structure of individuals. More than an economic model, neo-liberalism was a social engineering. In other words, neo-liberalism is a mode of profound social intervention in the conflict-producing dimensions. Because for freedom to reign as entrepreneurship and free enterprise, the state must intervene to depoliticize society, the only way to prevent politics from intervening in the necessary autonomy of action of the economy. It must primarily block a specific type of conflict, namely, that which questions the grammar of regulation of social life. This meant, concretely, to withdraw all pressure on instances, associations, institutions and unions that would seek to question such a notion of freedom from the awareness of the founding character of class struggle” (Safatle, 2023b, p. 6).

For neo-liberals, Mirowski (Mirowski, 2014, p. 83) states that, although the idea of freedom is valued, they struggle to conceptualize it. This is because they view coercion as the root of all evil and believe that the free market is necessary for our freedom. Even Hayek, who is known for his rigorous thinking, faces the same problem. In his book *The Foundations of Freedom*, he defines freedom as providing the opportunity and incentive for individuals to use their knowledge to the fullest. This definition has been criticized as being overly

focused on knowledge. Additionally, Hayek's definition links individual freedom exclusively to market freedom.

Mirowski, referring what he calls, *The Neoliberal Thought Collective*, notes that they interpret “freedom in a largely negative fashion, while simultaneously elevating freedom as the ultimate value. While this observation has become commonplace in the literature on political philosophy, that commentary has been strangely silent on how neoliberals have come to abjure or otherwise avoid the salience of positive liberty. The key to comprehension of the neutralization of time-honored traditions of positive liberty comes with the progressive fragmentation of the self, both in economic theory and in everyday life. The moral quest to discover your one and only ‘true self’ has been rendered thoroughly obsolete by the reengineering of everyday life, and that, in turn, is the *fons et origo* of most characteristics of everyday neoliberalism” (Mirowski, 2014, p. 87).

On this, Pereira, Pestana, Andreoni, Ferretti, Fogaça, Senhorini, da Silva, Beer and Ambra (Pereira da Silva et al., 2023, p. 4), note that, “the discussion on the notion of freedom among the exponents of neoliberalism poses the analysis of a field of antagonistic forces between coercive and abstentionist devices governing the link between the subject and society. In repudiation of a form of governmental interference of an imposing regulation of the market and private law, authors such as Hayek seem to align themselves in the defense of a conception of freedom that Isaiah Berlin (Berlin, 1981) described as negative. Briefly, this author defines it as the absence of interference or coercion (physical or legal), so that ‘the wider this area of non-interference is, the wider my freedom will be’ (Berlin, 1981, p. 137). Berlin opposes this conception of positive freedom, which demands much more than an absence: ‘it is the individual's desire to be his own master and lord’ (Berlin, 1981, p. 142), hence the centrality of notions such as autonomy, truth and self-realization. Berlin sums up the distinction between them by stating that the latter is a ‘freedom for,’ while the former is a ‘freedom from’; and, what interests us most, he attests that the negative conception is the one that ‘has been conceived by the liberals of the modern world from the time of Erasmus (some would say Occam) to the present day’ (Berlin, 1981, p. 140). We know, however, the great difference between these and the neoliberals, as Dardot and Laval (Dardot & Laval, 2013) insist, which makes the question about the direct maintenance of that negative conception among the latter remain.

In its own way, the opposition between negative freedom and positive freedom recovers another series of oppositions implicit in the concept of freedom, namely between that of independence, as the absence of external constraints, and that of autonomy, as the power to choose one's own rules. Thus, the negative character of freedom on the screen seems to demand not only the exigency of the state, but also the rejection of any social interaction that clashes with the individualized boundary. If, on the one hand, the guideline that rejects the imposition of rules on citizens offers a shield to the individual against possible state tyranny, on the other hand, it disseminates a hostile market logic in which each individual withdraws into self-government and

considers the otherness of the other as an opponent. It is thus clear that in the neoliberal notion of autonomy, which is concretized in the concept of negative freedom, a precise model of the subject is implicit, namely that of an individual independent of others, not subject to any norm and, as such, always thought of in a relationship of mutual exclusion with the other. The concept of positive freedom, in turn, presupposes a subject who is understood to be limited by rules and who must choose between the recognition that he is part of a social structure organized by relations of interdependence. If in the first case freedom and the rule are mutually exclusive, in the second they are mutually constituted” (Pereira da Silva et al., 2023, p. 4).

Neo-liberalism actualizes what Hartman calls the *liberal imagination of freedom*, in *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*, notes that “the entanglements of bondage and liberty shaped the liberal imagination of freedom, fueled the emergence and expansion of capitalism, and spawned proprietorial conceptions of the self. This vexed genealogy of freedom plagued the great event of Emancipation, or as it was described in messianic and populist terms, Jubilee. The complicity of slavery and freedom or, at the very least, the ways in which they assumed, presupposed, and mirrored one another—freedom finding its dignity and authority in this ‘prime symbol of corruption’ and slavery transforming and extending itself in the limits and subjection of freedom—troubled, if not elided, any absolute and definitive marker between slavery and its aftermath. The longstanding and intimate affiliation of liberty and bondage made it impossible to envision freedom independent of constraint or personhood and autonomy separate from the sanctity of property and proprietorial notions of the self. Moreover, since the dominion and domination of slavery were fundamentally defined by black subjection, race appositely framed questions of sovereignty, right, and power” (Hartman, 2022, p. 201). And shows how liberal discourses of freedom enable forms of subjection, since “the traversals of freedom and subordination, sovereignty and subjection, and autonomy and compulsion are significant markers of the dilemma or double bind of freedom. Marx, describing a dimension of this paradox, referred to it with dark humor as a double freedom—being free to exchange one’s labor and free of material resources. Within the liberal ‘Eden of the innate rights of man,’ owning easily gave way to being owned, sovereignty to fungibility, and abstract equality to subordination and exploitation. If sovereignty served ‘to efface the domination intrinsic to power’ and rights ‘enabled and facilitated relations of domination,’ as Michel Foucault argues, then what we are left to consider is the subjugation that rights instigate and the domination they efface” (Hartman, 2022, p. 202).

The following, studies neo-liberalism as: the continuation of liberalism, the current modality of capitalism, the government of life through the notion of freedom or the conduct of conduct, neo-liberalization as multifarious ongoing in/complete processes, governmentality as “technologies of domination,” and the regime of the market and the economization of life.

Liberalism or exit the neutral

Neo-liberalism poses as neutral, or maybe that is just its wishful thinking. The quintessential pantomime of neutrality is the neo-liberal project, a rationality that poses as neutral to capitalism and its subjects, as if only managing the game-rules while in reality modeling and conducting every aspect of life. As a distinct mode of governmentality it primarily focuses on the government of freedom, as a supposed neutral agent that does not act upon the market and citizens, actually it frames and conducts freedom. Neo-liberalism continues on the line of the “neutralist liberal position,” that is as Judith Suissa notes, “the position which holds, that the state should be neutral with regard to different conceptions of the good life [and appeals to] the ideal of the autonomous individual—the person who reflects upon and freely chooses from amongst a plurality of conceptions of the good—both justifies the establishment of liberal freedoms and rights and the institutions intended to guarantee these rights, and, so the argument goes, is fostered within the framework of the liberal state” (Suissa, 2006, pp. 31–32). “However, it is important to understand that liberalism, as an ideological position, is not in itself ‘neutral’—as indeed it would be logically impossible for any such position to be neutral. So there is nothing neutral about the liberal stance itself. But once ‘liberalism’ is taken to mean ‘the liberal state,’ the demand for neutrality is logically translated into a demand that individuals and communities be free to pursue their own conceptions of the good within a political framework and institutions which allow them to flourish and interact as fairly and equitably as possible, refraining from any discrimination on the basis of possibly competing conceptions of the good” (Suissa, 2006, p. 140).

“When the term ‘neoliberalism’ emerged at the Walter Lippmann Colloquium, held in Paris in 1938, it symbolized an effort to restore certain theoretical bases of liberalism in a context in which it had lost its hegemony. This ideology, as multiple in its formulations as in its practices, was transformed in the following decades into think tanks with massive corporate support. Its main pole of organization, from 1947 onwards, was the Mont Pèlerin Society” (Safatle et al., 2023, p. 14).

“What then is liberalism? Foucault does not understand liberalism as an ‘ideology.’ as an ‘economic doctrine’ and much less as a ‘political philosophy.’ but as a set of practices that ‘resonate’ together according to a certain rationality. Liberalism is not an institution but a ‘way of doing things,’ a technology of government over the economic and moral conduct of men. Here, precisely, lies the ‘newness’ of this technique of government with respect to the *raison d'état*. For the *raison d'état*, the goal of government was to be the state itself, and this was to be accomplished by the complete regulation of all everyday activities. Such was the function of the police. Individual initiative was seen as potentially ‘dangerous’ to the security of the state and had to be filtered through official guidelines and regulations. Control of opinion by means of advertising, control of economic activities by means of state monopolies, control of bodily forces by means of disciplines. In

contrast, liberal rationality presupposes the ability of individuals to govern themselves, to act independently of the state; it assumes that individuals know what they want and know what they do. No one better than they can know what their interests are and how to devise appropriate strategies to satisfy them” (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 152).

What is new about neo-liberalism? “Against the conventional story, Foucault's formulation of neoliberalism as a remaking of the liberal art of government is able to reveal the slow transformation of liberal into neoliberal formations, neoliberalism's continuities with and modifications of liberal political and economic theory; neoliberalism's nonunified character, even at its inception; the commonalities that nonetheless bind this modality of thought, governance, and reason into an identifiable and nameable one; and neoliberalism's cohabitation with certain other political rationalities, what he calls ‘a series of governmental rationalities [that] overlap, lean on each other, challenge each other, and struggle with each other: art of government according to truth... according to the rationality of the sovereign state... according to the rationality of economic agents... and according to the rationality of the governed themselves’” (Foucault, 2008, p. 313) in (Brown, 2015, p. 52).

When Foucault employs the word “liberal, it is first of all because this governmental practice in the process of establishing itself is not satisfied with respecting this or that freedom, with guaranteeing this or that freedom. More profoundly, it is a consumer of freedom. It is a consumer of freedom inasmuch as it can only function insofar as a number of freedoms actually exist: freedom of the market, freedom to buy and sell, the free exercise of property rights, freedom of discussion, possible freedom of expression, and so on. The new governmental reason needs freedom therefore, the new art of government consumes freedom. It consumes freedom, which means that it must produce it. It must produce it, it must organize it. The new art of government therefore appears as the management of freedom, not in the sense of the imperative: ‘be free,’ with the immediate contradiction that this imperative may contain. The formula of liberalism is not ‘be free.’ Liberalism formulates simply the following: I am going to produce what you need to be free. I am going to see to it that you are free to be free. And so, if this liberalism is not so much the imperative of freedom as the management and organization of the conditions in which one can be free, it is clear that at the heart of this liberal practice is an always different and mobile problematic relationship between the production of freedom and that which in the production of freedom risks limiting and destroying it. Liberalism as [Foucault understands] it, the liberalism we can describe as the art of government formed in the eighteenth century, entails at its heart a productive/ destructive relationship [with] freedom [...]. Liberalism must produce freedom, but this very act entails the establishment of limitations, controls, forms of coercion, and obligations relying on threats, etcetera” (Foucault, 2008, p. 81).

“The liberal order never claimed, or was certainly not claiming through the mouth of the future chancellor Erhard to be an alternative to capitalism, but was indeed a particular way of making capitalism work” (Foucault, 2008, p. 106).

Let’s “analyze ‘liberalism,’ not as a theory or an ideology, and even less, obviously, as a way in which ‘society’ ‘represents itself,’ but as a practice, that is to say, a ‘way of doing things’ directed towards objectives and regulating itself by continuous reflection. Liberalism, then, is to be analyzed as a principle and method of the rationalization of the exercise of government, a rationalization which obeys and this is what is specific about it—the internal rule of maximum economy. While any rationalization of the exercise of government aims to maximize its effects whilst reducing its costs as much as possible (in the political as well as economic sense of costs), liberal rationalization starts from the premise that government (not ‘government’ as an institution, obviously, but as the activity that consists in governing people’s conduct within the framework of, and using the instruments of, a state) cannot be its own end. Its *raison d’être* is not found in itself, and even under the best possible conditions the maximization of government should not be its regulative principle” (Foucault, 2008, p. 336).

New capitalism

To seek further clarity, according to Jérôme Baschet, “it is necessary to place the trends of the last thirty years in a broader perspective. In fact, the neo-liberal decades are not only opposed to the Keynesian-Fordist compromise of the postwar period; they also signify a deeper rupture, which must be placed in a long history of capitalism” (Baschet, 2015, p. 28). Baschet continues and argues that, capitalism, as a global system, came into existence between the middle of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the next. During this time, it redefined productive practices and social structures that already existed, but in a completely new way. The mode of production was dominated by the factory system, which created a separation between producers and means of production. This led to the formation of a labour market and the extension of wages. The economy emerged as a dominant and autonomous sphere, operating according to its own logic. “It also imposes a new representation of humanity, which acts to satisfy its personal desires: for the first time in human history, a society makes individual interest its fundamental value. However, although it assumes a dominant role, the economy cannot extend its law over the whole of social life.” During the nineteenth century, institutions such as schools and the army continued to function independently based on their own principles, despite contributing to the capitalist system. National mythologies were reinforced by schools, which instilled values in future citizens. The nation-state and its ideology played a role in the functioning of capitalism by unifying the national market and promoting patriotism. Public schools could also promote values such as knowledge, the

common good, and the general interest. Capitalism combined the economy with non-economic institutions that had hierarchical characteristics. Liberalism recognized the role of the State in establishing and preserving business freedom, while also limiting its intervention (Baschet, 2015, p. 28).

“This configuration functioned, with all its variants, until the 1970s. Then, there was a slippage from a capitalist system based on the disciplinary institutions of the State and its ideology of the general interest, towards a capitalism based on the generalization of the rules of the economy. The non-mercantile aspects that allowed the mercantile sphere to prosper gradually vanish, leading to a generalized vacuum, commonly referred to as the ‘crisis of values.’ Disciplinary institutions lose their autonomy and their own ideal, the preservation of which is denounced as archaism and a brake on reform. To say that a system of the ‘mercantile whole’ predominates could be abusive, but the articulated functioning of autonomous spheres (economy, State, education, science, etc.) gives way to a system in which a clear permeability between these fields prevails. The direct imposition of the demands of the economy is intensified, without denying the role of the State, since it continues to operate as the ultimate guarantor of financial solvency and, in addition, assumes a very active role in shaping society to the standards required by the economy. In short, we are moving from the disciplinary capitalism of national states—where, while supporting each other, the spheres of the economy and the state are governed by different rules and have a differentiated influence on the social field—to a globalized capitalism of control, characterized by an entrepreneurial form of the state and a generalized subordination of social behavior to the logic of the economy.

Therefore, the neoliberal phase is not only opposed to the Keynesian-Fordist compromise that allowed the boom of the ‘Glorious Thirties’ (the post-war years), but also breaks with the configuration that structured capitalist society since the formation of the national States during the 19th century. It is in this perspective that the main trends of the last three or four decades should be understood” (Baschet, 2015, p. 28).

Castro-Gómez underscores that, “Foucault does not identify neo-liberalism with capitalism. In the class of January 24, 1979, he states that the crisis of governmentality from which neoliberalism emerges is not equivalent to a ‘crisis of capitalism’ (Foucault, 2007a, p. 92). Neither liberalism nor neo-liberalism are simple projections of the ‘logic of capital.’ On the contrary, we could say that capitalism does not exist independently of the economic and political practices that produce it. Capitalism, like the state, is the correlate of a set of practices; it is [...] a ‘transactional reality’” (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 177).

Governmentality

In 1982 in *Technologies of the Self*, Foucault wrote: “My objective for more than twenty-five years has been to sketch out a history of the different ways in our culture that humans develop knowledge about

themselves: economics, biology, psychiatry, medicine, and penology. The main point is not to accept this knowledge at face value but to analyze these so-called sciences as very specific 'truth games' related to specific techniques that human beings use to understand themselves.' He continues, offering an example of his methods and concerns, 'I studied madness not in terms of the criteria of formal sciences but to show what type of management of individuals inside and outside of asylums were made possible by this strange discourse. This encounter between the technologies of domination of others and those of the self I call 'governmentality'" (Foucault, 1998, pp. 224–225) (Spencer, 2016, p. 165).

"Dardot and Laval follow Foucault in formulating their analysis of neo-liberalism as a specific form of capitalism possessed and productive of its own apparatus of power. Central to Foucault's analysis, in these terms, is the concept of governmentality foregrounded in later works such as *Security, Territory and Population* and *The Birth of Biopolitics*. In these his concerns turn from a more or less exclusive preoccupation with technologies of domination to a position more attentive to what he terms 'technologies of the self.' [...] Here Foucault's agenda shifts from questions of how individuals are subjugated by power to ones of how subjectivity is actively produced. 'Governmentality.' as Thomas Lemke elaborates, conceptually unites 'technologies of the self with technologies of domination.' and forms a semantic link between 'governing ('gouverner') and modes of thought ('mentalite')' (Lemke, 2002, p. 50)" (Spencer, 2016, p. 13).

This union means that, "a governmentality is a particular mentality, a particular manner of governing, that is actualized in habits, perceptions, and subjectivity. Governmentality situates actions and conceptions on the same plane of immanence" (Read, 2009, p. 34).

Foucault notes that "a series of governmental rationalities overlap, lean on each other, challenge each other, and struggle with each other: art of government according to truth, art of government according to the rationality of the sovereign state, and art of government according to the rationality of economic agents, and more generally, according to the rationality of the governed themselves. And it is all these different arts of government, all these different types of ways of calculating, rationalizing, and regulating the art of government which, overlapping each other, broadly speaking constitute the object of political debate from the nineteenth century. What is politics, in the end, if not both the interplay of these different arts of government with their different reference points and the debate to which these different arts of government give rise?" (Foucault, 2008, p. 331).

Castro-Gómez in *Historia de la gubernamentalidad I: Razón de Estado, liberalismo y neoliberalismo en Michel Foucault*, underscores that "one does not intervene directly and immediately on others—by repressing their actions in a violent way—, but on the possible field of their actions. The aim is not, therefore, to annul the freedom of the subjects, but to guide it, and this on the basis of specific technologies. It is a matter of 'guiding' (*Leiten*) the subjects rather than producing them in a disciplinary way, as previous models proposed.

To govern means, then, to guide the behavior of others by means of regulated intervention in their field of present and future actions. Those anonymous ‘forces’ of the war model, which appeared randomly in history clashing against each other, are now seen as practices that are always exercised in accordance with a certain rationality. This is why in his lectures at the *Collège de France* corresponding to the courses *Security, territory, population* (1977-1978) and *The Birth of biopolitics* (1978-1979) Foucault introduces the neologism governmentality to refer to the type of reflexivity and technologies that make the conduct of conduct possible” (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 44).

By governmentality, Foucault, then understands: “the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security” (Foucault, 2001, p. 219).

Machado situates the argument and argues that, the neo-liberal regime was ultimately a recomposition of the global colonial structure, the “neo-liberal reconversion of the regime of global accumulation meant the imposition of a new scheme of colonial governmentality” (Machado Araújo, 2011, p. 163).

Harney and Moten, draw a critique to government and governmentality through the notion of governance, and note that, “Nikolas Rose had it wrong, governance is not about government, and Foucault might have got it right. But how could he know if he could not find the priority of what he knew in North Africa? Governance is the wit of the colonial official, the CIA woman, the NGO man. Will we be in on the joke now that we all know governmentality so well? We can all read it like a book” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 59). “Governance is a strategy for the privatization of social reproductive labor, a strategy provoked by this communicability, infected by it, hosting and hostile. As Toni Negri says ‘the new face of productive labor (intellectual, relational, linguistic, and affective, rather than physical, individual, muscular, instrumental) does not understate but accentuates the corporality and materiality of labor.’ But accumulating collective cognitive and affective labor from these highly communicable differences is not the same as accumulating biopolitical bodies that labor. Differences here matter not for order, but order matters for differences. The order that collects differences, the order that collects what Marx called labor still objectifying itself, is the order of governance” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 60). “Governance then becomes the management of self-management. The generation of interests appears as wealth, plentitude, potential. It hides the waste of the raw immaterial and its reproduction in the flurry of its conferences, consultations, and outreach. Indeed within the firm, self-management is distinguished from obedience by the generation of new interests in quality, design, discipline, and communication. But with the implosion of the time and space in the firm, with the dispersion and virtualization of productivity, governance arrives to manage self-management, not from above, but from below. What comes up then may not be value from below as Toni Negri calls it, but politics from below, such

that we have to be wary of the grassroots and suspicious of the community. When what emerges from below is interests, when value from below becomes politics from below, self-management has been realized, and governance has done its work” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 62). “The compulsion to tell us how you feel is the compulsion of labor, not citizenship, exploitation not domination, and it is whiteness. Whiteness is why Lazzarato does not hear industrial labor. Whiteness is nothing but a relationship to blackness” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 62). “Governance is the extension of whiteness on a global scale.” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 63). “Governance should not be confused with government or governmentality. Governance is most importantly a new form of expropriation. It is the provocation of a certain kind of display, a display of interests as disinterestedness, a display of convertibility, a display of legibility. Governance is an instrumentalisation of policy, a set of protocols of deputisation, where one simultaneously auctions and bids on oneself, where the public and the private submit themselves to post-fordist production. Governance is the harvesting of the means of social reproduction but it appears as the acts of will, and therefore as the death drive, of the harvested. As capital cannot know directly the affect, thought, sociality, and imagination that make up the undercommon means of social reproduction, it must instead prospect for these in order to extract and abstract them as labor. That prospecting, which is the real bio-prospecting, seeks to break an integrity that has been militantly preserved. Governance, the voluntary but dissociative offering up of interests, willing participation in the general privacy and public privation, grants capital this knowledge, this wealth-making capacity” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 87).

Conduct of conduct

Dardot and Laval, underscore that “the main innovation of neo-liberal technology precisely consists in directly connecting the way” persons are “governed from without to the way that they govern from within” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 264).

Political technologies aim to persuade people to voluntarily adopt certain behaviors that are perceived as good, noble, and originating from their own sense of freedom, rather than imposing these behaviors on them against their will (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 13). Such persuasion, operates through what Foucault called *environmental subjectivation*, “what appears on the horizon [...] is not at all the ideal or project of an exhaustively disciplinary society in which the legal network hemming in individuals is taken over and extended internally by, let’s say, normative mechanisms. Nor is it a society in which a mechanism of general normalization and the exclusion of those who cannot be normalized is needed. On the horizon of this analysis we see instead the image, idea, or theme-program of a society in which there is an optimization of systems of difference, in which the field is left open to fluctuating processes, in which minority individuals and practices

are tolerated, in which action is brought to bear on the rules of the game rather than on the players, and finally in which there is an environmental type of intervention instead of the internal subjugation of individuals” (Foucault, 2008, p. 277).

Wendy Brown, commenting on Foucault, underscores that neo-liberalism is “a mode of reason of the production of subjects, a ‘conduct of conduct’” (Brown, 2015, p. 48), a rationality that governs through the modulation of freedom and the rules to perform such freedom, neo-liberalism is not about the state leaving the economy alone, but how to govern for the economy and regulate society by the market. Neo-liberal rationality rather than governing to homogenize society, governs for the multiplicity and the enterprise differentiation (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 216).

“Neoliberalism is a distinctive mode of reason, of the production of subjects, a ‘conduct of conduct,’ and a scheme of valuation. It names a historically specific economic and political reaction against Keynesianism and democratic socialism, as well as a more generalized practice of ‘economizing’ spheres and activities heretofore governed by other tables of value. Yet in its differential instantiations across countries, regions, and sectors, in its various intersections with extant cultures and political traditions, and above all, in its convergences with and uptakes of other discourses and developments, neoliberalism takes diverse shapes and spawns diverse content and normative details, even different idioms. It is globally ubiquitous, yet disunified and nonidentical with itself in space and over time” (Brown, 2015, p. 22).

“Neoliberalism is a specific and normative mode of reason, of the production of the subject, ‘conduct of conduct,’ and scheme of valuation, yet in its differential instantiations and encounters with extant cultures and political traditions, it takes diverse shapes and spawns diverse content and normative details, even different idioms” (Brown, 2015, p. 49).

“Political rationality is also not the same thing as ‘governmentality,’ Foucault’s term for an important historical shift in the operation and orientation of the state and political power in modernity. This is a shift away from sovereignty and its signature—‘do this, or die’—to what Foucault calls governing through ‘the conduct of conduct’—‘this is how you live.’ Put differently, governmentality represents a shift away from the power of command and punishment targeting particular subjects and toward the power of conducting and compelling populations ‘at a distance’” (Brown, 2015, p. 118).

In further chapters, we will see how this operates in architecture. Manuel Schwartzberg, in Foucault’s *“Environmental” Power: Architecture and Neoliberal Subjectivization* notes that “we have become neoliberal by design, through the pervasiveness of its modes of economization. The neoliberal ideas and paradigms explored by Foucault have effectively taken root and become our own socio-ontological or onto-epistemological apparatus. It is not a question of posing a one-to-one relation between neoliberal architecture and neoliberal subjects, but of showing how the rationality and the metrics—the epistemologies; social and technical systems

of symbolization—that configure both are intimately entangled and effectively produce each other” (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 181).

Neo-liberalization

As we have seen, by way of Echeverría’s theses, “modernity should be understood as the peculiar character of an historical form of the civilizing totalization of human life. Capitalism should be understood as a form or mode of reproduction of the economic life of humanity: a way of implementing that set of activities, which directly and preferentially concerns the production, circulation, and consumption of goods produced” (Echeverría, 2005, p. 1). He also emphasizes that “we are becoming permanently modern; the ascendancy of modernity is a *fait accompli*. Against the dreams of a postmodern condition, we are living within modernity and are immersed in a unique, universal and continual process of modernization” (Echeverría, 2005, p. 1).

Echeverría constantly reminds us of the incompleteness of the modern project. “The first thing to note about modernity as a structuring principle of the ‘really existing’ modernization of human life is that it is a civilizing modality which, although it dominates in real terms over other non-modern or pre-modern structuring principles it encounters, is nevertheless far from having annulled, buried and replaced them. Modernity is presented as an attempt that is always in the process of overcoming them, but as an attempt that is not fully achieved, that must be maintained as such, and that must therefore coexist with the traditional structures of that social world. In this sense it can indeed be said that the modernity we know so far is ‘an unfinished project,’ always incomplete; it is as if something in it incapacitates it to be what it pretends to be: a civilizing alternative ‘superior’ to the ancestral or traditional one” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 12).

Neo-liberalism is inscribed in modernization’s *longue durée*. We could even say that if neo-liberalism is not only an economic project, but a rationality, a mode of government and a form of existence. It is then a modality of both modern civilizational form and capitalism as production form.

Neo-liberalism too is an unfinished and ongoing project. Such impossibility of its project is what constantly reproduces its violent outbursts towards life. So rather than talking about neo-liberalism, only as a mode of reason or a modality of governing life, the same as modernity we could speak about neo-liberalizations, as plural processes. Violently located. Also considering what Stephanie I. Mudge argues following “the anthropologist John Comaroff, for instance, that the noun form incorrectly renders neoliberalism ‘an accomplished object’ (Comaroff, 2011, p. 142)” (Mudge, 2016, p. 96).

In this path, geographers as Jamie Peck, Adam Tickell and Simon Springer have mobilized the notion of neo-liberalization. “Taking certain cues from the globalization debate, [they] propose a processual conception of neo-liberalization as both an ‘out there’ and an ‘in here’ phenomenon whose effects are

necessarily variegated and uneven, but the incidence and diffusion of which may present clues to a pervasive ‘metalogic’” (Amin, 1997) (Dicken et al., 1997). Like globalization, neo-liberalization should be understood as a process, not an end-state. By the same token, it is also contradictory, it tends to provoke countertendencies, and it exists in historically and geographically contingent forms” (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p. 383).

In *The Discourse of Neoliberalism An Anatomy of a Powerful Idea*, Springer argues that, “cutting against the predominant view of neo-liberalism as a pure and static end-state, geographers in particular have sought to explain neo-liberalism as a dynamic and unfolding process ((Brenner et al., 2013); (Ward & England, 2007)). The concept of ‘neo-liberalization’ is consequently seen as being more appropriate to a geographically informed theorisation insofar as it recognises and accounts for the hybridised forms of neoliberalism as it travels around the world and is taken up in different contexts. [...] But there is also room for caution, as a mongrelised reading of neoliberalism renews the difficulty of achieving consensus on a conceptual definition of what ‘neoliberalism’ actually means, thus reducing our clarity on what we are actually struggling against” (Springer, 2016b, p. 5).

Neo-liberalization “acknowledges the multiple geographies of neo-liberalism through attention to contextual specificity and local experimentation ((Brenner et al., 2010); (Ward & England, 2007); (Purcell, 2008); (Katie Willis et al., 2008); (Springer, 2015)). As a series of protean processes, individual neo-liberalizations are considered to ‘materialise’ quite differently as mutated and hybrid forms of neo-liberalism, depending on and influenced by geographical landscapes, historical contexts, institutional legacies and embodied subjectivities ((Peck, 2001); (Peck & Tickell, 2002))” (Springer, 2016b, p. 21).

“Neo-liberalizing practices are thus understood as necessarily and always overdetermined, contingent, polymorphic, open to intervention, reconstituted, continually negotiated, impure, subject to countertendencies and in a perpetual process of becoming. In utilising this dynamic conception of neo-liberalism-as-a-verb over static notions of neo-liberalism-as-a-noun we arrive at the conclusion that while particular social spaces, regulatory networks, sectoral fields, local formations and so forth will frequently be hampered by crises, this does not necessarily imply that they will resonate throughout an entire aggregation of neo-liberalism. In other words, because ‘neo-liberalism’ indeed does not exist as a coherent and fixed edifice, as an equilibrial complex or as a finite end-state and is instead more appropriately understood as a discourse, it is consequently unlikely to fail in a totalising moment of collapse ((Brenner et al., 2010))” (Springer, 2016b, p. 21).

“Neo-liberalization is theorized as culturally produced and spatially contextual, constituted with a range of social relations and materialized through socio-spatial processes and practices in a range of scales, sites and spaces ((Larner, 2003) (Larner, 2000); (Kingfisher, 2013); (Springer, 2012). An aspect of this approach is challenging the notion of the state as autonomous from society, and emphasizing the active remaking and redeployment of the state in creating the political subjectivities and enabling the conditions for marketization.

It includes Foucauldian tracings of the specificities of elements associated with neo-liberalisms such as the technologies of the enrolment and regulation of subjectivities, and the calculative and self-enterprising forms of conduct (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 264)” (England & Ward, 2016, p. 53).

“The process of neo-liberalization, then, is neither monolithic in form nor universal in effect” (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p. 384).

Economization

“We’re not devoting our efforts to dealing with the economy as a particularity, or as a discipline, but to the struggle against the economization of life. The critique of the economy stems from the refusal that proletarianized human beings feel towards the categories of Capital” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 1).

Neo-liberalization has normalized the economization of all human actions. Neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost the economization of life, a modulation of all spheres of life through the economic rationality of the market and its implied metrics. Economization operates through the generalization of the market in all spheres of life, the enterprise as the institutional paradigm, and the entrepreneur as its subject.

“What is the function of this generalization of the ‘enterprise’ form? On the one hand, of course, it involves extending the economic model of supply and demand and of investment-costs-profit so as to make it a model of social relations and of existence itself, a form of relationship of the individual to *himself*, time, those around *him*, the group, and the family. So, it involves extending this economic model. On the other hand, the ordoliberal idea of making the enterprise the universally generalized social model functions in their analysis or program as a support to what they designate as the reconstruction of a set of what could be called ‘warm’ moral and cultural values which are presented precisely as antithetical to the ‘cold’ mechanism of competition. The enterprise schema involves acting so that the individual, to use the classical and fashionable terminology of their time, is not alienated from his work environment, from the time of his life, from his household, his family, and from the natural environment. It is a matter of reconstructing concrete points of anchorage around the individual which form what Rüstow called the Vitalpolitik. The return to the enterprise is therefore at once an economic policy or a policy of the economization of the entire social field, of an extension of the economy to the entire social field, but at the same time a policy which presents itself or seeks to be a kind of Vitalpolitik with the function of compensating for what is cold, impassive, calculating, rational, and mechanical in the strictly economic game of competition. The enterprise society imagined by the ordoliberals is therefore a society for the market and a society against the market, a society oriented towards the market and a society that compensates for the effects of the market in the realm of values and existence” (Foucault, 2008, p. 260).

Brown points out (Brown, 2015, p. 32), that “Carl Schmitt argued that liberal democracy was already a form of economizing the state and the political, and for Hannah Arendt and Claude Lefort, the economization of society, politics, and man was a signature of Marxism in theory and practice” And asks, “what is distinctive about neo-liberal economization?” According to Brown, economization has expanded to cover previously unimaginable practices and desires. However, this change is not just a matter of degree. The modern neo-liberal rationality does not simply enlarges the scope of the timeless figure of economic human, *homo æconomicus*. In fact, the shape and nature of this figure has evolved over time. Two hundred years ago, the figure was that of a merchant or trader who pursued their own interests through exchange. One hundred years ago, the idea was reconceived by Jeremy Bentham as avoiding pain and seeking pleasure through cost-benefit calculations. Thirty years ago, the figure was still profit-seeking but had become more entrepreneurial. Today, the figure has become financialized human capital, investing in ways that enhance its value and attracting investors through constant attention to credit ratings across all spheres of existence (Brown, 2015, p. 32).

Neo-liberal economization is distinctive for Brown in three ways. First, in contrast to classical economic liberalism, neo-liberalism asserts that we are solely *homo æconomicus*. This is a new and disruptive idea introduced by neo-liberalism in political and social thought. Previously, Adam Smith, Nassau Senior, Jean-Baptiste Say, David Ricardo, and James Steuart considered the relationship between economic and political life, but never suggested that economics should dominate other areas of life. In fact, some even warned against allowing the economy too much influence in political, moral, and ethical matters.

Second, neo-liberal *homo æconomicus* is characterized by its desire to enhance its competitive positioning and increase its worth as human capital, rather than being seen as a mere object of exchange or interest. This is a unique feature that sets it apart from the subjects described by classical or neoclassical economists, as well as Jeremy Bentham, Karl Marx, Karl Polanyi, and Albert Hirschman.

And third, today, the model for human capital and its areas of activity are becoming more like that of financial or investment capital. While there is still some focus on profitable exchange and entrepreneurship, the emphasis is increasingly on enhancing one's portfolio value in all areas of life through self-investment and attracting investors. This is done through various practices such as social media engagement, rankings, and monetization. Activities such as education, training, leisure, and consumption are now seen as strategic decisions related to enhancing one's future value (Brown, 2015, pp. 33–34).

“We have become neoliberal by design, through the pervasiveness of its modes of economization” (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 181).

Dispositifs and the logistics of neo-liberalization

Neo-liberalism “operates on interests, desires, and aspirations rather than through rights and obligations; it does not directly mark the body, as sovereign power, or even curtail actions, as disciplinary power; rather, it acts on the conditions of actions. Thus, neoliberal governmentality follows a general trajectory of intensification. This trajectory follows a fundamental paradox; as power becomes less restrictive, less corporeal, it also becomes more intense, saturating the field of actions, and possible actions” (Read, 2009, p. 29).

Such interests, desires, and aspirations circulate through distinct logistics and semantic dispositifs, but as Karen Barad reminds us dispositifs are not merely semantic, dispositifs produce *material-discursive practices* (Barad, 2007, pp. 132, 149). What are the dispositifs in motion, and what are the logistics through processes of neo-liberalization?

The logistics of neo-liberalization operates through multiple dispositifs. As a material-discursive practice it articulates diverse and at times contradictory values. Neo-liberalization, and particularly neo-liberal architectural subjectivation, operates through a non-exhaustive assemblage of desires and aspirations, dispositifs as: success, self-realization, the new, innovation, creativity, flexibility, competition, metrics and accountability, risk and resilience, amongst other.

The logistics of such dispositifs must be studied through the asymmetric power relations that persist through coloniality. As Nelson Maldonado-Torres argues, coloniality “is kept alive in literacy and learning manuals, in the criteria for determining what constitutes good academic work, in the patriarchal and eurocentric definition of culture, in the common sense of the universal citizen, in the image that peoples project of themselves—a strange mimetic reminiscence of coloniality and of that superior european other—in the aspirations of the subjects” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007b, p. 131).

Neo-liberal dispositifs are then deployed through logistics and particularly by way of schooling and abstract labour. The circulation of such dispositifs comprises from: curriculums, methodologies, theories, lexicons, habits, professional associations, social networks, manuals, guides, mentoring schemes, TV series, coaching to other forms of modulation.

What about architecture? As Spencer argues, “one of the means through which neoliberalism has been able to achieve the realization of its truths, as forms of environmental control, has been through a tendency in architecture which shares many of its beliefs, and that has been equally committed to establishing these as common-sense truths. The ground on which architecture will later identify itself with neo-liberalism is prepared in the 1960s. The promotion of cybernetics, the critique of planning, the affirmations of participation, sensory experience, connectivity and interaction, the denunciations of separation, distance, interpretation and critical

reflection, the championing of the enterprising and creative individual, liberated from all constraints and at one with the environment, already mirror the ideals of neoliberalism and the model of the new subjectivity it would like to produce—performative, creative, entrepreneurial. With its more recent turns away from ‘negative critique’ and towards the affirmative philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari, the sciences of complexity and emergence, and the theory of affect, architecture has legitimated its alignments with and servicing of neoliberal projects for the reorganization of labour, education, culture and public space. [Spencer demonstrates in *The architecture of neoliberalism*] how the truths shared by neoliberalism and the architecture compliant to its agenda have informed projects designed to serve as forms of environmental governmentality” (Spencer, 2016, p. 161).

Logistics of desire

“What are we taught to want?” (Moten & MAKC, 2023). How do we learn and sustain the desire to be, the desire to be educated, the desire to be needed, the desire to work, the desire to be innovative, the desire to be creative, the desire to be original, the desire to be white, the desire to be one, the desire to be recognized, the desire of totality, the desire of purity, the desire of success, the whiteness of desire, the logistics of whiteness, the desire of whiteness, the logistics of desire?

Logistics as we have seen is understood broadly, as the efficient circulation of commodities, that is the effective storage and delivery of commodities—products, services and bodies. Logistics encompass all the strategies for the process of efficient delivery of commodities from the place of production/extraction to the point of consumption/transformation.

Logistics operate through “a whole labour of rationalization extending to the most intimate dimension of the subject: a rationalization of desire. Rationalization of desire is at the heart of the norm of personal enterprise. As underlined by one of its technologists, Bob Aubrey, a Californian international consultant, ‘to speak of personal enterprise is to express the idea that everyone can have a grip on their life: conduct it, manage it, control it in accordance with their desires and needs by developing appropriate strategies.’ As a way of being of the human ego, personal enterprise is a way of governing oneself according to principles and values. Nikolas Rose identifies some of them: ‘energy, initiative, ambition, calculation and personal responsibility.’ It is the efficient, competitive individual who seeks to maximize his human capital in all areas, who not only seeks to project himself into the future and calculate his gains and losses like the old economic man, but above all seeks to work on himself so as constantly to transform himself, improve himself, and make himself ever more efficient. What distinguishes this subject is the very process of self-improvement to which he is prompted, leading him incessantly to perfect his results and performance. The new paradigms covering the labour market,

like education and training, life-long learning and employability.' are significant strategic modalities of it" (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 264).

Architecture is strategic technology of logistics: as it "distributes: mass, space, materials, privilege, access, meaning, shelter" (Deamer, 2014, p. 217), so-called rights, violence, desire, amongst other.

Success as self-realization

"It's been clear for generations now that one of the central barriers to overcoming our oppressive conditions is the popular idea of success. The notion that if we work hard enough things will be fine clouds the reality: under capitalism, in order to be at the top, many others have to be on the bottom. How we define liberation and freedom matters, and the fact that many people have been deceived into thinking accumulating vast amounts of wealth or fame means being free is something we must combat. Royalty, fame, and celebrity to some degree dictate power in this society, but they are not liberation and can never bring freedom. Believing this myth feeds into a form of counterrevolution that the state uses to stabilize itself and keep people invested in its existence. If it's the state that we must unravel to achieve liberation, then we must take away the weapons it uses against us externally and internally. Deeper observation instructs us to not only think past these things in the present but also in our understanding of the past" (William C. Anderson, 2021, p. 40).

As Max Weber argued, and Santiago Castro-Gómez underscores, success is a fundamental value of capitalism (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 42). In contemporary capitalism, innovation and creativity are the *new* semantic dispositifs of success, the victory route is defined by creative and innovative performance. This new semantic dispositifs are added to other neo-liberal qualities, such as: self-realization, flexibility, competition, metrics and accountability, risk and resilience. As Spencer underscores, this is "the ethos that the subject must cultivate in order to thrive in the competitive environment of the market. According to the truth games of neo-liberalism there is no choice for the self, politically or ontologically, but to govern itself, and to have itself governed, according to these imperatives" (Spencer, 2016, p. 23). What are the contemporary signifiers of success or its surrogates progress and development? Capital's main axiom is the production of *new* capital, which contemporary neo-liberal capitalism delivers in multiple forms under a creative and innovation regime a never-ending violent process of creation and re-creation of new value and desires.

Dardot and Laval warn us (Dardot & Laval, 2013, pp. 265–269), to consider the entrepreneurial ethic as only a fraud, since it is the prevailing ethic of our time. However, it is distinct from weak existentialism and easy hedonism. While it shares some similarities with these ethical forms in promoting self-creation and integral flourishing, it also celebrates combat, force, vigor, and success. The enterprise ethic views work as the primary means to achieve self-realization, autonomy, and liberty, allowing individuals to utilize their faculties, expend creative energy, and prove their worth. This work ethic is different from the conversion ethic of Christian asceticism and the work ethic of early Protestantism. The new work ethic emphasizes individual aspirations and personal projects, with the enterprise being made up of personal enterprises of all members. Modern management aims to control personal identities through assessments of personality, character traits, and even unconscious motivations. The workplace is viewed as a place of education and practical learning, and participation in enterprise is emphasized from a young age by political and economic leaders.

There are various methods, including coaching, neuro-linguistic programming, and transactional analysis, that aim to improve a person's ability to manage their emotions, stress, and relationships. These methods aim to strengthen the ego and its ability to function effectively in challenging situations. Although they have unique histories and theories, they share some similarities. Firstly, they present themselves as psychological knowledge with specific vocabulary, sources, methodologies, and logical arguments. Secondly, they offer techniques for transforming individuals that can be applied both within and outside of the workplace based on fundamental principles. Understanding oneself through meditation, self-reflection, or self-diagnosis with or without a coach, alone or in a group, within or outside of the workplace, is only meaningful if it leads to a better comprehension of one's actions and the communication process with others (Dardot & Laval, 2013, pp. 265–269).

“The new subject is the human of competition and performance. The self-entrepreneur is a being made to succeed, to win” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 281). “From the subject via the enterprise to the state, a single discourse makes it possible to connect a definition of human with the way in which it wants to ‘make a success’ of its life,” and the means by which it must be guided, encouraged, trained, and empowered to achieve his objectives. This discourse is deployed by neo-liberal rationality to govern the subject in a way that maximizes results and is exposed to risks while taking full responsibility for its failures. Self-government in the neo-liberal age is called the ‘enterprise,’ which is different from previous enterprise culture. The enterprise model is promoted ideologically, depicting it as the site where individuals can achieve self-realization, material well-being, commercial and financial success, and contribute to the general prosperity of the population. This new management aspires to resolve the contradiction between the hedonistic values of consumption and the ascetic values of work (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 260).

Yanin Alfaro in the mexican magazine *Obras* by Grupo Expansión in her article *7 consejos para convertirte en el próximo "arquistar,"* 7 tips to become the next "starchitect," mobilize the following recommendations: "identify what makes you unique and be true to your concepts, be an idea explainer, develop your personality, innovate and make functional and aesthetic projects, set clear and measurable objectives; be global, build contacts and make social networks your allies" (Alfaro, 2016). Architecture modulates success through the logistics of formalism and fame. New form, money, social and professional recognition are success. The logistics of success are mobilized through biennales, prizes, media, grants, social networks, diplomas and entrepreneurship at large. Through the neo-liberal promise that we all can and want to be the next starchitect. But let's face it, dear *archipreneurs*, there are just not enough galaxies for so many wannabe stars. And remember, to be a great architect you have to be a great narcissus.

The new

"Innovation is a criterion of architectural self-evaluation. Originality is a *conditio sine qua non* of being recognized as an important architect" (Schumacher, 2011, p. 409)

"Innovation requires the active unlearning of the habitual schemata and design routines of the discipline. Substantial innovation is only possible if concepts and routines are radically altered" (Schumacher, 2011, p. 414)

"Radical innovation presupposes newness. Newness is otherness. The new is produced by blind mechanisms rather than creative thought" (Schumacher, 2011, p. 416)

Creativity and innovation are constitutional qualities and abilities—amongst others—that *homo oeconomicus* should learn and perform. The notion of the new at large, is a fundamental governmental apparatus managed through the *logistics of desires* and modulated through neo-liberal pedagogy. Let's follow a genealogy first drawn by Deleuze in his early work, in *Difference and Repetition*. "What becomes established with the new is precisely not the new. [...] in other words, difference" (Deleuze, 1994, p. 136). But, the repetition of a new difference. Followed by recent lines of thought that have focused their work on the critique of creativity, such as the work of Isabell Lorey, Angela McRobbie, Marion von Osten, Gerald Raunig and Paolo Virno, amongst others. As Raunig writes. "We are cogs in an increasingly modularized society, and at the same time we modulate ourselves and the world." This dual modulation encompasses a continuous "reforming and deforming of our times." Appeals to creativity point to de-forming "smoothing and the scoring striation of

times.” Exceeding the “discourse of the economization and industrialization of creativity” in the traditional meaning, now it is no longer a question of the “becoming-commodity of culture, but rather of economies of desire, of a subservient modulating of our desires and their disciplining modularization” (Raunig, 2013, p. 105).

The *logistics of desire* refers to the modalities in which the creative desire is produced, circulated and consumed. The creative impulse is captured by neo-liberal rationality and set to work by/for capital, in other words, how the creative desire is modulated and circulated. It is important to note that one of the prime objectives and requirements of capital, after its production, is its circulation, the ‘free’ circulation of capital.

Rolnik, argues that “when comparing the active politics and the reactive politics of the actions of desire, in the former a new equilibrium is shaped through an act of creation that transmutes reality with its instituting force, while in the latter the equilibrium is remade in a fictitious and fleeting form through an act that, to tell the truth, interrupts the destiny of the ‘power of creation’ proper to life to reduce it to ‘creativity.’ Since creativity is only one of the indispensable capacities for the work of creation, when it is dissociated from knowledge-body, it becomes sterile and does nothing but recompose the instituted. Desire then ceases to act in harmony with what life demands of it and deviates from its ethical function (Suey Rolnik, 2019, p. 68). The “separation of subjectivity in relation to its living condition is what prepares the ground for desire to surrender itself, joyfully, to the *cafisheo* of the drive, of whose movements it is the executor. This surrender manifests itself in the reduction of the drive's power to ‘create’ new modes of existence in response to the demands of life, to the mere exercise of its ‘creative’ capacity, which will then be invested in the composition of new scenarios for the accumulation of capital. Instead of the creation of the new, what is produced (creatively and compulsively) are ‘novelties,’ which multiply the opportunities for capital investments and excite the will to consume. That is to say, the vital power is used for the reproduction of the instituted; only its parts are changed or variations are made on them—with greater or lesser creativity. In situations of crisis, the deviation of the drive and the surrender of desire to its abuse intensify, manifesting themselves in mass movements that clamor for the maintenance of the status quo, as is the case of the vertiginous rise of conservatism today” (Suey Rolnik, 2019, p. 104).

The regimes of desire, innovation and creativity, govern in a similar manner to economization. We could even refer to it as a *creativization* of life, a modality of governance that makes creativity an imperative in all spheres of life. Such regime emerges when creativity is not limited to creative practices, or aesthetics practices, but pervades contemporary life and asks to be creative in all spheres. At a professional, social and domestic milieu, subjects are constantly asked to perform creatively, to innovate. What subjectivity does the regimes of creativity and innovation produce? Is there such a thing as an *innovator* as Benoît Godin suggests? (Godin, 2015, p. 95).

Desires operate together, through the logistics of the new, and an infrastructure managed by the creative-entrepreneur. Central to the neo-liberalization of creativity is von Mises notion of *praxeology*. “Far above the millions that come and pass away tower the pioneers, the men whose deeds and ideas cut out new paths for mankind. For the pioneering genius to create is the essence of life. To live means for him to create.

The activities of these prodigious *men* cannot be fully subsumed under the praxeological concept of labor. They are not labor because they are for the genius not means, but ends in themselves. *He* lives in creating and inventing. For *him* there is no leisure, only intermissions of temporary sterility and frustration. *His* incentive is not the desire to bring about a result, but the act of producing it” (von Mises, 1998a, p. 138).

Innovation

By the beginning of the XIX century, innovation became the god that we are still worshipping today. The new cult was meant to defeat the new plague that had descended upon the world — ‘stagnation.’ Before the XVIII century, ‘stagnation’ was unknown; suddenly, it spread its gloom far and wide. Innovation, from the Latin *innovare, innovatio*, should signify renewal, rejuvenation from inside, rather than novelty, which is its modern meaning in both english and french. The reason, for the change in meaning, was the shift away from theology, and even philosophy, toward science and technology. The foul smell of heresy finally dissipated and was replaced by scientific and economic progress (Girard, 1990, pp. 7–20).

Creativity and innovation are loose and shifting signifiers. Innovation, once signifying change of political order, now the contemporary notion follows the schumpeterian credo of economic value creation. Innovation in the Greek tradition meant political change, opposition to that which should not change, nowadays innovation is reduced to economical change, that is production of new exchange value. The semantic reversal of innovation, originally a political concept, related to governance and religion, was brought by modernity through the economization of the concept (Godin, 2015, p. 101). Neo-liberal rationality has transformed the way creativity and innovation are understood, the forms they operate and their sites of veridiction. Both, creativity and innovation modulate all human actions in contemporary life, and in specific ways they modulate disciplines and their performance in the professional realm. Creativity and innovation are in constant motion, in constant redefinition, we do not aim to return or recover the ‘original’ understanding of these terms but how to critically resist their current economization, and scape from its economic and progressive captivity.

Joseph Schumpeter's *Theory of Economic Development* in 1911 (Joseph Alois Schumpeter, 1961) led to a renewed focus on the promotion of entrepreneurship. Schumpeter believed that economic theory must consider historical conditions and the importance of disruptive innovations. He argued that economic

development arises from innovative combinations of production, technology, and commerce, rather than from static equilibrium. Schumpeter viewed the entrepreneur as the active and creative force behind these new combinations, who disrupts traditional methods and drives economic development. However, Schumpeter also believed that only leaders with willpower and authority could be entrepreneurs. Innovation and competition are inseparable, with the entrepreneur as the fighter who loves to struggle and win (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 117).

As Foucault underscores, “we cannot halt at this problem of innovation and, as it were, trust in the boldness of capitalism or the permanent stimulation of competition to explain this phenomenon of innovation. If there is innovation, that is to say, if we find new things, discover new forms of productivity, and make technological innovations, this is nothing other than the income of a certain capital, of human capital, that is to say, of the set of investments we have made at the level of *man himself*. Taking up the problem of innovation within the more general theory of human capital” (Foucault, 2008, p. 249).

Creativity

Creativity is more and more conflated with notions of freedom. In accordance with the neo-liberal rationality of ‘*conduct of conducts*,’ Angela McRobbie has referred to the *creative dispositif*, “the word ‘creativity’ displaces and supplants the word ‘culture.’ since it is less contaminated by the Marxist legacy [...] Creativity becomes something inherent in personhood (childhood, adolescence and young adulthood; less often, old age), which has the potential to be turned into a set of capacities. The resulting assemblage of ‘talent’ can subsequently be unrolled in the labour market or ‘talent-led economy.’ The creativity dispositif comprises various instruments, guides, manuals, devices, toolkits, mentoring schemes, reports, TV programmes and other forms of entertainment” (McRobbie, 2018, p. 20). Education and pedagogy, as McRobbie states, “from primary schooling through secondary and tertiary sectors, becomes the privileged spaces for the deployment of the *dispositif of creativity*, a defining feature being the importing of vocabularies from the ‘business school.’ which in turn become a new orthodoxy” (McRobbie, 2018, p. 74).

Through neo-liberalism, creativity and innovation operate as governmental apparatuses, the emergence of a sort of *creative governmentality*, thus the government of conduct through an apparent unbound creative freedom. Schwartzberg referring to *econo-mo-subjectivization* draws attention to the popular notion of creativity, that “is particularly interesting because it has become a generalized imperative of neo-liberalized societies: creativity—and its proxies, innovation and disruption—are seen today as an essential component of any competitive worker. Creativity is a fundamental metric within what neo-liberals call human capital—a concept that, lies at the core of neo-liberal subjectivization” (Schwartzberg, 2015, p. 181).

Dutch art sociologist Pascal Gielen (Gielen, 2013) highlights how new exploitative practices in the arts are using the architectural model of the “project” to extract more productivity from workers. This involves temporary, often unpaid, intensive personal investment in one-off initiatives with no guarantee of success or long-term commitment. Gielen argues that the overuse of the term “creativity” has caused it to lose its meaning, and that it is being used to obscure the dominant relations of production and conditions of exploitation in post-fordist “creative entrepreneurialism” (Andreotti, 2016, p. 84).

As Ross Exo Adams notes: “Architecture’s true political capacities and complicities can only be assessed in relation to a deep understanding of the political ontology of urbanization. Architecture, fixed within its discursive confines and answering obediently to the demands of an urban order, cannot be unbound from its neutralized historical worldview and will thus remain unconscious of its political and ontological consistency—of its service as a political technology. Instead, its objective as well as its measure of success will persist in how well it can adapt itself to suit the technological and social ‘necessities’ of a blinding, apolitical present. This basic truth of architectural production, reproduced ad infinitum in its discourse, fixes it to a program of perpetual change whose locus of innovation remains safely confined to aesthetic effect. If the urban expanse is the apparatus which protects life by depoliticizing it, it does so today by also aestheticizing it—suspending life in the permanent play of indifferent differences. Indeed, the urban possesses yet another paradoxical character: the more aesthetically diverse it appears, the more radically equivalent life within it becomes. Both the discourse and practice of architecture today play into this, perpetuating the myth that invention and innovation can only be registered in the banal immediacy of aesthetic difference” (Adams, 2014c, p. 195).

Creativity is not only limited to neo-liberal subjectivation, it operates also through territorial neo-liberalization. As de Queiroz and Rodríguez note: cities are described using different forms of adjectives that associate them with specific problems from a more general and appealing perspective. Economic growth must prioritize sustainability, and cities must become more resilient through creativity, innovation, and intelligence. Institutions must manage urban processes more efficiently to achieve this. City management should support economic growth by becoming smarter, more creative, more sustainable, and more resilient. UNESCO’s Creative Cities Network was created to enhance cooperation among cities that recognize creativity as a critical factor for so-called sustainable development (de Queiroz Ribeiro & Rodríguez Mancilla, 2022, pp. 455–456).

Flexibility

“Capitalistically flexibilized individuals are neither conscious nor universal people, but only universally exploited, unsupportive and lonely people. The new responsibility of risk is not amusing, but rather frightening, since what is permanently at stake is one’s own

existence. General distrust is gaining ground. In a climate of persecution mania and harassment, a paranoid corporate culture emerges. People who are constantly insecure and overpressured lose their motivation and become ill” (Kurz, 2018, p. 124)

Neo-liberal capitalism *abuses* the open and incomplete condition or the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject and operates a continuous modulation, it asks for a constant re-shaping, a constant re-invention, based on the supposed flexibility of the subject, labouring subjectivities are under constant modulation, as Guattari and Deleuze remind us by way of Gilbert Simondon “modulation is molding in a continuous and perpetually variable manner” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 562; Simondon, 2020, p. 31) .

“The dynamic axiomatic of capital, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) theorized, highlights the tension between, on one hand, the flexibility and versatility of capture and exploitation by capital and, on the other hand, the necessity of distinguishing the operations through which that machine of capture subsumes social relations from the inventions that also resist and overflow the diagram of capture and exploitation” (Gago, 2015, p. 28).

Moten notes that, “society is not friendly association with others; it’s friendly association without others, in the absence of the other, in the exhaustion of relational individuality, in consent not to be a single being” (Moten, 2017a, p. 282). And in neo-liberalism, “the conception of society as an enterprise made up of enterprises comprises a new subjective norm, which is no longer precisely that of the productive subject of industrial societies. The neo-liberal subject in the process of being formed, some of whose main features we wish to delineate here, is the correlate of an apparatus of performance and pleasure that is currently the subject of numerous works. There is no absence of descriptions of ‘hypermodern, uncertain, ‘flexible.’ ‘precarious.’ ‘fluid.’ ‘weightless’ man today. These valuable, often convergent works at the intersection of psychoanalysis and sociology register a new human condition, which according to some even affects the psychic economy itself” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 255).

The new government of subjects assumes that businesses are not primarily focused on community or human well-being, but on competition. They are portrayed as places of innovation, change, and constant adaptation to market demand, with an emphasis on excellence and perfection. Individuals are expected to conform to this ideal by constantly improving themselves, being efficient and flexible, and seeing themselves as their own employer, inventor, and entrepreneur. “The economy becomes a personal discipline. Margaret Thatcher provided the clearest formulation of this rationality: ‘Economics are the method. The object is to change the soul’” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 117).

Architecture pushes and expects both space and people to be flexible. On this double logistics, Spencer comments: “architecture has sought to sanitize the ‘madness of theory.’ to dispossess itself of its theoretical

demons. Theory has been worked over until it can be put to work for and within neoliberalism. The 'smooth' and the 'folded' have been instrumentalized in the affirmation of flexibility and compliance, 'complexity' employed to dissimulate neoliberal imperatives as the laws of nature. The way of the market comes to appear as the way of the world, and vice versa. Through theory, architecture has fashioned itself as a service provider for the 'real' of the market, a resource for the spatial articulation of neoliberal modes of managerialism." (Spencer, 2016, p. 72)

David Cunningham on the *Foreword to Critique of Architecture: Essays on Theory, Autonomy, and Political Economy* by Spencer, notes that his critique "lies on what he first named 'architectural Deleuzism.' That is, 'a self-styled avant-garde in contemporary architecture claiming and legitimizing the emergence of a mode of spatiality' defined by 'mobility, connectivity and flexibility.' 'borderless and reprogrammable.' as 'essentially progressive through its particular reading of the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari.' Of course, in some sense, this recourse to Deleuze (with or without Guattari) in the late 1990s appears as a classic instance of architecture's appropriation of a radical philosophy for the rationalization of existing forms of dominant institutional practice; a pattern of legitimation that is hardly new in itself, and which seems little different as instrumentalized 'theory' from the appropriation of Derrida's work in the previous decade" (Cunningham, 2020, p. 11).

According to Spencer, under neo-liberalism, the development of oneself through physical, intellectual, and psychological training and qualification is an ongoing process that requires constant tracking, measuring, and rating of performance. One must be adaptable, communicative, and willing to work long hours and take on unpaid work to gain experience that potential employers will find favorable. However, the challenges and difficulties of this work cannot be acknowledged. The principles of neo-liberalism are presented as positive choices and freedoms, and life is depicted as competition. There is no acknowledgement of struggle, only opportunity. The belief in uni-versal laws of spontaneous development and evolution obscures any signs of tension or contradiction, and everything is seen as productive but not as laborious (Spencer, 2016, p. 76).

Regarding how new and distinctively neo-liberal modes of labour and its organization are being introduced, Spencer continues and argues, that these modes aim to retrain individuals to become more cooperative and flexible while also smoothing over any precarities, struggles, and contradictions. Architecture has shifted its focus from theory to work and is now being used to promote neo-liberal governmental and managerial practices in the workplace. These practices are centered on post-political ontologies of complexity and emergence, self-organized massing of swarms, and networked, cooperative behaviors and dispositions. Such architectures claim to be aligned with progressive reality and design open, landscaped, and connective spaces to facilitate communication. In order to maintain this deception, the image of labour as strife, struggle, and hardship must be negated through elegant design and phantasmagoric appearance (Spencer, 2016, p. 108).

Competition

“Neoliberalism is the tale of Social Darwinism taken to its absurd culmination ((Kulić, 2004); (Leyva, 2009)). It fosters an individual ethic that allows selfishness to reap its own rewards. And so we spiral downwards into a seemingly bottomless pit of narcissism, ego and self-absorption” (Springer, 2016b, p. 2).

“The new religion of neoliberalism combines a commitment to the extension of markets and logics of competitiveness with a profound antipathy to all kinds of Keynesian and/or collectivist strategies” (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p. 381).

As Foucault emphasizes, the distinction between liberalism and neo-liberalism is competition. “So, the first shift is that of exchange, a shift from exchange to competition in the principle of the market. Putting it again very roughly, how was the market defined in eighteenth century liberalism, or rather on what basis was it described? It was defined and described on the basis of free exchange between two partners who through this exchange establish the equivalence of two values. The model and principle of the market was exchange, and the freedom of the market, the non-intervention of a third party, of any authority whatsoever, and a fortiori of state authority, was of course applied so that the market was valid and equivalence really was equivalence” (Foucault, 2008, p. 136).

“Now for the neo-liberals, the most important thing about the market is not exchange, that kind of original and fictional situation imagined by eighteenth century liberal economists. The essential thing of the market is elsewhere; it is competition. In this, moreover, the neo-liberals only follow” (Foucault, 2008, p. 136).

“Competition is an essence. Competition is an *eidos*. Competition is a principle of formalization. Competition has an internal logic; it has its own structure. Its effects are only produced if this logic is respected. It is, as it were, a formal game between inequalities; it is not a natural game between individuals and behaviors” (Foucault, 2008, p. 138).

“For Foucault, [the difference between liberalism and neoliberalism] has to do with the different ways in which they each focus on economic activity. Classical liberalism focused on exchange, on what Smith called mankind's tendency to ‘barter, truck, and exchange.’ It naturalized the market as a system with its own rationality. [...] Neoliberalism, according to Foucault, extends the process of making economic activity a general matrix of social and political relations, but it takes as its focus not exchange but competition. What the two forms of liberalism, the ‘classical’ and ‘neo’ share, according to Foucault, is a general idea of *homo œconomicus*. [...] What changes is the emphasis from an anthropology of exchange to one of competition. The shift from exchange to competition has profound effects: while exchange was considered to be natural, competition is understood by the neo-liberals of the twentieth century to be an artificial relation that must be protected against the tendency for markets to form monopolies and interventions by the state. Competition

necessitates a constant intervention on the part of the state, not on the market, but on the conditions of the market” (Read, 2009, p. 27).

Spencer, following Dardot and Laval, underscores that (Spencer, 2016, p. 161), “what is at stake in neo-liberalism 'is nothing more, nor less, than the form of our existence—the way in which we are led to conduct ourselves, to relate to others and to ourselves: according to Dardot and Laval (Dardot & Laval, 2013). Neoliberalism is, they say, first and foremost a ‘rationality’ based upon ‘the generalization of competition as a behavioural norm and of the enterprise as a model of subjectivation.’ For Dardot and Laval this is how we should understand neo-liberalism, rather than as an ideology.” But, Spencer argues, it should be understood as both an ideology and a rationality, neo-liberalism strategically constructs and propagates its beliefs as widely accepted truths, which it uses to govern individual behavior. This includes views on the limitations of human knowledge, the role of planning and welfare, and the market as a superior system. By presenting these beliefs as the natural order of the world, neoliberalism legitimizes its own rationality. In Foucault's terms, it is both a truth game and a form of environmental governmentality (Spencer, 2016, p. 161).

Let's see how the neo-liberals conceptualize competition. Ludwig von Mises in *Human action: a treatise on economics*, elaborates first a distinction between the term “biological competition” in relation to animals refers to the competition between animals in their search for food, which is called biological competition. This is different from “social competition,” which is the competition between individuals to achieve the most favorable position in society. Social competition exists in all forms of social organization, but in a socialist system, there would be no social competition because individuals would not strive for special appointments. However, in a totalitarian system, social competition exists in the form of people trying to gain favor with those in power. In a market economy, competition exists between sellers and buyers. This is called catallactic competition, and we need to be careful of common misconceptions when dealing with it (von Mises, 1998a).

According to Dardot and Laval (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 240), the new public management emphasizes the importance of competition, which aligns with Friedman's belief that monopoly is harmful to consumers, whether they are owned by private companies or the government, hence the best way to protect consumers is through free competition within their own country and free trade globally.

To implement a policy of competition, the state must become a competitor on a global level. This involves two interconnected operations: creating competitive markets and integrating competition into state activity. The liberalization of network industries, such as telecommunications, electricity, gas, railways, and postal services, demonstrates a new form of public intervention that creates markets or quasi-markets in sectors previously considered monopolistic. This neo-liberal approach, prioritizes competition and entrepreneurship (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 240).

The “shift in ‘anthropology’ from *homo œconomicus* as an exchanging creature to a competitive creature, or rather as a creature whose tendency to compete must be fostered, entails a general shift in the way in which human beings make themselves and are made subjects. First, neoliberalism entails a massive expansion of the field and scope of economics. [...] Secondly, this entails a massive redefinition of ‘labor’ and the ‘worker.’ The worker has become *human capital*. Salary or wages become the revenue that is earned on an initial investment, an investment in one’s skills or abilities” (Read, 2009, p. 28).

Competition in architecture is taught from day one at architecture schools. The studio as a pedagogical dispositif lays the perfect stage to train the necessary skills to compete, both in the academic and professional realm. Competition is rule. Like any other neo-darwinist, architects grow and breed through competition. Although it has certain scales. At the level of the labour structures as architectural offices, cooperation is promoted rather than competition. But Marx has made it very clear, capitalism needs the cooperation of the workers, a subordinated cooperation. “A large number of workers working together, at the same time, in one place (or, if you like, in the same field of labour), in order to produce the same sort of commodity under the command of the same capitalist, constitutes the starting point of capitalist production. [...] When numerous workers work together side by side in accordance with a plan, whether in the same process, or in different but connected processes, this form of labour is called co-operation. [...] Through the co-operation of numerous wage-labourers, the command of capital develops into a requirement for carrying on the labour process itself, into a real condition of production. [...] Co-operation remains the fundamental form of the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 2004, pp. 439–454). At the scale of the market, architects are ruthless competitive entrepreneurs. Competition is structured through its two main clients: private capital and the state. Through the following chapters we will delve deeper into the regime of architectural competitions.

As we will also see in coming chapters, the neo-liberal uni-versity produces: entrepreneurial, competitive, adaptable, flexible, resilient, original, innovative and creative subjectivities, as labouring commodities. Igea Troiani argues that in higher education, an established patriarchal model of academic labour constructs and obstructs the formation of alternative values and identities of diverse educators and students, concentrating on an economically driven architectural education. “Neoliberalism in schools of architecture focuses on the short-term vocational goal of making students instantly employable, efficient ‘factory workers’ (who can maximise the money they can make for their employers). Free student labour, undertaken as ‘live projects’ for outside clients in architecture schools, is just an exploitative practice” (Troiani, 2017, p. 178). We agree with Troiani, but set apart, and underscore that the problem is not that the uni-versity produces mainly one type of architect. But that the problem is the actual existence and need of something as the uni-versity and the architect.

“The nurturing of competitive marketplace tactics that pit design studios or research clusters against one another are gender biased because they advocate macho aggression. According to Olssen (Olssen, 2009), ‘although it is essential in economic contexts to ensure norms of fair cooperation in order to avoid monopolies and the centralization of economic power, in many community contexts, including families, and frequently in work places, reciprocal social relations depend upon cooperative behaviour, and facilitation, rather than competition. One of the crucial failings of unbridled neoliberalism from the perspective of educators,... is that it seeks to institute competition as the central structuring norm of a society on the grounds that this best promotes efficient institutional and behavioural forms” (Troiani, 2017, p. 178).

According to Schwartzberg, the principle of *environmental economo-subjectivization* at the workplace shifts from “external control and internalized self-policing (discipline) to encouraging competitive self-expression (‘creativity’)” (Schwartzberg, 2015, p. 188).

Metrics, indicators, accountability and performance

Metrics and indicators of performance are modes of measuring and tracking accountability and responsibility, both exerted as internal responsibility and external control. But as Springer underscores, “fuck the ever-intensifying move towards metrics and the failure to appreciate that not everything that counts can be counted” (Springer, 2016a, p. 288).

The novelty of entrepreneurial government, as Dardot and Laval highlight (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 282), is characterized by leadership based on individual responsibility and self-control, which is achieved through internalized constraints. To be a successful “personal entrepreneur,” one must optimize oneself for social and professional success, but relying solely on training and coaching is not sufficient. Auditing, monitoring, and evaluating techniques are necessary to increase self-control and individual performance. The goal is to create an accountable individual who is responsible for their actions and wholly calculable. Evaluation is the primary means of incentivizing individual performance, and those evaluated become evaluable subjects who depend on their evaluator and the tools they use.

“‘Accountable’ subjectivation and ‘financial’ subjectivation ultimately define a form of *subjectivation as an excess of self over self* or *boundless self-transcendence*. In this way, an original figure of subjectivation is delineated. It is not a ‘*trans-subjectivation*.’ which would involve aiming at a beyond the self that establishes a break with the self and self-renunciation. Nor is it a ‘*self-subjectivation*’ whereby one would seek to attain an ethical relationship to the self independently of any other goal, whether political or economic in kind. In a way, it is an ‘*ultra-subjectivation*.’ whose goal is not a final, stable condition of ‘self-possession, but a beyond the self

that is always receding, and which is constitutionally aligned in its very regime with the logic of enterprise and, over and above that, with the cosmos' of the world market" (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 284).

Accountable neo-liberal subjectivation leads to tracking widespread failure, widespread failure leads to generalized depression. The game is not meant for all to win. In fact, it is mean for all to loose and some, very very few, might win. As Safatle notes, "when the individual is placed at the center of the dynamic, an external law, the law of capital valorization, weighs on it with maximum force. By internalizing it, it is the individual itself who starts to demand of itself to be a successful entrepreneur, seeking to 'optimize' the potential of all his attributes capable of being 'valorized.' such as imagination, motivation, autonomy, responsibility. This illusorily inflated subjectivity inevitably provokes, at the moment of its absolute emptying, frustration, anguish associated with failure and self-blame; the typical pathology in this context is depression" (Safatle et al., 2023, p. 2).

Risk

Neo-liberalism generalizes risk since "economy is not for cowards" (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 151). Or so they say. And at the same time "to follow one's desires is to run risks" (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 276).

"The contrast between two sorts of human beings—the 'risk-loving.' who are courageous and dominant, and the 'risk-averse.' who are timid and dominated—was consecrated by two theoreticians connected to French employers, François Ewald and Denis Kessler. They maintained that any social reformation presupposed the transformation of the maximum number of individuals into risk-lovers.' In his turn, a few years later, Laurence Parisot, the French employers' leader, would put it more directly: 'Life, health, and love are precarious; why should work escape this law?' [...] In this discourse, risk is projected as an ontological dimension that is the twin of the desire driving everyone" (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 276).

"The entrepreneurial subject is exposed in all areas of life to vital risks from which he cannot extricate himself, their management being a matter of strictly private decisions. To be a personal enterprise assumes living entirely in risk. Aubrey establishes a close relationship between the two: 'Risk forms part of the notion of personal enterprise'; 'personal enterprise is reactivity and creativity in a world where one does not know what tomorrow will bring.'

This dimension is not new. Market logic has long been associated with the dangers of slump, loss and bankruptcy. The problematic of risk is inseparable from 'market risks.' which have had to be protected against by resort to insurance techniques since the end of the Middle Ages. The novelty attaches to the universalization of a style of economic existence hitherto reserved for entrepreneurs" (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 275).

"From the subject via the enterprise to the state, a single discourse makes it possible to connect a definition of *man* with the way in which *he* wants to 'make a success' of *his* life, as well as the way that *he* must

be 'guided.' 'encouraged.' 'trained.' and empowered' to achieve *his* 'objectives.' In other words, neo-liberal rationality produces the subject it requires by deploying the means of governing *him* so that he really does conduct *himself* as an entity in a competition, who must maximize his results by exposing *himself* to risks and taking full responsibility for possible failures" (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 260).

"Equality that destroys heterogeneity is equality to a model" (Sup Marcos, 2017, p. 208). Castro-Gómez underscores, that ordoliberal *Sozialpolitik*, it is not about "equality as an objective of government, but, on the contrary, 'to let inequality act' (Foucault, 2007a, p. 176). There is no transfer of income from one to another (distribution of wealth), but rather labor incentives for everyone to see for *himself*. The State will simply ensure that as many individuals as possible can 'self-regulate' and manage their own risks" (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 185).

Resilience

Adapt and persist. Under the civilizatory catastrophe, currently advertised as "climate crisis," resilience is one of the key dispositifs of neo-liberal governmentality. "Practices are being reshaped around the need to develop the capacities of humans, [and territories] individually and collectively, for resilience. Resilience is currently propounded by neo-liberal agencies and institutions, especially, as the fundamental property that peoples and individuals worldwide must possess in order to become full and developed subjects" (Chandler & Reid, 2016, p. 1).

For David Chandler and Julian Reid, the term resilience is often used in neo-liberal discussions to describe the ability to adapt positively to change. Resilient individuals and communities do not resist change but rather embrace it as a means of personal growth and transformation. However, resilience is an ideal and cannot be fully achieved, as it is a continuous process without an end point. While some people may be more capable of adapting to change than others, no one is completely resilient. Our past experiences and cultural values can limit our ability to be resilient, but we can work towards becoming more resilient by being open to change (Chandler & Reid, 2016, p. 14).

As noted earlier, neo-liberal capitalism *abuses* the incomplete condition of the false promise of the universal individual subject and operates/demands continuous modulation, based on the supposed resilience of the subject. "Implicit in the strategy of resilience is a narrative of survival of the fittest" (Adeyemo, 2017, p. 55). According to Crawford Holling "resilience determines the persistence of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes of state variables, driving variables, and parameters, and still persist. In this definition resilience is the property of the system and persistence or probability of extinction is the result. Stability, on the other hand, is the ability of a system to return to an equilibrium state

after a temporary disturbance. The more rapidly it returns, and with the least fluctuation, the more stable it is. In this definition stability is the property of the system and the degree of fluctuation around specific states the result” (Holling, 1973, p. 17).

Dele Adeyemo problematizes the neo-liberal resilience strategy and notes that “Holling informs us that stable ecological systems would be susceptible to only minor fluctuations in their environment, whereas resilient systems would be able to absorb dramatic distortions and continue to persist. The price of survival in a resilience model might mean a catastrophic loss of life or destruction of whole parts of the system. The hope, therefore, that resilience frameworks are a means of maintaining stability for the majority is a profound delusion. Stability and resilience are incompatible models and it would be dangerous to conflate them” (Adeyemo, 2017, p. 55).

The disastrous developmentalist models and their current resilient and “sustainable development engage in the active promotion of a neo-liberal model of society and subjectivity in which everyone is demanded to ‘prove themselves by bettering their individual and collective self-reliance’ (Duffield, 2007, p. 69)” (Chandler & Reid, 2016, p. 59). Nothing more than spatio-territorial resilience.

Henri Lefebvre asserted that, urbanism is a mask and a tool. “A mask for the state and political action, a tool of interests that are dissimulated within a strategy and a sociologic. Urbanism does not try to model space as a work of art. It does not even try to do so in keeping with its technological imperatives, as it claims. The space it creates is political” (Lefebvre, 2014). Urbanism is a manifold machine, currently it wears an eco-sustainable resilient mask, while being a machine of financial speculation, a technology of isolation (Adams, 2014b) and exclusion, and most importantly a machine of world conquering/expansion. Ross Exo-Adams constructs the rhetorical genealogy of the last urban-isms, the last discursive attempts to naturalize urbanization and revive nature. If the rise of the full spectrum of green, from ‘sustainable’ urbanism to ‘ecological’ urbanism “appears as a manic attempt to derive nature itself from urbanization” (Adams, 2014a, p. 16), resilience urbanism is the latest attempt to protect urbanization from nature. “Just as the hope for a self-regulating society was dying, neoliberalism regurgitated its facsimile—the notion of urban resilience—” (Adeyemo, 2017, p. 54), as the latest urbanist mask, resilience urbanism fully absorbs the financial potential of risk and crisis capitalism. By merging; neo-liberal governmentality—as the mask of freedom and crisis—, the full spectrum of green, climate change remediation and risk opportunity, resilience urbanism pushes individuals, communities and places into the uncertain terrains of financial and real estate speculation, while demanded to persist and “absorb change and disturbance and still maintain the same relationships” (Holling, 1973, p. 14).

As Moten and Harney note, “resilience is the name for the violent destruction of things that won’t give, won’t return to form, won’t bend when access is demanded, won’t be flexible and (com)pliant. Stopping when you are told to stop and moving along when you are told to move along demonstrates resilience and

composure; but broken, breaking, dissembled assembly demonstrates itself openly, secretly, dissembling in captured but inaccessible glance, for us, to us, as incomplete and much more than complete. Its daimonic performance can't be individuated and won't be performed" (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 44)

More and more, places and peoples of impoverished and colonized territories, in a similar line to the creative city's initiative, are demanded and accounted to be resilient, such is the case of the program 100 Resilient Cities, started in 2013 by the Rockefeller Foundation. The institution defines a resilient city as one that has the ability to overcome physical, social, and economic crises, while also learning from them and preventing them in the future. Such a city should be able to resiliently handle the challenges related to unemployment, public transportation, violence, as well as water and food shortages. The foundation offers financial and logistical support and collaborates with the private sector and non-governmental organizations to execute resilience strategies in cities as: "Cali and Medellín (Colombia); Colima, Guadalajara, Juárez y Ciudad de México (México); Buenos Aires and Santa Fe (Argentina); Montevideo (Uruguay); Ciudad de Panamá (Panamá); Río de Janeiro and Salvador de Bahía (Brasil); San Juan (Puerto Rico); Santiago de los Caballeros (República Dominicana); Santiago de Chile (Chile) and Quito (Ecuador)" (de Queiroz Ribeiro & Rodríguez Mancilla, 2022, p. 455).

Neo-liberalization of so-called méxico and colombia

The conventional narrative of the neo-liberalization of Abya Yala puts at the center the fascist chilean experience and the 'shock' doctrine. Although this happened in some contexts, in the case of so-called méxico and colombia's neo-liberalization, particularly méxico, started with Luis Montes de Oca's political and economic projects, through his close relations with european neo-liberals as Ludwig Von Mises. This was a long process of moral and ideological modulation that started in 1938, fifty years before the beginning of the conventional narrative with the presidential term of Carlos Salinas de Gortari in 1988.

In Abya Yala neo-liberalism "has become a term seeking to remain attached to the past. As a keyword, it serves as a quick, widely understood diagnostic of a set of policies that altered the face of the continent (privatization, reductions in social protections, financial deregulation, labor flexibilization, etc.)" (Gago, 2017, p. 1).

More and more progressive governments claim the end of neo-liberalism in so-called *latino américa*. The current mexican president, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, on March 17 2019, formally declared an end to the neo-liberal model and its economic policy. "We are beginning a new stage, it is a profound change, a transformation; it is not just a change of government, it is a change of regime. It is the moment to express that for us this nightmare is over. We formally declare from *Palacio Nacional* the end of the neoliberal policy,

coupled with its economic policy. Both are abolished: the neoliberal model and its economic policy of pillage, against the people and surrender” (López Obrador, 2019).

But as Marquis Bey underscores: “simply insisting on escape does not mean one escapes, and maybe even emphatically insisting on escape to the contrary of historical and contemporary evidence does more harm than good” (Bey, 2023, p. 14).

The violent and ridiculous declaration of López Obrador goes parallel while; having breakfast with oligarch Carlos Slim, in order to better displace, dispossess and devastate the Yucatán peninsula with the so-called *Tren Maya*; violently colluding with drug cartels in Chiapas to terrorize Zapatista communities; obstructing the investigation of the disappearance of 43 students from Ayotzinapa, in order to protect the army; militarizing the whole territory and creating the National Guard; supporting his successor, Claudia Sheinbaum, while she was mayor of ciudad de México, with the neo-liberal slogan “Innovative and rights-based city”; and much, much more.

Raúl Zibechi during the Zapatista seminar *El Pensamiento Crítico Frente a la Hidra Capitalista* at CIDECI-UniTierra in 2015, focused his presentation on a critique to progressive governments, as the one of López Obrador. Zibechi argues: “the new progressive governments put on a *mask*, anti-neoliberal, for human rights, against poverty, for a 'multipolar' world. But they continue the same model with new forms: monocrops, open-pit mining, urban real estate speculation, which are part of the same model. In other words, what we call extractivism for the sake of simplicity. Neo-liberalism is still neo-liberalism, only it is no longer privatising, in some places because there is nothing left to privatise, in others because people stood up and prevented further privatisation. The model is the same, but it has a different discourse. What discourse? Ours, they took our discourse, they took the discourse from the streets and made it the official discourse. [...] With the progressive governments, capitalism has deepened. [...] Progressive governments have destroyed social movements and communities with social policies and repression. [...] The hydra is dressed in the garb of the left and below. [...] The installation of a confused discourse is one of the fundamental characteristics of progressive governments” (Zibechi, 2016, p. 231) (Zibechi, 2015d) (Zibechi & Machado, 2017).

Neo-liberalism is far from being a thing of the past. Currently it wears the mask of progressive governments. Progressive “neo-developmental” neo-liberalism crosses violently all Abya Yala (Zibechi & Machado, 2017, p. 98). It still is a “social regime of existence and a mode of political command” (Gago, 2015, p. 21).

At a national scale, the first implementation of the neo-liberal model in Abya Yala occurred in so-called Chile during the fascist military dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet in the 1970s, and was influenced by the so-called north american neo-liberal movement, led by Milton Friedman. According to Perry Anderson, Pinochet's Chile immediately implemented a harsh neo-liberal program including deregulation, anti-union

repression, redistribution of wealth in favor of the rich, and privatization of the private sector. This occurred just a decade before the Thatcher government. Neo-liberalism in Abya Yala subsequently became associated with the economic policies recommended for developing countries, known as the Washington Consensus, a term coined by economist John Williamson in 1989 (Perry Anderson, 2001) in (Díaz Londoño, 2011, p. 139).

A meeting was held in 1989 to examine the global application of neo-liberal and structural adjustment policies. Participants included officials from the World Bank (WB), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), members of the U.S. Congress and Government, the Federal Reserve Board, intellectuals, and experts from various parts of the world. The meeting's conclusions were organized into a document by John Williamson, titled *What Washington Means When It Refers to Economic Reforms* (Williamson, 1990), which identified ten economic policies promoting structural reforms under neo-liberalism. These policies included fiscal discipline, guarantee of private property rights, changes in public spending priorities, tax reforms, financial liberalization, market-determined interest rates, price stability, trade liberalization, promotion of foreign direct investment, and deregulation of the State. Abya Yala saw the implementation of neo-liberalism through economic and political reforms recommended by the IMF and the WB. These reforms included the complete opening of economies to markets and international capital, cuts in public spending and social subsidies, privatization of state-owned enterprises, and the establishment of a favorable climate for foreign investment. The Washington Consensus aimed to supposedly rationalize the state by making it smaller, fiscally disciplined, orderly in public spending, promoting capital and trade openness, and defending private property, privatizing state enterprises, and encouraging foreign investment (Díaz Londoño, 2011, p. 139).

Global apparatuses of coloniality, or as they go, *multilateral organizations* played a crucial role in establishing the neo-liberal project at the global level. The IDB, IMF, WB, and the World Trade Organization (WTO) were responsible for creating and enforcing neo-liberal policies, which resulted in the formation of an extensive global, supranational, and transnational network. This network consisted of governments, intellectuals, technocrats, businessmen, advisors, and consultants who ensured that economic policies were adhered to worldwide (Díaz Londoño, 2011, p. 134).

The external debt crisis in so-called latin america during the 1980s led to the implementation of the neo-liberal model. This crisis, which was caused by an increase in debt levels, resulted in a reduction in per capita gross domestic product, weakened productive structures and the state, increased poverty levels, and unequal income distribution. The high foreign debt also caused a decrease in international trade participation, high inflation rates, and a constant decline in living standards. International financial and economic institutions used this crisis as a means of pressuring so-called latin american countries to change their economic policies and influence their internal political processes (Díaz Londoño, 2011, p. 141).

“The practices of three private institutions have played key roles in the production and promotion of neo-liberal ideas on a global scale: the Mont Pelerin Society, the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) and the Atlas Economic Research Foundation.” Their work was mainly aimed “at producing a certain (neo)liberal common sense in specific socio-communication circuits, thus aiming at the formation of public opinion on the widest possible scales” (Mato, 2007, p. 20).

The Atlas Foundation has provided support to a group of sixteen Latin American institutions, including three in so-called: argentina (ESEADE, *Fundación Libertad*, and *Fundación República para una Nueva Generación*), one in brazil (*Instituto Liberal*), one in chile (*Libertad y Desarrollo*), one in colombia (*Fundación Desarrollo y Libertad*), two in costa rica (*Asociación Nacional de Fomento Económico* and *Instituto para la Libertad y el Análisis de Políticas*), one in ecuador (*Instituto Ecuatoriano de Economía Política*), one in guatemala (*Centro de Investigaciones Económicas Nacionales*), two in méxico (*Centro de Estudios en Educación y Economía* and *Instituto Cultural Ludwig von Mises*), three in Perú (*Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Legales*, *Instituto Libertad y Democracia*, and *Instituto de Libre Empresa*), and one in venezuela (*Centro de Divulgación del Conocimiento Económico*). These institutions have maintained their relationship with the Atlas Foundation (Mato, 2007, p. 30).

So-called méxico

Neo-liberal by design

Some words from Durito:

“‘Neo-liberalism made political doctrine’ is faithfully carried out by ‘junior politicians,’ who have been trained abroad and who have successfully created a ‘virtual reality’ hiding poverty and repression in Mexico” (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 104). “Let’s say that we have an ordinary country whose name is accented on the antepenultimate syllable and that is located, by chance, beneath the empire of stripes and turbulent stars. And when [we] say, ‘beneath,’ [we] mean just that, ‘beneath.’ Let’s say that this country is struck by a terrible plague. Ebola? [COVID]? Cholera? No! Something more lethal and more destructive... neo-liberalism! Fine, [we’ve] already told you before about this sickness, so [we] won’t stop to repeat [ourselves]. Let’s suppose now that a young generation of ‘junior politicians’ has studied abroad the way to ‘save’ this country in the only way that it conceives of its salvation, that is to say, without knowing its history and hitching it to the caboose of the fast train of brutality and human imbecility: capitalism” (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 107).

Mirowski both in *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective* and *Never Let a Serious Crisis Go to Waste: How Neoliberalism Survived the Financial Meltdown*, underscore the reeducation efforts. “Neoliberal intellectuals identified their immediate targets as elite civil society. Their efforts

were primarily aimed at winning over intellectuals and opinion leaders of future generations, and their primary instrument was redefining the place of knowledge in society, which also became the central theme in their theoretical tradition” (Mirowski, 2014, p. 42) (Mirowski & Plehwe, 2015, p. 431).

Conventional tales in so-called México locate the beginning of neo-liberalism with Salinas de Gortari in 1988. But as María Eugenia Sotelo Romero, argues in *Los orígenes del neoliberalismo en México: La Escuela Austriaca*: in so-called México “contemporary orthodox neo-liberal economic thinking has its roots in the thirties and forties of the twentieth century. Its representatives were businessmen and intellectuals with a broad economic culture, linked to the banking sector. Undoubtedly, they were all men of action who defended their proposals and outlined a long-term project for the country, intensely debating the heterodox interventionist and nationalist policies that the Mexican state promoted during almost the entire twentieth century” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 7).

By the time neo-liberalism governs so-called México with Salinas de Gortari, the neo-liberalization process had been underway for fifty years. Neo-liberal politicians were not just admirers of foreign colonial governments, they themselves had been educated within neo-liberal rationality—locally and internationally—in order to fully neo-liberalize so-called México when in positions of power.

Some of these representatives were: Luis Montes de Oca, Faustino Ballvé, Gustavo R. Velasco, and Aníbal de Iturbide, closely associated with Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek, as prominent members of the Austrian School of Economics, as well as the Mont Pelerin Society. This group was supported by a group of businessmen, led by Raúl Baillères, who were the driving force behind the Mexican orthodoxy of the 20th century. The ideas of this group were spread throughout the country by Montes de Oca's close relationship with these prominent economists, as well as other influential liberal intellectuals, including Jacques Rueff, Henry Hazlitt, Walter Lippmann, Franz Schneider, and Carl Snyder (Romero Sotelo, 2016, pp. 7–8).

Sotelo Romero “supports the hypothesis that the formation of the orthodox current in México, with Austrian influence, was a conscious act of a sector of the country's economic elite whose purpose was to create an alternative project to what has been called economic nationalism, which emerged with the Mexican Revolution of 1910 and consolidated with the economic and social reforms promoted by President Lázaro Cárdenas (1934-1940)” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 7). Known as *Cardenismo*.

During the 1980s, when the neo-liberal model was being fully established in so-called México, the group of liberal thinkers who aimed to train groups to build an alternative project to *Cardenismo* and economic nationalism had already disappeared. However, these businessmen had the foresight to train their successors in higher education institutions. Through these institutions, an elite group was formed that could modify the institutions of the *Revolución* and *Cardenismo* to lead the country towards a liberal economic and social policy. Consequently, neo-liberalism has deep roots in so-called México, having developed over the 20th century with

the intention of limiting state involvement in the economy, promoting free trade and foreign investment, and ending protectionism. Throughout the century, it remained in constant conflict with the State of the Mexican Revolution, of which it was the opposite (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 214).

Numerous structural changes were promoted since 1938, however, this is not an exhaustive study of México's neo-liberalization. We will study its process through: institutions that promoted neo-liberalism and the violent dispossession of communal land, as continuation of territorial coloniality.

Montes de Oca and the Austrians

In 1924, Montes de Oca was appointed *contralor general de la nación*, when president-elect Plutarco Elías Calles invited him to collaborate in his administration. "Three years later, in early 1927, he joined the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit, succeeding Alberto J. Pani. It was then that Montes de Oca met Walter Lippmann and Franz Schneider. Both journalists accompanied the American banker and ambassador Dwight Morrow to discuss with President Calles the oil problem and that of the Catholic Church. By then, Montes de Oca was Secretary of the Treasury. Everything leads to think that Lippmann was one of the important characters through whom Montes de Oca articulated himself to the international liberal movement of the time" (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 37).

In 1938 as director of the Banco de México, Montes de Oca translated Lippmann's book *The Good Society* into Spanish. "He proposed as the title of the book *Retorno a la libertad* because, in his opinion, it contained both the theses of the famed journalist and the measures outlined for the reconstruction of a renewed liberalism which, following the author's guidelines, he aspired to spread in Mexico" (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 40). "Still as general director of the central bank and during the government of President Lázaro Cárdenas, Montes de Oca set out to disseminate in the country the new liberal positions debated in the world that violated and contravened the president's economic and political project" (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 38). Among the reasons why he translated the book, Montes de Oca explains that he did so "to guide the youth, and even the current generation, along different paths, this work by Walter Lippmann, which was indispensable because with it he revives the discussion on the doctrine of [...] political and economic, intellectual and moral liberalism, which produced the greatness of the prolific, of the magnificent and exuberant nineteenth century" (Montes de Oca, 1940, p. vii) in (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 40).

"In 1940, [...] Montes de Oca left the central bank, the trench from which he had debated government policy. From that moment on, the combat strategy focused on strengthening liberal thought in other ways: founding institutions that would disseminate it and increasing the importance of private enterprise as an alternative to the intervening State. With this purpose, in the middle of the war, Montes de Oca promoted the

visit to Mexico of Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek. [After several invitations from Montes de Oca] In 1942, [...] von Mises arrived, who after his stay wrote in 1943 an interpretation of Mexican economic development in a long monograph, entitled *Problemas económicos de México, ayer y hoy* (von Mises, 1998b). This document is of great importance because the development project outlined by von Mises was crystallized, partially or totally, in the economic policies promoted by the government since 1982” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 72). The monograph was officially published by the Ludwig von Mises Cultural Institute in 1998 (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 73).

Von Mises and Montes de Oca had a productive relationship after their first meeting. Montes de Oca proposed founding the *Instituto Internacional de Ciencias Sociales* in 1942, with Von Mises as the director. In 1943, Montes de Oca updated Von Mises on the progress of the project and asked for suggestions on professors and their salaries. The institute would cover economics, history, and critical analysis of economic doctrines, constitutional history, economic and social history, and modern public finance. Through Montes de Oca, Von Mises became an advisor to the Mexican elite and helped with the formation of the *Instituto Tecnológico de México* (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 77).

Von Mises suggested that so-called México should have a hands-off approach to regulating the market and wages. He believed that the government should encourage the accumulation of capital, which would increase productivity and lead to higher wages. Von Mises also advocated for private property over collective property and for industrialization without protectionism, accepting the international division of labour. He strongly defended individualism and opposed any interference by the state in society.

He also considered the teaching of economics to be essential in creating a group of intellectuals who would advocate and defend orthodox beliefs while opposing heterodox views. He believed that this was a political and ideological issue. In so-called México, the founders of these institutions were linked to banking capital and supported the free market while rejecting the welfare state. They also promoted state intervention to strengthen market mechanisms and focused on studying the neoclassical current, particularly authors of the Austrian School. They opposed Keynesian policy, were anti-Marxist and anti-communist, and rejected policies of the Mexican Revolution and President Cárdenas. This current was highly doctrinaire (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 213).

Network of educational institution

In 1946, a group of businessmen led by Raúl Baillères founded the *Asociación Mexicana de Cultura* with the goal of promoting education and culture in so-called México as an alternative to the economic policies promoted since *Cardenismo*. The association aimed to establish higher education institutions with academic

freedom and no dependence on politics or economic hardship, to provide opportunities for cultural, scientific, technical, and moral education for Mexican youth. The association created the *Instituto Tecnológico de México* (later ITAM) to offer economics studies as an alternative to the curriculum at the *Universidad Autónoma de México* (UNAM), with some courses taught by businessmen (Romero Sotelo, 2016, pp. 93–96).

“In a 1988 interview, one of the founding partners, the banker Aníbal de Iturbide, clarified the circumstances that led this group of businessmen to create the Mexican Association of Culture and the Technological Institute of Mexico:

[In 1946] at the end of Manuel Ávila Camacho's presidency [...] there was still in force, in a very important way, an ideology, in our opinion mistaken, of Cardenist cut. The ideas of the government of General Cárdenas still had an important influence on the ideological development of Mexican politics and life, which seemed to us not to be the most fortunate way to seek a balanced development of the country.

Then a group of people, those of us who organized the *Asociación Mexicana de Cultura*, thought that if we had to encourage the industrial development of Mexico we had to try to change the mentality of the people, because with a predominantly socialist, leftist mentality, which was predominant in the political environment, we did not believe that industrial development was possible. It was not possible that this climate would be encouraging for the investment of capital, both Mexican and foreign, for México to begin a new period in its development, now predominantly industrial.

That was essentially the reason that prompted us to create the *Instituto Tecnológico de México*, having as our goal the creation of a school of economics from which would emerge the future men who would manage both the private and public economy of Mexico” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 97).

Javier Beristáin Iturbide, an economist and professor, was the nephew of Aníbal de Iturbide. He became the rector of ITAM at the age of 28 and held the position for 19 years, during which the institution was strengthened. He worked with Francisco Gil Díaz and Pedro Aspe Armella, both young economists. Gil Díaz was the coordinator and head of the Economics Department and a professor, while Aspe Armella was the head of academic services and coordinator of the Center for Economic Research. Aspe Armella would later work as the Secretary of Finance and Public Credit under president Salinas de Gortari.

Baillères, along with Montes de Oca and a group of people, worked together to promote the *Asociación Mexicana de Cultura* and ITAM until Baillères passed away in 1967. During his time as president of the association, Baillères convinced President López Mateos to grant university autonomy to ITAM on April 10, 1962. Baillères disagreed with the government's economic policies since the Cardenista era due to his increasing involvement in the economy. He created ITAM as an alternative project for the nation with the aim of preparing young people to transform a statist country into a liberal capitalist country in thirty or forty years.

Baillères' efforts were successful as many alumni and people related to ITAM assumed important government positions” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, pp. 159–162).

Two other relevant neo-liberal institutions were *Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales y Económicas, A. C.*, and *Instituto Cultural Ludwig von Mises, A. C.*, a full study falls beyond the scope of this research, but it’s important to briefly underscore their pernicious importance.

Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales y Económicas, A. C. was established to influence government policy in favor of domestic and foreign free enterprise. A study conducted by Merle Kling in 1961 shows that the organization was founded by Agustín Navarro Vázquez to pressure the government and defend its interests, while promoting the benefits of a free enterprise regime. The group was unique among interest groups in so-called México, as it provided foreign capital with an organized entry into the country and was an opposition group to the government. The group was supported by the social doctrine of the catholic church and had three objectives: conducting an anti-communist campaign, building an ideological climate favorable to private enterprise, and maintaining a systematic opposition to government intervention (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 199). The *Instituto* invited influential neo-liberal intellectuals, such as Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek, to share their ideas and proposals. They also aimed to create a specialized library focused on publications related to economic freedom and promote the publication of theoretical works on the Austrian school of economics, including Faustino Ballvé’s Ten Lessons. The institution believed that this work would be useful for those starting their studies in economics (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 202).

In 1983, Simón Bolívar, Carolina R. de Bolívar, and their friends established the *Instituto Cultural Ludwig von Mises* (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 206):

“to contribute to solving Mexico’s economic and social problems by proposing creative and effective solutions. Its name pays homage to the Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises, who had a profound influence on Mexico’s economic development between 1942 and 1969. Our institute is inspired by the activities of the Institute of Economic Affairs in London and other strategic think tanks around the world that apply a similar methodology in the defense and promotion of freedom.”

The institution’s main task was to study promote the principles of a market economy through various means such as conferences, books, articles, and radio and television programs.

“According to their point of view, all this dissemination and promotion effort deployed generated a current of thought in university centers, such as the *Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México*, *Universidad Panamericana*, *Tecnológico de Monterrey*, *Instituto Politécnico Nacional*, *Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana* and *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, which in turn led to ‘socialist philosophy’ being gradually replaced by ‘a paradigm based on the philosophy of freedom [...] and on a social market economy’” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 206).

These neo-liberal mexicans, worked towards creating institutions that would counter the Cardenist approach in politics and the economy. They established higher level educational institutions as an alternative to the leftist ideology of the public university, particularly the National School of Economics at UNAM. The group created specialized entities during the 20th century to teach and spread liberal and neo-liberal ideas and to train professionals who would influence the country's economic policy. They also established educational centers to develop an elite capable of participating in debates and constructing alternative projects to the interventionist and nationalist economic policies of the mexican state.

The directors of *Instituto Cultural Ludwig von Mises* explain this objective as follows:

“In economic education our fundamental task at the beginning was to open windows of opportunity to the study of the theories and fundamentals of market economics through conferences, forums, colloquiums, books, articles, publications and radio and television programs.

In the research we took on the task of planting collections of the most important books of the Austrian School of Economics, among them Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich von Hayek and other schools such as Public Choice and the Chicago School, in the libraries of private and public universities” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 8).

***Ejid*os and the privatization of communal land**

The push towards territorial neo-liberalization that aims to eliminate communal property, can be traced back before the Salinas de Gortari reform of Article 27 of the Constitution. One of the key objectives of this policy was to convert *ejidos* into private property through programs such as *Procede* (Baschet, 2018, p. 57). The present-day mexican *ejido* system, was established in the constitution of 1917, and implemented by Cárdenas during the 1930s (Esteva, 2012, p. 244).

“If at the beginning of the century the Mexican Revolution—a *campesino* and agrarian revolution—demanded land and freedom, in the course of the following years the struggles had to materialize the conquests and confront new and old enemies. In México, one of the most important conquests of the 1910 *Revolución* was a profound agrarian reform, which recognized half of the country's land as property of the *ejidos* and communities. Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution of 1917, in force until 1992, established the nation's ownership of land and water. It limited the extension of private property and considered the expropriation of large estates. It granted land rights to *campesinos* who lacked land” (de Ita, 2019, p. 95).

For 80 years, the mexican agrarian reform redistributed 103 million hectares of land (which is 52% of the country's total land area) to 3.5 million *ejidatarios* and *comuneros*, who formed 29,942 *ejidos* and agrarian communities. People had inalienable, imprescriptible, unseizable, and non-transferable rights over their properties, which included 56% of the agricultural land and 60% of the forests (de Ita, 2019, pp. 96–97).

During the Salinas de Gortari administration in so-called México from 1989 to 1994, *Procede*—Program for the Certification of Ejidos and Urban Land Rights—was introduced to modernize the countryside by promoting market-based solutions. A key aspect of this was the counter-reform to Article 27 of the Constitution in 1992, which allowed for the privatization of *ejido* land that was previously inalienable. The aim was to increase investment incentives and improve the functioning of land and labor markets in rural areas. The counter-reform cancelled agrarian distribution and established the basis for the rental and sale of *ejidos*. *Ejidatarios* could now obtain individual titles or certificates for their parcels, which allows them to rent, sell, hire labor, and use their land as collateral for loans. However, any decision to sell *ejido* land to outsiders must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the assembly (de Ita, 2019, pp. 96–97).

The reform aimed to remove restrictions in the functioning of land markets and “transition from consuetudinaries to individualized forms of land ownership” (Deininger & Lavadenz, 2001) in (de Ita, 2019). In the past, land was considered a social right rather than a commodity. The 1992 land counter-reforms were created to promote functioning land markets, as seen by neo-liberal designers and global institutions as the World Bank. The lack of functioning land markets due to the social nature of *ejidos* and communal property was perceived as a significant issue causing poverty, backwardness, low productivity, and profitability of the rural sector. *Procede* aimed to encourage the functioning of land markets by introducing well-defined property rights that could be enforced through the judicial system. Technocrats believed that the lack of security in property rights hindered agricultural investment in so-called México (de Ita, 2019, p. 103).

The case of so-called México is representative of how neo-liberalization operates at a national scale through capitalist accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2003, p. 137). Communities have been displaced and dispossessed through the violent pressure of: the privatization of commons, energy and extractive projects, infrastructure mega-projects, the ‘conservation of nature’ and real estate speculation and financialization (de Ita, 2019, p. 95).

This violent dispossession project is not new, it must be placed under the *longue durée* of territorial coloniality and the current neo-liberalization of the territory, and the neo-liberal influence of Salinas de Gortari project can be traced, to 1943 and von Mises long monograph. In *Problemas económicos de México*, “von Mises goes on to carry out a sectoral analysis of the Mexican economy. First, he addresses the backwardness of agriculture, originated in large part by the agrarian reform promoted during Cardenism in its collectivist version (*ejido colectivo*). In his opinion, the system of private land ownership was necessary for its development:

“The agrarian consequences of the Mexican Revolution would have been much more propitious if the rulers had considered as the main objective of their interference the creation of a class of free landowners who would till land of their absolute property that their children could later inherit. The poorer the land, the more important it is that the farmer should feel full ownership of it. He must be assured that every improvement will

increase his own material well-being and that of his children. The main condition for the farmer to work the land with devotion is a genuine sense of ownership. Freeholders enthusiastically support private ownership. They strive tirelessly if they know that they will enjoy the fruits of their toil and labor' (von Mises, 1998b, pp. 12–13)” (Romero Sotelo, 2016, p. 84).

So-called colombia

Neo-liberal by constitution

“The Political Constitution of 1991 with its beautiful mask of multiculturalism managed to confuse us, because while dozens of indigenous organizations were strengthened and born and there was full right to dialogue with the government, we were being stripped of our struggles and demands through procedures, formalities, administrations and other stratagems, to include us socially and facilitate us the ‘allowed rights.’ named by Magdalena Gomez from méxico referring to racism at the time of the ‘allowed Indian’ described by Charles Hale from guatemala (Hale, 2004); that is, they began to take ‘the water out of autonomy’ (Gómez, 2014) in the framework of neo-liberalism. Thus, six months after the approval of the Political Constitution (December 16), the State with its paramilitary forces committed the massacre of *El Nilo*, in which 20 Nasa indigenous people who were peacefully demanding their right to land were murdered. From that moment on, the people were forced to contain the land recoveries to avoid more deaths, but at the same time, they began to occupy us with legal procedures to include us in a subordinate manner. Thus also, while we continued to demand social inclusion protected by the victory won with the 1991 Political Constitution, neo-liberal multiculturalism was developing (Curiel Pichardo, 2014)” (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, p. 78).

These words by Vilma Rocío Almendra Quiguanás—who has her roots in the Earth, daughter of a *Nasa* mother and a *Misak* father, both originally from *Madre de los Bosques*, that is to say, from the *Kauka*, in the south-west of a territory now called colombia—indicates that neo-liberalization in colombia has two fundamental particularities, its violence and its coincidence with the 1991 new constitution. So-called colombia was neo-liberalized by constitution, rather than through small constitutional amendments. The following is not an exhaustive study of colombia’s neo-liberalization. We will study its process through: 1991 constitution, violence and *Economía Naranja*.

The neo-liberalization of so-called colombia is much closer to the north american current, led by Milton Friedman. The implementation of neo-liberal economic policies began in the 1990s with the “opening up of the economy.” The Barco government and economic associations had already been thinking about this in the late 1980s, and in 1990 President Virgilio Barco announced the Program for the Modernization of the Economy. This was further developed by President Gaviria's *Colombia: La Revolución Pacífica*, which aimed to

modernize and internationalize the economy, increase production and exports. The previous policy of import substitution was deemed outdated and ineffective (Díaz Londoño, 2011, p. 141).

While the institutional legal framework of neo-liberal policy was being established in so-called colombia through a series of reforms, the political process was also unfolding. This culminated in the call for a national constituent assembly election on December 9, 1990, which aimed to produce a new political charter within six months. The assembly sought to address the structural crisis of the political regime through negotiation agreements with demobilized sectors of the armed insurgency, such as M-19 and EPL. These groups agreed to participate in the redesign of political institutions and develop businesses in exchange for a return to civilian life. Although the constituent assembly was characterized as a peace agreement, it failed to include the main guerrilla forces, FARC and ELN. Despite representing ideological and political projects ranging from conservative to social democratic, a political consensus was eventually built to design a new constitution. This consensus reflected the ongoing neo-liberal transformations and the constitutionalizing of a social rule of law. While both neo-liberal and social democratic projects were present in the constitutional text, the former ultimately prevailed (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 258).

Ochy Curiel notes that “the discourses that we find in this text are an expression of the hegemonic ideology in colombian society, it expresses a significant legal, theoretical and political power, given that it contains, endorses and legitimises a discourse that was the product of negotiation and alliance of those who had the power to decide, write and order its prescriptions, that is, the constituents; [furthermore] it synthesises two things that [Curiel] considers important: law and writing as means and technologies for establishing power and hegemony. Specifically on the latin american continent, legal discourse has been central to the formation of hegemony from colonial times to the formation of national states, and writing, from a western enlightened logic. [...] It is obvious that this constituent process did not succeed in transforming social inequalities derived from gender, race, class and other power relations, despite its importance as the supreme and fundamental law of the nation and as the embodiment of the social contract that supposedly emanates from a broad social consensus. This ‘contract’ arose from negotiation between political and social forces. It also relies on the agency of subalternised groups, it partially ‘includes’ them, although in the end it is the groups that hold political, economic, social, sexual and racial power that have the upper hand. In the process that preceded and accompanied the new constitution, they are the same ones who define what the nation should be based on, among other things, how and when women should or should not give birth. As Gramsci has argued about hegemony, the dominant group generally organises the lives of subordinate groups not through coercion but through persuasion (Gramsci, 2003)” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 27,32).

Precedents

According to Jairo Estrada Álvarez, the grounds for the neo-liberalization of so-called colombia can be traced back to the limitations of the import substitution industrialization process, the accumulation regime based on the domestic market, and the tendencies towards a crisis of capitalist profitability. The Lleras Restrepo administration (1966-1970) initiated a change in economic policy towards export promotion (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 34), while the Misael Pastrana administration (1970-1974) created a housing financing system to stimulate the capital market. UPAC—*unidades de poder adquisitivo constante*—units of constant purchasing power, with this system it was expected to stimulate the capital market, as a result of the increase in financial savings that would be generated and, as a corollary, it was hoped that productive investment in the construction sector would increase and, thus, employment and income in a sector that was considered as a generator of multiplier effects on the economy as a whole (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 66).

Alfonso López Michelsen's (1974-1978) administration made a more consistent effort to strengthen neo-liberal policies, which were gaining recognition internationally due to their ability to address inflation in a world capitalist economy. The administration sought advice from Ronald McKinnon, a professor at Stanford University, "considered at that time, along with the Chicago School, as a bastion of neoliberal theories in the academic world," who designed tax and financial reforms to expand the capital market (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 35).

"The presidential period of Julio César Turbay Ayala (1978-1982) can be inscribed, without doubt, within the process of installation of neo-liberal policies thanks to the introduction of a series of measures aimed at the liberalization of foreign trade and in favor of fiscal austerity" (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 35).

In the 1970s, colombian students who were trained in elite universities in the United States played a significant role in promoting neo-liberal politics and ideology in so-called colombia. Salomón Kalmanovitz notes that "neoliberal ideology reached its greatest roots during the 1970s when Colombian students from the universities of Chicago, MIT, Rice, Stanford and California found a home in the private foundation *Fedesarrollo*, the *Universidad de Los Andes*, the Banking Association and the *Banco de la República* [...] Many of these cadres joined the administrations of Lopez Michelsen and Turbay Ayala and the interested unions to guide the new course of economic policy" (Kalmanovitz, 2003, p. 471) (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 68). Prior to this, the colombian government was inspired by *Cepal*, but pressure from the IMF and the promotion of financial reform by the Banking Association and the *Banco de la República* led to the adoption of monetarist ideology, actively promoted from 1971 onwards. The idea of implementing a capital market in so-called colombia was proposed by Edward Shaw, close to Milton Friedman's approach, and advisor to military governments in South Korea and Taiwan (Kalmanovitz, 2003, pp. 471–472).

Gaviria

“In 1990, Colombia introduced policies aimed at modernizing and opening up its economy, which were later implemented by the Gaviria administration. These policies aligned with the Washington Consensus, which had already been established as a neoliberal framework for economic reform” (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 254). César Gaviria was president between 1990-1994. He was part of both Turbay’s and Barco’s cabinet, first as Vice Minister of Economic Development and with Barco as Minister of Finance until 1987, when he became Minister of Government. In 1989 he resigned to become head of debate of the liberal candidate Luis Carlos Galán Sarmiento who was assassinated on August while in presidential campaign. Gaviria then becomes candidate of the liberal party, assuming power between 1990-1994 and heading the National Constituent Assembly that produced the Constitution of 1991. Making path to a full neo-liberalization of so-called Colombia. “Gaviria’s reforms showed the consolidation of an approach to economic theory and policy that serves as a support for the transnational leverage of broad sectors of the dominant elites interested in the new business of capitalist globalization and in their insertion into the new system of power underway. This approach, essentially neo-liberal, was reproduced by an intellectual elite and technocrats trained mostly in U.S. universities under the influence of neoclassical and monetarist orthodoxy. Gaviria’s kindergarten, was used to highlight the youth of a considerable number of neo-liberals who at the time were high-ranking public officials” (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 254).

The 1991 Constitution aimed to promote economic freedom through free enterprise and private property, while also requiring the State to protect natural resources and provide universal access to public services with a social approach. However, the issue of land democratization, which has caused violence and conflict in so-called Colombia for centuries, remained unresolved. The Constitution did not assign the state the role of entrepreneur or benefactor of the economy, but rather emphasized the relationship between the market and the state. Despite declaring itself a *Estado Social de Derecho*, Social State of Law, so-called Colombia embraced privatization and liberalization as means for progress and economic development (Valencia Mosquera, 2021, p. 255).

Irrespective of the political party in power, there has been a consistent effort to legalize the deregulation of the economy and implement fiscal discipline in so-called Colombia. This has led to the establishment of a neo-liberal order as a state policy. Although some believed the administration of Ernesto Samper was an alternative to neo-liberalism, it did not result in any significant policy changes (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 250). Estrada Álvarez argues, it is possible to identify five different moments, rather than periods, because of the overlapping of policies over time. “From the legal-economic point of view, five moments in the construction of the neo-liberal order in Colombia can be appreciated, namely: design and implementation of key structural legal reforms tending to deregulate the economy (1990-1991); formulation of the economic Constitution

(1991); deepening of economic deregulation through the design and implementation of constitutionally mandated legal reforms (1992-1998); crisis management order and reinforcement of economic deregulation and fiscal discipline (1999-2004); supranationalization of the legal-economic order through the ‘negotiation’ of free trade agreements” (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 250).

According to Estrada Álvarez, the culminating point of the establishment of a neo-liberal economic legal system can be seen in the process of negotiating “free trade” agreements. With the goal to establish a global economic legal system, similar to a political constitution, that will make the economic reforms of the past few decades permanent (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 111).

Think-tanks

Some of the think-tanks that promoted Colombia’s neo-liberalization were: The *Instituto de Ciencia Política* (ICP), *Federación de Organizaciones no Gubernamentales Verdad Colombia* (FVC), *Instituto Libertad y Progreso* (ILP), and *Institución Promoción de la Pequeña Empresa Latinoamericana*. The ICP was created in 1986 and is made up of people from different backgrounds who wanted to prioritize private investment over state investment. They promoted their ideas through publications, meetings, and teaching economics in universities. The FVC was created in 2001 and focuses on analyzing the armed conflict in so-called Colombia and promoting neo-liberal ideas and policies. “FVC is present on the radio through the program *Realidades*, broadcast on Sundays for an hour and a half, in the noon time slot. It discusses topics related to democracy, principles and values, the Colombian economy, and other issues of national and international interest. Interviews are also conducted with politicians, military, intellectuals and representatives of other neo-liberal think tanks and NGOs” (Valencia Mosquera, 2021, pp. 242–244).

Instituto Libertad y Progreso is a think-tank founded in May 2005 but with roots in the inactive *Fundación Desarrollo para la Libertad*. Its mission is to promote and defend the principles of western liberal democracy, particularly individual freedom, economic and market freedom, the rule of law, and political democracy exercised through individual autonomy. All these thin-tanks use various mechanisms to promote neo-liberalism, such as: publications, conferences, teach at universities, websites and legislative programs (Valencia Mosquera, 2021, pp. 245–246).

As we will see in further chapters, “in the field of higher education, with the issuance of Law 30 of 1992, progress was made in the process of deregulation of the higher education sector and the institutional legal framework was created for a growing organization of a (private) higher education market, a matter that had been taking shape since the issuance of Decree 80 of 1980. The regime of ‘freedom’ brought about by Law 30

of 1992 led to the emergence of ‘new operators’ of the service, who considered higher education as another business with good possibilities of profitability” (Estrada Álvarez, 2004, p. 99).

Violence

The neo-liberalization of so-called colombia has been accompanied and imposed through violent authoritarianism, militarization, and paramilitary groups. Social and political movements against neo-liberal reforms “have been stigmatized on many occasions as long arms of armed subversion” (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 279). And, the defeat of the insurgency is seen as necessary for the full implementation of the neo-liberal political project. Private property rights have been protected through military spending and the formation of private armies, and labor flexibilization has been enforced through violence, resulting in a high number of murdered trade unionists. Financial deregulation has facilitated the laundering of assets from illegal sources, while fiscal discipline has been selectively enforced to punish social spending. Military spending has increased under the guise of fighting terrorism and providing security for growth (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 280).

The fascist government of narco-paramilitary “Álvaro Uribe Vélez in Colombia (2002-2010) established a link between neo-liberal policies and internal conflict, through a growing militarization of state policy and a focus on *democratic security*. This concept was part of a broader plan to create an authoritarian, corporatist state known as the *communitarian state*. The government saw democratic security as essential to political and economic development, but this was achieved through the suppression of any dissenting political or social expression. The Uribe Vélez government also turned the social conflict generated by neo-liberal policies into a national project, with a focus on securing the support of the middle and lower classes. The government also linked security and economy, using the war on insurgency to justify increased public spending and US intervention” (Estrada Álvarez, 2006, p. 279).

Economía Naranja: Coloniality, repetition and neo-liberalization

As a final note, regarding the case of so-called colombia, let’s take a closer look at *Economía Naranja*, Orange Economy, the banal cultural attempt of Iván Duque when he was president between 2018-22. The latest absurd attempt to neo-liberalize colombia. We still need some time to see where/how the progressive government of Gustavo Petro moves. No hope in progressivism.

Coloniality’s mode of reason reproduces constant farce. The periphery is condemned to repeat its center, first the center is presented as high tragedy, then the periphery mimics the center as rotten farce. In other words, the coloniality of power, being and knowledge submits colonial nation-states to follow their

center, the *developed* center. Such power is not necessarily exerted in a direct manner but through the *logistics* of desires and aspirations.

Between 2018-22 so-called colombia had the lowest farce as president, *una marioneta con aspiraciones*. Duque was elected in 2017 and his election campaign was based on the so called *Economía Naranja*—Orange Economy. Duque, a mediocre politician and wannabe global bureaucrat started writing together with Felipe Buitrago about *Economía Naranja* while working at the IDB. Their orange project was defined as: “the group of linked activities through which ideas are transformed into cultural goods and services whose value is determined by intellectual property” (Buitrago Restrepo & Duque Márquez, 2013, p. 40).

Coloniality and the logistics of desires and aspirations operate from multiple sites and in different forms. Desires and subjection coincide. Duque is the prime example of a creatively colonized subject. Behind the farcical curtains of his orange endeavor, he projects his personal aspirations, a desire to be the new Mayor of London, as shown by his invitation to british creative “missions” or his claims that colombia could have been the next Silicon Valley. The marionette’s dream was to govern the San Francisco Bay Area or London, while stuck in colombia, while actually being himself ruled by some sort of creative telos. A fundamental characteristic of the neo-liberal rationality, as we have seen.

The orange economy could be the epitome of cultural coloniality, as the last step for the full neo-liberalization of colombia’s creative practices. The last push towards full economization and precarization, the road to progress via ruthless competition it—attempts—operates through the triad of coloniality: that of power through state apparatuses via economic control and public policies, secondly via the coloniality of being through the homogenization and contemporary imperative: Thou shall be creative! And lastly through the coloniality of knowledge through the control and extraction of intellectual property.

Economía Naranja as proposed by Duque was the lowest farce of the creative high tragedy, a ridiculous attempt to further “develop” colombia, as if europe was still a mirror in which to reflect. His vitamin c economy, while posing as a progressive policy, in reality was nothing more than a smokescreen to hide colombia’s pressing problems, a rotten farcical scene. While trying to capture yet more and more, the orange economy tries to subsume any creative and cultural expression. The orange economy is a clear example of a rotten farce, and at the same time its own biggest failure. Duque and Buitrago kept desperately trying to convince the whole nation to ride the creative train. A ride that ended as a slow train wreck. Since the beginning of the presidential campaign, they were unable to fully communicate to the general audience what *Economía Naranja* was and what it sought. A basic advertisement failure—in theory a field that should be well covered and exploited by the industries of creativity. Caught in the parasitic paradigm of innovation, the need for intellectual property of Duque and Buitrago, drove them impulsively to re-name the creative and cultural industries in order to possess and “control” a new brand, stating: “the cultural and creative economy lacks a

brand identity, we decided to label it the Orange Economy” (Buitrago Restrepo & Duque Márquez, 2013, p. 45). An incomprehensible creative orange brand. Overall the vitamin c economy, as a farcical repetition, relies fundamentally on the economization of creativity through the commodification of any cultural practice through the exploitation of intellectual property. Certainly, not an innovation, the creative and cultural industries have been at the forefront of capitalism since mid-twentieth century (Adorno & Horkheimer, 2002) (Adorno, 2005).

Spatio-territorial neo-liberalization or Neo-liberal architect(ures)

Spatio-territorial neo-liberalization

“Modern globalization, neoliberalism as a world system, must be understood as a new war of territorial conquest” (Sup Marcos, 1997)

A full study on the particularities of spatio-territorial neo-liberalization through Abya Yala, falls beyond the scope of this research. The focus remains on the neo-liberal architect, the fantasy of the uni-versal individual architectural subject, the uni-versity and its vocational neo-liberal education, and abstract-alienating-subordinated neo-liberal labour. Nonetheless, some key aspects need to be briefly mentioned. Spatio-territorial neo-liberalization has been mostly modulated through: professionalizing education, abstract labour under financial real estate market and state interventions, continuous extractivism, violent deterritorialization and dispossession, financialization, metropolization and ruthless competition. Territorial coloniality at large.

Three instances, might help illustrate and situate/spatialize/territorialize neo-liberalization. First, neo-liberalization as a situated, incomplete and ongoing process of de/territorialization of capital; second, speculation and financialization as neo-liberal commodification modalities of housing, and lastly the mineralization of subjectivity as neo-liberal governmentality through violent extractivism.

As mentioned before, neo-liberalization has been mobilized by numerous geographers, since it acknowledges the diverse modalities of neo-liberalism as it moves globally and is enforced upon various territories. As Peck and Tickell argue, drawing inspiration from the globalization debate, they suggest a process-based understanding of neo-liberalization as a phenomenon that has both external and internal components. Its “effects are necessarily variegated and uneven, but the incidence and diffusion of which may present clues to a pervasive ‘metalogic.’” Similar to globalization, neo-liberalization is a continuous process and not a final outcome. Additionally, it is full of contradictions and tends to provoke opposing forces, and its forms are shaped by historical and geographical contexts (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p. 383).

Carla Alexandra Filipe Narciso in *Urbanismo neoliberal y diseño del espacio público*, argues that the territorial expression of neo-liberalism in Abya Yala emerged due to the exhaustion of import substitution industrialization in the 1970s and the onset of a long recession following the economic crisis of 1982. This led to the implementation of neo-liberal policies and the extension of urban planning and large urbanism. Filipe Narciso then, draws from the work of Carlos de Mattos, and highlights three trends that marked the new phase of neo-liberal urbanism. These trends included the financialization of the world economy, the abandonment of centralized urban planning, and the promotion of urban competitiveness and marketing strategies (Filipe Narciso, 2013, p. 4).

In *La ciudad en la inflexión ultraliberal latinoamericana: reflexiones a partir del caso de Río de Janeiro*, Luiz Cesar de Queiroz Ribeiro and Orlando Alves dos Santos Junior, note that urban transformations in Abya Yala, under neo-liberal experiments, might be viewed as an adaptation in the space-time structure of the urban system. This adaptation is influenced by two historical factors. Firstly, the formation of a mixed urban order due to the extended process of capitalist urbanization in the periphery of the world-system. Secondly, the economic adjustment resulted from the conflicting coexistence of two projects, one neo-developmental and the other neo-liberal (de Queiroz Ribeiro & dos Santos Junior, 2022, p. 54).

The current urban order in Abya Yala is characterized by the coexistence of unequal and combined patterns in the organization and economic integration. This can be seen in the exchange of goods and services based on market logic, alongside social action oriented towards values such as reciprocity and redistribution. The classic latin american sociological literature has shown that despite urbanization, associativism, clientelism, corporatism, and patrimonialism still exist in the market, society, and state. These forms of organization and economic integration have historically constituted an institutional pattern of production and reproduction of the city in Abya Yala. This pattern is marked by the non-residual importance of informality and illegality of landowners and urban planning that coexist with formal production organized by real estate capital and the state. The hybrid institutional pattern results in three socio-spatial dynamics: self-segregation of the upper classes in certain spaces with better infrastructure and urban services; peripheralization of the popular classes in less favorable areas with inadequate public services and far from employment centers; and infiltration of the popular classes into middle and upper-middle-class neighborhoods through irregular settlements on hillsides, river banks, and idle lands (de Queiroz Ribeiro & dos Santos Junior, 2022, p. 54).

Queiroz Ribeiro and Marcelo Rodríguez Mancilla, in *Urbanización del capital y difusión de ideologías urbanas en América Latina: la ciudad como máquina de crecimiento económico*, compare the urbanizing agendas of various nation-states that occupy Abya Yala. In the case of ciudad de México they highlight, in 2014 from *Secretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda (Seduvi)*: Mission: urban development and territorial planning are tools that enable the construction of a territory with conditions of equity, sustainability and spatial quality, for

this reason an avant-garde, sustainable, equitable, competitive and inclusive city model must be established, with an international vision for the benefit of the inhabitants of Ciudad de México. Plan urban development and promote strategic and social impact projects with effective, efficient and transparent management. Vision: to be a dependency of evolution that promotes and applies the assigned resources in an efficient and effective manner, promoting innovation and continuous improvement in citizen care, as well as in the quality of life of the inhabitants of Ciudad de México” (de Queiroz Ribeiro & Rodríguez Mancilla, 2022, p. 461). Currently, in 2023, has as a mission to “generate and integrate a public urban and housing policy for territorial cohesion that contributes to the sustainable development of Ciudad de México” And, has as its vision “to have a Secretary for Urban Development and Housing that helps to ensure territorial justice and social inclusion, by innovating the system of planning and public management of urban development and contributing to the protection of the human right to housing, in congruence with the territorial planning of Ciudad de México” (SEDUVI, 2023). So-called México has been the ground of violent territorial dispossession through: turistification, massive infrastructural projects as the so-called *tren maya*, neo-liberal partnerships between the state and the financialization of housing, amongst others.

In the case of so-called Colombia, they highlight, from *Ministerio de Vivienda, Ciudad y Territorio* (2014): "Mission: Ministerio de Vivienda, Ciudad y Territorio contributes to improving the quality of life of citizens, promoting the planned territorial and urban development of the country and reducing the deficit in urban housing, drinking water and basic sanitation, through financing and development of public policy, corresponding programs and projects, with quality services and committed human resources. Vision: in 2021, Ministerio de Vivienda, Ciudad y Territorio will have managed to reduce the country's urban housing deficit and improve the coverage of urban and rural Drinking Water and Basic Sanitation services, contributing to improving the quality of life of Colombians and consolidating a better system of friendly and productive Cities, through participatory policies, programs and projects and modern Entities” (de Queiroz Ribeiro & Rodríguez Mancilla, 2022, p. 462). This of course did not happen. Today, in 2023, *Ministerio de Vivienda, Ciudad y Territorio*, mission is to “define and implement public policy through programmes and projects that articulate access to water, basic sanitation, land use planning, urban development, integrated water resource management, housing solutions and sustainability, adapted to the needs of the territories to improve the quality of life of the population.” And, its vision for 2023 “the Ministry will have strengthened the comprehensive habitat policy that allows territorial planning around water, expanding the coverage of access to public water and basic sanitation services and comprehensive solid waste management, as well as access to housing solutions to improve the quality of life of the population, thus meeting the needs of the territories, and strengthening their institutional capacities” (Minvivienda, 2023). Needless to say, it will also fail in 2030.

Real estate speculation and financialization

As a first example/illustration of spatio-territorial neo-liberalization we could focus on territorial coloniality at the urban scale, through speculation and financialization as neo-liberal commodification modalities of housing. More state and more market has paved the way to the financialization of housing.

Territorial commodification both in so-called colombia and méxico might be traced through the change in the production of public housing for the impoverished majorities. Since the 1970s the state moved from being an active designer and builder of public housing to administering individual subsidies and greasing the ground rules for massive real estate speculation at the expense of the poorest. There is a major distinction between both nation states, whereas the 1910 revolution led to land redistribution in so-called méxico through Article 27 and the creation of *ejidos*, so-called colombia didn't have a land redistribution process, fact that led to the initial campesino and marxist guerrillas.

The case of so-called méxico is symptomatic of how neo-liberalization operates at a national scale through territorial speculation. As we have mentioned, in 1992, Salinas de Gortari promoted *Procede*, that allowed the privatization and individualization of *tierras ejidales*, communal land. Since then, communities have been displaced and dispossessed through real estate speculation massive pressure. It is not the state stepping aside from territorial transformations, rather it is the state moving everything it can for trans/national real estate to operate violently.

We have already seen that even since 1943, von Mises had recommended the abolition of communal property, *ejidos*, which evidences how neo-liberalization operates in the long run of the commodification of the territory.

Victor Delgadillo Polanco, in *Financiarización de la vivienda y de la (re)producción del espacio urbano* (Delgadillo Polanco, 2021, pp. 2–4), draws a general outline of urban financialization, and notes that, real estate production has seen a tremendous increase in several cities across Abya Yala over the past few decades. This surge in real estate is being fueled by the influx of global financial capital that has found new and profitable ways to invest in built spaces. A phase of peripheral urban expansion, driven by the construction of social housing, has been followed by intensive urban development. Thus, modern skyscrapers with luxury or social housing and offices, corporate towers, and shopping malls are emerging in selected areas of several cities. However, on the outskirts of the cities, social houses have been built with minimal dimensions and cheap materials to address the housing deficit under the private property regime.

Numerous recently constructed spaces, meant for housing, work, and other purposes, are unoccupied or not fully utilized due to high sale or rental prices that most people cannot afford. Additionally, some of these spaces are built mainly as financial assets, focused on reproducing foreign capital. Despite the existence of

thousands of empty homes and offices, more office and residential towers are still being constructed. This raises the question of why offices are still being built, especially after the COVID-19 pandemic, which has resulted in more people working from home. Furthermore, Samuel Jaramillo (Jaramillo, 2021) asks why Latin American real estate production, which used to be a relatively minor aspect of capital accumulation, technologically and financially limited to national capitals, has become an attractive and lucrative investment opportunity for international capital.

The scale of the new real estate production is so vast that it has led to significant urban restructuring and creation of spaces that serve as reserves of value and international financial assets. However, according to Jaime Palomera (Palomera, 2018), this has also led to a new wave of real estate speculation that poses a threat to the planet. This phenomenon can be attributed to the massive financial sector that has emerged due to neo-liberal deregulation, the digital revolution, and the globalization of economic processes. As a result, cities are being used as investment portfolios by international financial investment funds. This has led to an increase in research on the financialization of the real estate market in Abya Yala and other regions of the world in order to better understand the causes and consequences of this trend. Ultimately, this new real estate and financial flood uses immobile assets such as land, housing, and buildings as vehicles for the reproduction of capital (Delgadillo Polanco, 2021, pp. 2–4).

As Raquel Rolnik, underscores in, *Urban Warfare: Housing and cities in an age of finance*, “we live under the empire of finance and fictitious capital hegemony, an era of increasing dominance of rent extraction over productive capital. The international literature on political economy of housing has termed this process ‘financialization.’ that is, ‘the increasing dominance of financial actors, markets, practices, measurements and narratives, at various scales, resulting in a structural transformation of economies, firms (including financial institutions), states and households’ (Aalbers, 2017). The promotion of the ideology of homeownership, already deeply rooted in some societies and more recently introduced in others, has been a central element of the new paradigm of housing. Together with the ‘socialisation of credit.’ it supported a double movement: on one hand, the inclusion of middle and low-income consumers into financial circuits; on the other, the takeover of the housing sector by global finance. This process opened a new frontier for capital accumulation, allowing the free circulation of funds throughout almost all urbanised land” (Raquel Rolnik, 2019, p. 28).

As mentioned before, by way of Safatle, neo-liberalism signifies the victory of the nation-state, rather than its diminishment to a bare minimum. On a similar line, Manuel Aalbers, in *The financialization of housing: A political economy approach*, argues that “while some authors conceptualize financialization in terms of ‘less state and more market,’ states and semi-public institutions are increasingly dependent on financial markets and are also evaluated using similar tools applied to firms. The state is often the driver of financialization processes, for example by pushing families into housing debt, by enabling financial institutions to buy up

subsidized housing, or by simply withdrawing from providing or regulating the housing sector and opening up the field to rent seeking financial institutions” (Aalbers, 2016, p. 19).

Back to Delgadillo Polanco (Delgadillo Polanco, 2021, p. 6), he problematizes the *epistemic coloniality* and *financial coloniality*, that operates through neo-liberal financialization, and notes, that: “financialization is one more concept, like that of Global City or Gentrification, where the direct translation from English was imposed in Spanish. In English, financialization is derived from the noun financial; and in Spanish, the concept derived from the adjective *financiero* should be *financierización*. But very few texts in Spanish use it, such as the one by López and Rodríguez (2010). Thus, the name that has ended up being used in Spanish is financialization.

Several colleagues maintain that, based on the relatively late temporality of the phenomenon and the study of the phenomenon (with respect to the United States, the United Kingdom and other European countries), the preeminence of the dollar and the euro in the global economy, and the the dimension of financial flows north-south, what happens in Latin America is a subordinate financialization: (Aalbers & Centro COES, 2020); (Abeles et al., 2018); (Lapavitsas, 2016); (López-Morales & Gasic Klett, 2021); (Ricardo Méndez, 2020); (Queiroz et al., 2020); (Shimbo & Rufino, 2019) and (Socoloff, 2019). ECLAC even recycles a concept from the 20th century, to speak of a ‘dependent’ financialization (Abeles et al., 2018)” (Delgadillo Polanco, 2021, p. 6).

As a final short note, we might entangle the already mentioned farce *Economía Naranja*. In 2020 the Decree 697 created the *Áreas de Desarrollo Naranja* (ADN), which are delimited and recognized geographical areas. These are designed to promote and enhance cultural and creative activities. Currently, there are two types of ADN. Induced ADN, created to transform unused spaces into new engines of economic, social, and cultural development. Spontaneous ADN, as the outcome of spontaneous clusters of economic activities linked to the cultural and creative economy. This is the true face of *Economía Naranja*, when the Trojan horse of creative and cultural industries falls on its own, what we have left is a violent machine of dispossession, deterritorialization, speculation and financialization, in the name of creativity (Ospina, 2021). *Economía Naranja* couples two primary sites of capital domination, labour and territory, by economizing any cultural activity and through the imbrication of creative industries with real estate speculation as technologies of territorial coloniality.

Extractivism and violence

As previously noted, from a political-ecology standpoint, situated in Abya Yala, Machado Aráoz, argues neo-liberalism is the emergence and prevalence of non-traditional forms of exploitation that are connected to

the exhaustion of vital energies, both bodily and territorial. Essentially, the underlying situation is the depletion of life sources, which is caused by the history of exploitation. This leads to the introduction of unconventional exploitation of both bodies and territories (Machado Aráoz, 2016, p. 243).

Machado Aráoz draws a solid and imbricated argument between extractivism, civilizatory catastrophe, coloniality and the production of subjectivity. Neo-liberal extractivism and violence through the *longue durée* of coloniality. Disciplines such as architecture, civil engineering, urban planning, and the newest mask, landscape urbanism are all involved in the mining industry, which is referred to by Machado Aráoz as part of a system of ecobiopolitical accumulation through dispossession-expropriation.

In *Potosí: Genealogía de la minería contemporánea*, Machado Aráoz (Machado Aráoz, 2018, pp. 261–262) argues, modern mining is a symbol of colonialism and has changed its way of operation throughout history. “Currently, in the phase of neo-liberal governmentality, of colonialism on a global scale, transnational mining emerges as an emblematic chapter of the new forms of subalternization of populations, territories and resources.” The domination of capital is no longer based solely on exploiting people but on exploiting territories. Mega-mining is a perfect example of this new stage, where expropriation is not just about taking away labour but also life at its source. The new technologies used in mining have given capital control over all aspects of life, including its sources and processes. This is what Machado Aráoz means by ecobiopolitical accumulation through dispossession-expropriation, “a modality of domination based on the integral control of the fundamental constitutive dimensions of human living environments”

Machado Aráoz, en *El auge de la minería transnacional en América Latina. De la ecología política del neoliberalismo a la anatomía política del colonialismo*, aims to bring attention to certain aspects of the mining boom that have not been adequately emphasized. He connects this boom to the geopolitics of neo-liberalism and traces its origins to the crisis of the post-war accumulation regime. He argues that the ecological question, and ecological-distributive conflicts in particular, played a crucial role in the gestation and manifestation of this crisis. Furthermore, he suggests that neo-liberalism can be understood as a socio-territorial reorganization of accumulation on a global scale, aimed at redefining the modalities of ecological imperialism and maintaining control over key natural resources. Machado Aráoz highlights the eco-geopolitical importance of Abya Yala in the system of global accumulation, both as a key player in the process of struggles that led to the crisis and as a sphere for experimentation and consolidation of neo-liberalism (Machado Aráoz, 2011, p. 151).

Abya Yala and the process of “mining reconversion” have a significant and exclusive role in the neo-colonial reconfiguration of the world under neo-liberal globalization. This process began with the oppressive state terrorism in the 1970s, continued with economic discipline in the 1980s, and ended with privatization and structural reforms in the 1990s. This transformation relied on excessive imperial violence, particularly demonstrated through the coups d'état in Brazil and Chile, which were closely linked to the mining interests of

transnational capital. The following dictatorships in Uruguay and Argentina and the Condor Plan further intensified the repressive terror in the region (Machado Aráoz, 2011, p. 157).

Machado Aráoz argues “the genealogy of neoliberal mining in Latin America has its neuralgic epicenter in the Pinochet regime (1973-1988).” The reforms that started in 1974, consolidated the 90s mining plundering in so-called Chile, “but would also later be applied as a ‘successful model’ in the remaining countries of the region in order to open them to large transnational mining corporations and politically create the conditions for the profitability of their extractive processes.” The reforms were based on three central pillars: legal security over mining concessions, fiscal and commercial benefits, and lax environmental controls. The legal security ensured the ownership of mining concessions and guaranteed foreign investments, while the fiscal and commercial benefits provided significant tax relief and legal stability for investors. The lax environmental controls included low standards for water, air, and soil quality, suppression of environmental impact funds, and decentralization of environmental control agencies.

The introduction of new legal and institutional foundations in Abya Yala created a great opportunity for global mining interests. The World Bank provided significant loans to speed up the modernization and reform of the legal framework for mining operations. As a result, several countries like Perú, Bolivia, Ecuador, México, Brazil, Guatemala, Honduras, Colombia, and Argentina introduced modifications to their mining legislation, adopting the new criteria imposed. These reforms made Abya Yala a privileged destination for large mining transnationals, leading to the entry of major corporations such as Barrick Gold, Newmont, Rio Tinto, and Xstrata Copper. The privatization of large state-owned mining companies also played a role in the mining boom of the nineties (Machado Aráoz, 2011, p. 164).

“A cycle of transformations is completed in which the recomposition of the colonial structure of the world takes place. After a period, tragic for the history of the peoples of the south, that goes from the beginning of the 1970s to the mid-1990s, the neo-liberal reconversion of the regime of global accumulation meant the imposition of a new scheme of colonial governmentality, a transformation of the modalities and links through which capital operates the differential appropriation and disposition of bodies and territories as objects of exploitation and means of accumulation. Symptomatically, at the level of global hegemonic discourses, simultaneously with the ‘improvement’ of neo-liberal globalization, the dominant environmental rhetoric expresses a paradigm shift, recovering the mythical reference to ‘unlimited growth’: the new Meadows report published in 1991, has already the suggestive title *Beyond the Limits* and, in its prologue, the Nobel prize winner in economics, Jan Tinbergen, praise it because it “clarifies the conditions under which sustained growth, a clean environment and equitable income can be organized ((Meadows et al., 1991); cited by (Naredo, 2010))” (Machado Aráoz, 2011, p. 164).

Neo-liberal extractivism, continues and expands the violence of territorial coloniality. Machado Aráoz, underscores that “there is a geography of the extraction of mining resources that is very different from the geography of mineral consumption: there is a clear differentiation between the countries of the south and the geopolitical north, with extractive processes concentrated in the former and the highest rates of consumption in the latter” (Machado Aráoz, 2011, p. 170)

Machado Aráoz then makes an argument on the neo-liberal city, the mineralization of subjectivity and the civilizatory crisis, which for him, fundamentally, pertains to bodies that lose the ability to sense danger and perceive threats to life. In conversation with Mina Lorena Navarro Trujillo, for the second number of *el Apantle, ¿Común cómo? Lógicas y situaciones, Claves desde la Ecología Política para re-pensar la ciudad y las posibilidades de comunalización*, Machado Aráoz (Machado Aráoz, 2016, pp. 252–255) argues that capital infiltrates personal experiences to trigger the methods and tools of commercial reproduction in the most intimate aspects of our emotions. This results in urban areas with extreme fragmentation where movement spaces are highly segmented and controlled. In the midst of a paradoxical stage of dispossession characterized by both intense violence and naturalization, Machado Aráoz, refers to anesthetization as the means to cope. This involves a consumerist mentality that promotes self-privatization and detachment from the events unfolding around us. He then draws on the work of Adrián Scribano, in order to “think of the idea of a civilizatory crisis not only as the material collapse of the world, which it is, the water, energy, and food crisis, but already as a civilizatory crisis, which has to do fundamentally with bodies that become incapable of feeling that life is threatened. The civilizatory crisis is a crisis of meaning: the inability to feel what is happening at the level of the flows of life; and inability to answer about the meaning of life. The neo-liberal city is predominantly inhabited by bodies that get used to exorbitant levels of violence, because our bodies have a historicity and our senses and emotions are molded under a certain sociability. So a history of violence and dispossession is creating like little monsters; Brazilian anthropologist, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, says, ‘we have become a society of drones, who kill without seeing and destroy without feeling.’ And that is very impressive; the logic of war today seems absolutely less bloody” (Machado Aráoz, 2016, p. 254).

Machado Aráoz, when discussing the ecobiopolitical, is referring to capital as a model of civilization that creates a state of insensitivity towards life processes and ties us to the commodification of our senses and desires.

On violence and the mineralization of subjectivity, Machado Aráoz notes, in *Minar. Colonialidad y genealogía del extractivismo*, that “modern mining produces minerals for modern life. This is absolutely dependent on mining, minerals and metals. There could be no State or Market; there could be no marriage alliances, family, or inheritance; the largest and most important industry that has existed from the beginning and that exists on the face of the modern earth would disappear: the industry of war; there could be no planes,

cars, computers, cell phones, or large-scale agriculture; there could be no comfort, luxury or hunger... Modern life is, 'inconceivable' without 'the' mining, in its evolution and in its present, a complete mineral experience. [...]

As such, modern life cannot dispense with colonialism-coloniality either; that is to say, it cannot deprive itself of resorting to the continuous exploitation of nature. Modern mining has naturalized exploitation; it has made it the basis of civilization. Western civilization has mineralized the human condition; that is to say, it has provoked an incredible capacity to tolerate and get used to violence and cruelty, its essential method of production. It has created an (in-)human species rarely disabled to feel and react to the devastation of life. [...]

Through the classically called process of rationalization—critically considered as colonization of the world of life and especially understood as mineralization of subjectivity—this mining has pre-constituted the generative bases of the modern habitus; it has been molding its typical, normal ways of thinking, feeling, acting, seeing, valuing; therefore, also of not-seeing, not-feeling, not-valuing... On the macropolitical level, that rationality of the *ego conqueror* has shaped a geopolitics, that of the colonial world, divided by the abysmal line that separates the colonial space from the center, from the colonial space of the periphery” (Machado Araújo, 2019, pp. 13–17).

Coda

What will come after neo-liberalism? Could it be, that similar to the argument Federici draws, that capitalism was rather than the transition from feudalism to capitalism, it was a violent counter-revolutionary project to dominate and control anti-feudalism struggles (Federici, 2004, p. 23)? After a few years in silence, Zapatistas have been releasing several *comunicados*. In the 14th part of this recent series, titled *Catorceava Parte y Segunda Alerta de Aproximación: La (otra) Regla del Tercero Excluido*, Fourteenth Part and Second Approach Alert: The (other) Rule of the Excluded Third they argue that: “Capital begins to replace neoliberalism as a theoretical-ideological alibi, with its logical consequence: neo-Malthusianism. That is, the war of annihilation of large populations to achieve the well-being of modern society. War is not an irregularity of the machine, it is the ‘regular maintenance’ that will ensure its operation and duration. The radical reduction in demand to compensate for supply limitations. It would not be about social neo-darwinism (the strong and rich become stronger and richer, and the weak and poor become weaker and poorer), or Eugenics, which was one of the ideological alibis for the Nazi war of extermination of the Jewish people. Or not only. It would be a global campaign to annihilate the majority population of the world: the dispossessed. Dispossess them of life too. If the planet’s resources are not sufficient and there is no spare planet (or it has not been found yet, although they are working on it), then it is necessary to drastically reduce the population. Shrink the planet through

depopulation and reorganization, not only of certain territories, but of the entire world. A Nakba for the entire planet” (El Capitán Marcos, 2023).

This seems to be *la tormenta fascista* ahead, considering what Rolnik argues that, neo-liberalism is not moving towards neo-fascism, but that neo-liberalism is always already fascist, which explains why the first experiment at a national level was violently imposed through pinochet’s dictatorship, and the current rise, or rather unmasking, of the right in Abya Yala (Suely Rolnik, 2023).

Through this first chapter, *Within/together and against/apart neo-liberalization*, we have outlined, a situated account, of the neo-liberalization of life particularly through the fields and forces of coloniality in so-called colombia and méxico. By way of various and in some aspects contradictory understandings of neo-liberalism: neo-liberalism as an ideological hegemonic project; neo-liberalism as policy and programme; neo-liberalism as state form, neo-liberalism as governmentality; neo-liberalism as rationality; neo-liberalism as pure theoretical shit and fourth world war; and neo-liberalism as unconventional forms of exploitation. We have expanded on how neo-liberalism as a rationality, a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life, has become a ubiquitous regime of existence, that is, a mode of reproducing materially and symbolically a specific existence, centered on an economic/market-based life. The current violent modality on the *war against subsistence* (Illich, 1981).

Such situated account on the neo-liberalization of Abya Yala, particularly the territories occupied by the nation-states of méxico and colombia, is meant as a departure point to problematize territorial coloniality and the production of the neo-liberal architect, through the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, vocational education and professional abstract-alienating-subordinated labour. By way of this triad we could draw a critique of architecture at large. A critique of territorial coloniality.

Along further chapters, we will advance and entangle; the neo-liberal government of freedom or the conduct of conduct through the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject; the dispositifs and logistics of neo-liberalization through architectural education or the pedagogies of the new industries of the self; the neo-liberalization of so-called méxico and colombia, through territorial coloniality, architectural labour and the production of architectural subjectivity, the architect. And lastly, through an abolitionist critique of education and labour, in other words, through de-schooling and de-professionalizing, we will problematize the neo-liberalization of the architect, and advance a critique of architecture at large. Co-moving beyond *homo æconomicus-architectonicus*, towards the end of “the reign of *homo educandus* and *homo æconomicus* [...] Liberation from the one cannot occur without liberation from the other” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 62). Because living in and with *neo-liberalism* can be more than just living by and for *neo-liberalism*.

Chapter 2

Masks and suspects or the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject

Masks and suspects

“For the strategy of colonial desire is to stage the drama of identity at the point at which the black mask slips to reveal the white skin. At that edge, in between the black body and the white body, there is a tension of meaning and being, or some would say demand and desire, which is the psychic counterpart to that ‘muscular tension’ that inhabits the native body” (Bhabha, 1986, p. xxxiv)

“The modern productive apparatus is an inverted cyborg that is not completed by its mechanical part, but is instead completed by its organic part, without which it would be impossible for it to function. Capital needs its agents of accumulation, the worker and the capitalist, which in principle could be robots lacking any will of their own, to possess and reproduce at least a minimum of that exclusive human faculty, which is ultimately what keeps it alive. How to build a human identity whose free and spontaneous will becomes confused in its identification with the irrepressible tendency to valorize its economic value, a tendency that beats with the force of an artificial, ‘thingly will’ [*voluntad cósica*]? The solution to this problem could only be offered by a type of human being whose identity is precisely ‘whiteness’; a type of human being belonging to a particular history that is already over a century old, but that nowadays threatens to spread throughout the planet. ‘Whiteness’ is not, in principle, an identity of a racial order. The pseudoconcretization of the homo capitalisticus certainly—and necessarily, for historical reasons—includes certain ethnic features of the whiteness of the ‘white man,’ but only as incarnations of other more decisive features, which are of an ethical order, that characterize a certain type of human behavior, a life or survival strategy. A certain ‘white’ appearance, which can be revealed in highly quintessential forms, is required, for example, to define the ideal modern and capitalist human identity, which would in principle be an identity indifferent to colors. This is an appearance that does not avoid any disfigurement or distortion of whiteness, so long as these elements can contribute to demonstrating on a global scale that human free will and the automatic ‘will’ of capital are unexceptionally interchangeable” (Echeverría, 2019, p. xxiii)

“*He who refuses to follow suit is suspect*” (Adorno, 2004, p. 61)

“If you don’t behave like everyone else, *la gente* will say that you think you’re better than others” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 18)

“The individual is entirely fabricated by society, in particular by its collective equipment. The idea of a transcendental subject that is irreducible to processes of semiotic contamination and subjection is a fiction. It is better to give up expecting anything from a supposedly free, autonomous and conscious individual subject (putting to one side a residual territory—an opaque and reactionary ego—that serves as a support for undertakings to annihilate every collective project), if nothing of the order of what we are calling here the ‘collective assemblage of enunciation’ is put into place to resist subjection and divert it from its goals. But scholarly thinking, as much as ‘profane’ thinking, concerned to preserve human values—in reality, a certain kind of value, a certain kind of society—doesn’t cease taking refuge behind the idea that one is entitled to hope for a reprieve for, the taking in hand of the individual human, whatever the manipulations of which it is the object” (Guattari, 2016, p. 12)

“We can think of ourselves as individuals, experience the world as individuals, put our whole life at the service of that individual we believe ourselves to be—at the service of the salvation of its soul or its accumulation of material wealth or prestige... but we cannot properly be individuals. We are knots of networks of concrete relationships: this defines our existential condition. Each self is a we, even if we do not know it or recognize it” (Esteva et al., 2013, p. 33)

“If cultural identity ceases to be conceived as a substance and is seen rather as a ‘state of code’—as a peculiar transitory configuration of the subcoding that makes the code usable, ‘speakable’—, then this ‘identity’ can also be shown as an evanescent reality, as a historical entity that, while determining the behaviors of the subjects that use or ‘speak’ it, is simultaneously being made, transformed, modified by them” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 75)

“If ontology as a philosophical branch speaks to all the ways that we are said to exist, and such ways are wrapped up in coloniality, white supremacy, and gender normativity, this means that to validly “be” one must adhere to what these supremacies have dictated. And when we fall outside of those mandates, we are met with punishment and discipline—

from the disapproving to the carceral to the fatal. When we fall outside, the space into which we fall is deemed impossible. But what does it mean to assert an impossible life? When one wishes to live that impossibility and enact radical change, it is quite difficult to do when the world is unwelcoming and even hostile to such a change, deeming one unrealistic, wrong, too-fast-too-soon, detached from material realities, and so many other accusations. One way to describe the practice of living that impossibility is to speak of paraontological life. One of those five-dollar words that few—not even me sometimes—quite understand, and even fewer care much about, paraontology refers to a way of being that refuses the options provided for our being. The “para” in paraontology invites us to care less about the mandates of ontology—mandates that offer paltry, unchosen options that stanch the possibility of life lived otherwise—and instead to care more about all those other things we might have been and might be if only we could unleash our imaginations. And, as we’ll see, that will include being unleashed from some things we actually think we deserve to hold on to” (Bey, 2023, p. 7)

How well must *we* know what *we are* in order to refuse that which *we are*? The amount of theories and systems that explain the human individual self formulated from a uni-versal standpoint is enormous and has long ago been unmanageable. This is not another attempt to draw a general theory of the subject. Nor, is this an exhaustive study of the current majoritarian subjectivities.

This is closer to a situated, trans-versal, problematization of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject in order to frame how the neo-liberal labouring subject poses as the current modality of the majoritarian subject, or as Sylvia Wynter would say, the genre that overrepresents the human. Which through the fields and forces of coloniality and the experiences of so-called México and Colombia, is overrepresented by mestizo-white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies.

This chapter moves trans-versally through the meanderings that meet, move away, confront and inform: Saidiya Hartman, Bolívar Echeverría, Fred Moten, Stefano Harney, Frantz Fanon, Sylvia Wynter, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Gloria Anzaldúa, Manuel Zapata Olivella, Suely Rolnik, Félix Guattari, Ochy Curiel, María Galindo, Almudena Hernando, Claudia von Werlhof, Christian Laval, Pierre Dardot, Michel Foucault, Jason Read, and many others. Through this intellectual compos(ing) of mostly anti-colonial, black radical tradition (black studies), sex-gender dissidences and schizoanalysis material-discursive practices, and how these problematize the “hegemonic western-bourgeois [bio-economic] descriptive statement of the human” (Wynter, 2015, p. 118) we co-move beyond-against and beyond the coloniality of being. In order to lay ground to a critique of architectural production of subjectivity, that is the violent push towards the white-totality of being,

through the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, vocational disciplinary education and professional abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. The re/production of professional identities as the architect.

The first section, *Uni-versal by design: The individual subject*, draws a general problematization of both the individual and the subject, from the standpoint of the colonial experience, and how processes of individuation and subjectivation push violently towards completion and homogeneity, in and for the white-colonial-male-cis-hetero image of human existence. And, it is more and more that this image is re/produced, circulated, consumed and bodied through labouring identities, such as the architect, for our purposes. The non-event of emancipation, following Hartman, of black enslaved africans sheds very potent light—because as William C. Anderson, notes: “Black people seeking liberation present great potential to counter the system because [black people existed] directly in contradiction to the system” (William C. Anderson, 2021, p. 24)—into the process of the production of the liberal-individual-subject, since it was supposedly enacted by law, one day an enslaved body, the next day a free subject, but as Hartman notes, this process came with other-modes of domination and specially subjection. The racial construction of freedom. Through the *double bind of freedom*, the liberty of selling ones-own labour power and the liberty of having nothing to survive, such was the *burdened individuality* (Hartman, 2022). This freedom of being, individual liberty, meant that the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, i.e., white cis-hetero hegemonic male existence, would be—as already was for many—the modality of existence to follow. Follow to in/completion.

The second section, *White by design: Coloniality of being or what does it mean being ¿human?*, examines how the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject is not just any/body. It is overrepresented by white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies. This overrepresentation, or this hegemonic presence, is constituted in Abya Yala, through the violent experience of coloniality. By way of Wynter, Barad, Garcés and Rolnik the following notes draw an entangled and contradictory, or should we say juxtaposed, or *ch'ixi*... cartography, of how the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject has been imposed through coloniality in Abya Yala, through three fields: ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia, coloniality of being and overrepresentation, and the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious. These three fields allow us to situate the colonial process of individuation in so-called colombia and méxico, which calls for a situated account of *mestizaje*, as a violent process of *blanqueamiento*—becoming white. Through the work of Rivera Cusicanqui, Zapata Olivella, Aguilar Gil and Navarrete Linares. In order to examine its imbrications with the regime of heterosexuality and whiteness, which enable the overrepresentation of the architect through whiteness, and its re/production of class-gender-race privileges.

The third and last section, *Neo-liberal by design: Economic subject(ion) Or when are we?*, asks, what are the current technologies, the modalities and the logistics of the neo-liberal re/production of subjectivity, if neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life as a ubiquitous form of

our existence (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 3)? And sustains, that in order to frame how the neo-liberal labouring subject poses as the current modality of the majoritarian subject, in the coming sections we argue that the imbrication of *homo œconomicus*, human capital, entrepreneur and consumer-citizen, are all modes of neo-liberal subjection that not only compose the basis for the ethno-class or western-bourgeois genre of the human, as Wynter would say, but also lay the ground for the modulation of the neo-liberal architect, overrepresented by mestizo-white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies, in so-called colombia and méxico.

Overall, we are not compelled to problematize the metaphysics of the subject, as self/ego/identity/consciousness but rather to refuse the push towards subjection, individuation and completion, through the modulation of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject. And, problematize the individual subject considered as a labouring-body, a working-citizen. A mode of existence with the supposed right and hence command to work, and how this subject in the frame of neo-liberal capitalism is modulated through uni-versity education, re/producing neo-liberal architects, neo-liberal architectural subjectivities. Because, the creation of architecture is the creation of the architect, architecture cannot be performed if there is no architect to perform it. There is no *architecture without architects*. Which does not mean, as we have said, that all architecture is directly done by architects, but that architecture as a technology of territorial coloniality operates *environmentally*. Architecture does not need a license. Architecture does not need the direct participation of the architect to be constructed, but it does need, the constant re/production of the architect. It is the architect that re/produces, and circulates, the bourgeois ideology of design and sustains the spatiality of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, the *architectural world*. The architect as a labour subjectivity, “conceiver of buildings,” relies on a fundamental premise: that of the *impossibility* of the individual subject. In other words, the architect, the form “conceiver,” the solver of spatial needs, the dictator of in/habits, the real estate speculator, the genius design author of white-spatiality, which is to say colonial territoriality, stands, first and foremost, on the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject. Meaning whiteness.

Because as Marquis Bey argues in *Anarcho-blackness: Notes toward a black anarchism*, “we seek the end of white men in order to think more broadly. A commitment to dismantling all hierarchies and being concerned with all oppressed people demands the dismantling of the ontological and epistemological habitus of the White Man” (Bey, 2020, p. 86).

Uni-versal by design: The individual subject

“‘There must be the understanding that there is nothing, nothing, nothing, absolutely nothing that you can do to improve, transform, or better yourself,’ said Krishnamurti. There is in fact nothing you can do by the false and bloody instrument of yourself. You can’t hack something by yourself. You can’t squat something by yourself. You can’t steal something by yourself. You can’t steal away by yourself. You can’t steal yourself. You can’t feel yourself. You can’t feel bad all by yourself. And yet we feel complicit in and as ‘my’ individuation! We feel the need for strategy! [...] Where we work, every inch of our institutional lives is scoured and scavenged for productivity, efficiency, improvement, and profit. So, too, is our every word and act, our every thought and feeling. This navigated place without waves, without salt, is ‘eager to assist, organize, and structure our lifestream logistics.’ We feel it straightening us out, uncurling us, those fingers on our scalp. And we say: But this is not my improvement, my transformation, my practice. So, we try to outsmart work, outmaneuver the organization, swim against the tide. In so doing, we fall directly into the jaws of the productivity tool. Because outsmarting work, strategizing ways to be in the institution while trying not to compromise, while trying not to feel complicit, is the productivity tool [...] The worker first produces herself, but in so doing produces not just herself but the very relations of capital. Whether informal or formal work, all work today is the work of outsmarting. That’s the job. All work today aims at the creation of the individual who games, who leverages, who arbitrages, working in their crowded, solitary way. Show us someone with an abashed career strategy and we will show you a cog with feelings” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 132)

“Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of this kind of political ‘double bind,’ which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures... The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state , and from the state’s institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualization which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries” (Foucault, 1983, p. 213)

“The subject, like politics, decentralises and totalises, separates and centralises, differentiates and hierarchises, continually reproducing a Norm to which to conform” (Tari, 2016, p. 175)

“The individual is entirely fabricated by society, in particular by its collective equipment” (Guattari, 2016, p. 12)

“Majority implies a state of domination, not the reverse” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 291)

“You don’t so much have a face as slide into one” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 177)

Have we become individual subjects by design? We are still submerged in the subject discussion sustaining identity. Individual subjectivity relies on its own impossibility. “The eurocentric colonial postures of hegemonic modern knowledge are based on the split between object and subject, and on the creation of reason as the abstract subject of objective and universal knowledge. the subject is a category referring to the isolated individual, because it is constituted in and before itself, in its discourse and in its capacity for reflection; for its part, the object is a category referring to an entity not only different from the subject-individual, but external; likewise, the object is also identical to itself, since it is constituted by properties that give it that identity, define it, that is, delimit it and at the same time locate it with respect to other objects (Quijano, 1988, p. 14). Thus, what is in question is, first, the individual and individualistic character of the subject, since intersubjectivity and social totality are denied as the seats of the production of all knowledge; second, the idea of object does not consider that properties are modes and moments of a field of relations; third, there is no such exteriority between subject and object, since there is a structure of communication between them (Quijano, 1988, p. 16)” (Marañón Pimentel, 2017b, p. 26).

Regardless if we are, subjects, individuals or individual subjects, processes of individuation and subjectivation push violently towards completion and homogeneity, in and for the white-colonial-male-cis-hetero image of human existence. Whatever the human for you means. And, it is more and more that this image is re/produced, circulated, consumed and bodied through labouring identities, such as the architect. We are not here arguing for you, for we, to become better architects, other architects. No. On the contrary, we are con-moving towards becoming unfit for architectural subjectivation. Unfit for labour subjection. Unfit for voluntary servitude. Because still, *coercion rather than consent defines the free market and free labour* (Hartman,

2022, p. xxxii). *Homo educandus* and *homo æconomicus* modulate the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, which in turn re/produce *homo architectonicus*. Or is it the other way around? Anyway, we seem to become individual subjects by design. Yet we refuse.

Uni-versal and the individual

“...not to seek the tranquility of the One, because it is precisely a manichean anguish; it is necessary to work within the contradiction, making of its polarity the space for the creation of an intermediate fabric (*taypi*), a weave that is neither one nor the other, but the opposite, it is both at the same time” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 102)

“No-thing is a thing as much as anything is every-thing. What is the thing then? A thing is but this incomprehensible incompleteness...” (Ferreira da Silva, 2021, p. 6)

“Individualization, in modern logic, implies reducing a person to the smallest unit of abstract categories. The individual is an airline passenger, customer, student, or worker in economic society; they are housewife or head of the household in its sexist regime; citizen or foreigner in the nation-state. Those who were individualized in the abstract category of the disposable, of the unemployable, could not resist that condition; but they still had, unlike those who were constructed as individuals from birth and lacked a communal or social fabric throughout their lives, the condition of concrete women and men, rooted in the realm of gender: they were constructed in communality and still carried it. They were not individuals, but persons: knots of networks of concrete relationships” (Esteva, 2022, p. 99)

“The promise of emancipation of the singular individual, which was suggested as a possible response to neo-technics, has been realized, but has become the opposite: the use of freedom as an instrument of a totalitarian constriction of the horizon of life for each and every human being” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 29)

“The living individual is a system of individuation, an individuating system, and a system that is in the midst of undergoing the process of individuating; internal resonance and the

translation of self-relation into information are in this system of the living being”
(Simondon, 2020, p. 7)

“We are communality, the opposite of individuality; we are communal territory, not private property; we are sharing, not competition; we are polytheism, not monotheism. We are exchange, not business; diversity, not equality, although in the name of equality we are also oppressed. We are interdependent, not free” (Martínez Luna, 2010, p. 17)

“Divided, divisible, dividing dividuality that affirms and concatenates the parts instead of isolating and unifying them. Head through the wall, ladder through the floor. No one rules the multitude of ghosts, no Holy Ghost controls the many voices, no father governs the sons” (Raunig, 2016, p. 23)

“The literacy manuals of the *Instituto de Lingüístico de Verano* introduced individualism, broke all sense of communal or collective ties, openly stated their fight against communism, or against opposition to the government in power, supported the action of the local authorities, even when these acted on the basis of repression, stimulated a pragmatic, puritanical consciousness, of individual climbing, of breaking with the extended family, projecting the image of a model or ideal of society that was concretised in the United States” (López y Rivas, 2004, p. 22)

“The model of the individual by the dominant social machine is too fragile, too open to any type of suggestion” (Guattari, 2015, p. 368)

According to Echeverría, individualism, “is a characteristically modern phenomenon,” that in “the practical social behavior presupposes that the atom of human reality is the singular individual” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 11). “It is a tendency of the process of socialisation of individuals, of their recognition and inclusion as functioning members of the human genre. It consists in privileging the constitution of individual identity on the basis of an abstract centre of synthesis: their existence as owners (producers/consumers) deprived of commodities, i.e. as members of an anonymous mass or lacking in qualitative definition, and integrated into pure exteriority. It is a question of a constitution of the person that imposes itself through, and even against, all those sources of concrete socialisation of the individual—some traditional, others new—that are capable of

generating for the individual qualitatively differentiated communal identities and interiority (Echeverría, 1995, p. 153)

How did the notion of the one, the single, the unique, the indivisible, the individual emerged? Echeverría argues there are three modern phenomena, which appear as civilizatory tendencies granted with a new principle of unitary coherence or a new modality of organizing civilized social life and the corresponding world, that displaces ancestral organizing principles (Echeverría, 2019, p. 2). In *Modernity and "Whiteness,"* Echeverría mentions three modern phenomena, first the trust in the physical, and reason, and progressivism, and the city as the site for such progress, second the secularization of the political and third, individualism, "that practical social behavior that presupposes that the elementary particle of human reality is the singular individual. [It] implies recourse to the notion of a contract, first private and then public, as the essence of any relationship that is established between singular or collective individuals. [And] the democratic conviction that, if a republican government is necessary, it has to be consented to and decided on equally by all. Individualism is a modern phenomenon that is always in the process of imposing itself on the ancestral tradition of communitarianism [...] Individualism is thus one of the major modern phenomena; it introduces an unprecedented way of practicing the opposition between singular individuality and collective individuality" (Echeverría, 2019, p. 4).

"The modern character of an individual, its actual internalization of the capitalist Puritan ethos, or, in other words, its 'sanctity' in having been chosen by divine grace, is recognizable above all in the high degree of productivity of its labor. The evidently productive aspect of its actions is what places the individual above the line that separates categorically the 'winners' or *salvati* from the 'losers' or *sommersi*" (Echeverría, 2019, p. 39).

From an archaeological perspective, Almudena Hernando, argues that, against relational identities, the *fantasy of individuality*, has produced dependent individuality, and has caused the collapse of the enlightenment ideal of emancipation. This belief suggests that individuals can exist separately from their community and that reason and emotion can be separated. However, this belief is a fantasy that has shaped our social system and provides a false sense of security for those in power. Postmodern thought acknowledges the importance of emotions in knowledge relationships, but it places too much emphasis on subjectivity, preventing objective validation. This belief in individual autonomy and the separation of reason and emotion is directly linked to the subordination of women. The concept of individuality became prominent in the XVII century and was solidified by enlightened thought in the VXIII century (Hernando, 2018, p. 8,9,63).

Individuality, for Hernando, "is, in emotional terms, a highly costly identity mode. Since change comes to define existence, individuality causes the constant feeling of anxiety brought on by our permanent state of never having fully become." However, men who embraced individuality were able to find stability and preserve their emotions through hidden mechanisms. These mechanisms went unnoticed because they

gradually became part of subjective experiences formed through rational relationships with the world. The subordination of women was necessary for maintaining the patriarchal order, as men relied on emotional support from women. This reliance on emotional assistance led to a perpetual state of dissatisfaction and the constant desire for change. Society's emphasis on individuality creates a need for continuous change, innovation, progress, and the generation of new ideas (Hernando, 2018, p. 65,82).

But, as Moten notes, “critics of colonialism and its rampant episteme, most notably Sylvia Wynter, have noted that one cannot produce the self-owning, earth-owning individual without producing the figure of man, whose essential inhumanity is evident in his restless theorizing and practicing of race. For how could a self-owning, earth-owning man not belong to a self-owning group instantiated in and on a self-owning world that is, at once, an absolute and expansive locale? The self-owning, earth-owning group sets itself apart from other groups—particularly, fundamentally, in violent speciation, from groups that do not own (either self or earth)” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 27).

And, regarding this constant state of anxiety, that Hernando mentions, which is brought on by our permanent state of never having fully become, Moten and Harney, argue for embracing incompleteness, failure and unfitness through/for complicity, or as Anzaldúa, from a sex-gender dissidence stance would say, against the “despot duality that says we are able to be only one or the other” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 19). “We fall so we can fall again, which is what ascension really means. To fall is to lose one’s place, to lose the place that makes one, to relinquish the locus of being, which is to say of being-single. This radical homelessness—its kinetic indigeneity, its irreducible queerness—is the essence of blackness. This refusal to take place is given in what it is to occur” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 45). “But feel, which is the embrace of incompleteness undetermined by the economy of in/voluntarity, can’t be subdivided into a whole bunch of anesthetized feeling some kinda way about our incompleteness. To say we feel complicit in and as our individuation is to say we feel complicit through our individuation. To feel complicit in the work of an organization, a profession, a corporation, is not a form of consciousness (of which the unconscious is not just one among many). It can’t distinguish mental from manual labor or good jobs from bad jobs. To feel complicit all by yourself is to be a good employee. It is also to be a good citizen, to vote strategically, to make policy, to feel bad about loving your city. But to feel complicit in all our incompleteness is to be revolutionary—so much so you might even call it otherwise than being. To enter with accomplices, to work with unseen friends, to plan everyday with someone, to be with someone, is so much more than being someone in being less than someone. [...] Accomplices disrupt the individuation of the complicity we feel in the organization. But the organization, too—the museum, the hospital, the school—constantly interrupts and violates the complicity we build. And yet, the more we deepen our complicit, collective, uncorrected friendships, the more the individuation machine and its ‘strategic career in and out of the institution’ malfunction. [...] As we hold on tighter to our complicities, the two can’t hold.

Neither can you. Neither can I. Something's gotta give and what gives is what gives. You and I are not complicit. We feel—we share—complicity” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 133).

If as Wynter has noted, “one cannot produce the self-owning, earth-owning individual without producing the figure of man,” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 27), it is important to situate the hegemonic process of individuation. Hartman, underscores that “whiteness was a valuable and exclusive property essential to the integrity of the citizen-subject and the exemplary self-possession of the liberal individual” (Hartman, 2022, p. 209). And, argues that the “illusory universality of citizenship” has been consolidated again and again, through “mechanisms of racial subjection” (Hartman, 2022, p. 206). She makes the case through the violent experience of *burdened individuality*, of black enslaved africans in so-called united states of america, by “examining the metamorphosis of ‘chattel into man’ and the strategies of individuation constitutive of the liberal individual and the rights-bearing subject,” Hartman underscores, that freedom and slavery are interconnected and that the changes brought about by the non-event of emancipation did not completely eliminate slavery. And, examines the power relations that led to the re-subordination of the formerly enslaved, the control and domination of the free black population, and the continued marginalization of black people. Overall, “the advent of freedom marked the transition from the pained and minimally sensate existence of the slave to the burdened individuality of the responsible and encumbered freedperson” (Hartman, 2022, p. 203). And points to the double bind of freedom, by characterizing, “the nascent individualism of emancipation as ‘burdened individuality’ in order to underline the double bind of freedom: being freed from slavery and free of resources, emancipated and subordinated, self-possessed and indebted, equal and inferior, liberated and encumbered, sovereign and dominated, citizen and subject. The transformation of black subjectivity effected by emancipation is described as nascent individualism because blacks were considered less than human and a hybrid of property and person prior to emancipation and because the abolition of slavery conferred belatedly the inalienable rights of man and brought them into the fold of liberal individualism” (Hartman, 2022, p. 204).

Hartman, attempts, through *burdened individuality*, as a critical term, to express the “antagonistic production of the liberal individual, rights-bearer, and black(ened) subject as equal yet inferior, independent yet servile, freed yet bound by duty, responsible yet reckless, carefree yet brokenhearted.” *Burdened individuality* refers to the difficult responsibilities of freedom without fully enjoying its benefits, the combination of equal rights with the domination and control of blackness, “the entanglements of sovereignty and subjection,” and the transformation of involuntary servitude through the concept of free labor. It is not simply that black individuals were unable to achieve the same individuality as white citizens, but rather that the discourse on black freedom emphasized hardship, struggles, and a burdened existence. *Burdened individuality* is a descriptive and conceptual tool used to explain the modes in which individuals are both subjected to and used as

instruments of power. This power includes repression, domination, disciplinary techniques, strategies of self-improvement, and interventions by the state (Hartman, 2022, p. 212).

“The individual fabricated is ‘free from dependence on the will of others, enters relations with others voluntarily with a view of his own interest, is the proprietor of his own person and capacities, and free to alienate his labor.’ Assertions of free will, singularity, autonomy, and consent necessarily obscure relations of power and domination; but the genealogy of freedom discloses the intimacy of liberty, violence, theft, and subjection” (Hartman, 2022, p. 216).

Subjects of whom?

“The individual, denuded in the harsh light of scrutiny, reveals a subject tethered by various orders of constraint and obscured by the figure of the self possessed, for lurking behind the disembodied and self-possessed individual is the fleshy substance of the disposable and the encumbered, the castigated particularity that shores up the universal. With this in mind, the transubstantiation of the captive into volitional subject, chattel into proprietor, and the circumscribed body of blackness into the disembodied and abstract universal seems improbable, if not impossible” (Hartman, 2022, p. 216)

“The subject-object relationship is a colonial inheritance that we have assumed in all fields, from epistemology to revolution. Among indigenous peoples, as Carlos Lenkersdorf reminds us, there is no such binary relationship but a ‘plurality of subjects.’ We are all subjects and everything that exists in nature (human beings, animals, plants, rivers, mountains.) But if everything is a subject and there is no object, *sujeidad*—subjection—tends to dissolve, to lose centrality, life tends to dis-subject itself. We enter the terrain of ‘non-subjection’” (Zibechi, 2015b, p. 150)

Are we still under the *ethico-onto-epistemic* regime of the subject and subjectivity? What came before, and what comes after the subject? (Cadava et al., 1991, p. 5). As Gilles Deleuze notes, the subject is not an ontological truth, but a concept. A concept that has primarily “fulfilled two functions, first, a function of universalization in a field where the universal was no longer represented by objective essentials, but by acts, noetic or linguistic. [...] Second, the subject fulfills a function of individuation in a field where the individual can no longer be a thing or a soul, but is instead a person, alive and sentient, speaking and spoken to (I-You)” (Deleuze, 1991, p. 94). If we are still under the *ethico-onto-epistemic* regime of the subject and subjectivity, as

Deleuze notes on the same text, “a concept does not die simply when one wants it to, but only when new functions in new fields discharge it. This is also why it is never very interesting to criticize a concept: it is better to build the new functions and discover the new fields that make it useless or inadequate” (Deleuze, 1991, p. 94). The uni-versal individual subject is not only a concept and model of the human, more importantly it is a project, as “power’s prime instrument in manipulating us to behave in certain ways” (Mansfield, 2000, p. 67). Problematizing such project requires a brief review/refusal of the uni-vocal, self-sufficient, enlightened, rational, *anthropo-phallo-ego-logo-eurocentric* subject.

As we have seen, through the neo-liberal “notion of autonomy, which is concretized in the concept of negative freedom, a precise model of the subject is implicit, namely that of an individual independent of others, not subject to any norm and, as such, always thought of in a relationship of mutual exclusion with the other” (Pereira da Silva et al., 2023, p. 4).

The subject is a disputed/contested concept. Most genealogies of the subject start with Descartes and Kant, the following notes do not intend to refute such starting point but to problematize this normative line of thought. This does not mean that Descartes and Kant did not have a pervasive influence on the conceptualization of the subject, it rather aims to broaden the spectrum, de-center and practice some epistemic dis-obedience. It is also, not a *better* conceptualization of the subject, but aims to un-cover what *anthropo-phallo-ego-logo-eurocentrism* has *encubierto*—covered over—as Dussel would say.

Enrique Dussel in *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of “the Other” and the Myth of Modernity*, questions eurocentrism and disproves both Habermas and Hegel, for whom as Habermas notes: “the key historical events for the implantation of the principle of subjectivity are the *Reformation*, the *Enlightenment*, and the *French Revolution*” (Habermas, 1987, p. 17). Such statement either, conceals or avoids, the conquest and colonization of Abya Yala, since as Dussel notes, both the experience of the encounter and conquest are “essential to the constitution of the modern ego, not only as a subjectivity, but as subjectivity that takes itself to be the center or end of history” (Dussel, 1995, p. 25). Dussel continues and points that both Hegel and Habermas exclude Spain and with it Abya Yala from their definition of modernity, refuting that so-called *latino américa*, since 1492, has played a significant role in the development of modernity, with Spain and Portugal being integral to this process. They represent the other “face,” or alterity, that is essential to modernity. The European ego/subjectivity immature and on the fringes of the Muslim world, continued to evolve, to then embody by/through Hernán Cortés and the conquest of so-called México, where the ego establishes itself as “lord-of-the-world and will-to-power.” This interpretation offers “a new world vision of modernity,” uncovering not only its supposedly emancipatory concept but also the “destructive myth of a Europeanism based on eurocentrism and the developmentalist fallacy” (Dussel, 1995, p. 26). In order to problematize and

argument how the *ego conquiro*—I conquer—antedates the *ego cogito*—I think—, Dussel elaborates a dual interpretation of modernity: a eurocentric definition and a worldly definition (Dussel, 1996, p. 132).

Dussel notes that “the problem of universality should have been formulated for modernity in a *never-before-undertaken* manner. Eurocentrism consists precisely in confusing or identifying aspects of human abstract universality (or even transcendental) in general with moments of European particularity, in fact, the first global particularity (that is, the first concrete human universality). Modern European culture, civilization, philosophy, and subjectivity came to be taken as such abstractly human-universal. [...] The *ego cogito* also already betrays a relation to a proto-history, of the 16th century, that is expressed in the ontology of Descartes but does not emerge from nothing. The *ego conquiro* (I conquer), as a practical self, antedates it. Hernan Cortes (1521) preceded the *Discours de la methode* (1636) by more than a century. Descartes studied at *La Fleche*, a Jesuit college, a religious order with great roots in America, Africa, and Asia at that moment. The ‘barbarian’ was the obligatory context of all reflection on subjectivity, reason, the *cogito*” (Dussel, 1996, p. 132).

Nelson Maldonado-Torres comments on Dussel, and suggests that, the *ego conquiro* provides the foundation for the *ego cogito*. Dussel agrees, stating that the “barbarian” is the necessary context for reflection on subjectivity and reason. The barbarian is a racialized self, characterized by constant questioning and suspicion of their own humanity. Therefore, the certainty of colonization and the *ego conquiro*, like Descartes’ certainty of the cogito, are based on doubt and skepticism. Skepticism is central to european modernity, serving as a means to attain certainty and establish a strong foundation for the self. Before Cartesian skepticism became central to modern understandings, another form of skepticism emerged, constituting modernity. Maldonado-Torres characterizes this skepticism, as *racist/imperial Manichean misanthropic skepticism*, which defines the attitude that supports the *ego conquiro*. Unlike Descartes’ methodical doubt, this skepticism does not question the existence of the world or the normative status of logic. Rather, it questions the humanity of colonized peoples. The Cartesian division between *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, or consciousness and matter, is built upon an anthropological colonial difference between the *ego conquistador* and the *ego conquistado*. This difference translates into a division between european and non-european, lighter and darker peoples, referred to as the color-line by W.E.B. Du Bois. If the *ego conquiro* foreshadows the subjective turn and solipsism of the *ego cogito*, then Manichean skepticism paves the way for and shapes the reception of Cartesian skepticism (Maldonado-Torres, 2007a, pp. 245–246).

The *ego conquiro*—I conquer therefore I am—which is to say, I dis/possess therefore I am, is the violent base of whiteness, of the white subject as owner of the world. As possessor. As privatizer. As conqueror. I possess therefore I am. Because, as Du Bois wrote, “whiteness is the ownership of the earth” (Du Bois, 1999, p. 30).

If the *ego conquiro* intends to draw a genealogy of the subject of power, what Hartman does, is a cartography of the subjection of non-being, of black enslaved peoples, ultimately to “grapple with the changes

wrought in the social fabric after the abolition of slavery and with the nonevent of emancipation insinuated by the perpetuation of the plantation system and the refiguration of subjection” (Hartman, 2022, p. 203).

Through a detailed historical approach, Hartman, shows that “coercion rather than consent defined the free market and free labor” (Hartman, 2022, p. xxxii). “In the archive of slavery, [Hartman] encountered a paradox: the recognition of the slave's humanity and status as a subject extended and intensified servitude and dispossession, rather than conferring some small measure of rights and protection. The attributes of the human will, consciousness, reason, agency, and responsibility-were the inroads of discipline, punishment, and mortification. This foreshadowed the subject of freedom and the limits of personhood bound indissolubly to property. The recognition of the formerly enslaved as a newly endowed subject of rights was not the entry to the promised land. This should not have been a surprise. Western humanism was born in the context of the Atlantic slave trade and racial slavery. It became apparent that being a subject was not the antidote to being a slave, but rather that these figures were intimate, twinned” (Hartman, 2022, p. xxxii). And notes, three important arguments, first that “the violence part and parcel of person hood and the recognition of the slave as a subject (we might even say the imposition of being made a subject) ” (Hartman, 2022, p. 5). “The selective recognition of the humanity of the slave did not redress the abuses of the institution nor prevent the wanton use of the captive warranted by his or her status as chattel, since in most instances the acknowledgment of the slave as subject was a complement to the arrangements of chattel property rather than its remedy; nor did self-possession liberate the former slave from his or her bonds, but rather sought to replace the whip with the compulsory contract and the collar with guilty conscience” (Hartman, 2022, p. 6). Second, that “the slave is the object or the ground that makes possible the existence of the bourgeois subject and, by negation or contradistinction, defines liberty, citizenship, and the enclosures of the social body. As Edmund Morgan has argued, the meaning and the guarantee of (white) equality depended upon the presence of slaves. White men were ‘equal in not being slaves.’ The slave is indisputably outside the normative terms of individuality and to such a degree that the very exercise of agency is seen as a contravention of another's unlimited rights to the object” (Hartman, 2022, p. 104). And third, that even though, “the freed came into ‘possession’ of themselves and basic civil rights consequent to the abolition of slavery. However, despite the symbolic bestowal of humanity that accompanied the acquisition of rights, the legacy of freedom was an ambivalent one. If the nascent mantle of sovereign individuality conferred rights and entitlements, it also served to obscure the coercion of ‘free labor,’ the transmutation of bonded labor or involuntary servitude, the invasive forms of discipline that shaped individuality, and the regulatory production of blackness” (Hartman, 2022, p. 209). Into *voluntary* servitude.

As Moten, notes, “a critique of the subject animates Hartman’s work. It bears the trace, therefore, of a movement exemplified by an aspect of Judith Butler’s massive theoretical contribution wherein the call to subjectivity is understood also as a call to subjection and subjugation and appeals for redress or protection to

the state or to the structure or idea of citizenship—as well as modes of radical performativity or subversive impersonation—are always already embedded in the structure they would escape” (Moten, 2003, p. 2) (Moten, 1999, pp. 1–2).

By way of Hartman, Spillers, Denise Ferreira da Silva and Laura Harris, Moten’s work is compelled, to “the analysis, preservation, and diffusion of the violent “affectability” of “the aesthetic sociality of blackness,” to which the violence of the slave owner/settler responds and to whose regulatory and reactionary violence it responds, in anticipation” (Moten, 2017a, p. xi). And underscores, that “the history of blackness is testament to the fact that objects can and do resist. Blackness—the extended movement of a specific upheaval, an ongoing irruption that anarranges every line—is a strain that pressures the assumption of the equivalence of personhood and subjectivity” (Moten, 2003, p. 1). Together with this equivalence, Moten, is also committed to study/un-do the opposition of identity and difference, between the homo- and the hetero-, or refusing the opposition of identity and difference, the opposition between one and many, or identity and multiplicity. And engage in practices of *world un-making* that experiment alternative modalities of life or existence (Moten & da Silva, 2021).

If Moten’s work is compelled to blackness’ resistance and the opposition of identity and difference, it is together with Harney and their practice of coming-together and writing, that is studying, that they generously share a critique of the individual subject through blackness and the incompleteness of existence, as to become unfit for subjection (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 35). Or as Denise Ferreira da Silva, writes in the preface to *All Incomplete*, “No-thing is a thing as much as anything is every-thing. What is the thing then? A thing is but this incomprehensible incompleteness, which is also Stefano Harney and Fred Moten generously offer to our attention. Incomprehensible incompleteness is then not so much the name for something or a somewhere from where resistance is attempted” (Ferreira da Silva, 2021, p. 6).

Moten and Harney, note that, “with the rise of logistical capitalism, it is not the product that is never finished but the production line, and not the production line, but its improvement. In logistical capitalism it is the continuous improvement of the production line that never finishes, that’s never done, that’s undone continuously. The sociologists caught a glimpse of this line and thought that they were seeing networks. The political scientist called this line globalization. The business professors named it and priced it as business process re-engineering” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 36). “If Locke invents the derivative, then Kant’s innovation is high frequency trading. And when Kant reverses the fortunes of logistics by announcing that it is the ends (of man) and not the means that are important, the human, the ultimate derivative, is fully logistically installed. The human is held up, [...] by logistics, a logistics that gives the illusion of a free-standing subject. A human universe appears to Kant, full of what he posits as human properties. [...] Logistics now has a subject and it is race. The humanization of the flesh is the racialization of the flesh. [...] This is why logistics is the science of

whiteness in/as the science of loss. Such is the peril to flesh/earth by the time of [...] Hegel, as Denise Ferreira da Silva teaches. [...] Now, to be obscure, as Saidiya Hartman instructs, is to be entangled; it is to be hunted, to be subject to the subject of the grasp. Sub-subjected thus, how can you say that we are persons? Flesh/Earth is assaulted by global improvement, worldly usufruct. With improvement, Hegel produces the regulatory framework called deregulation. Nothing will get in the way of the development of the race, or in the way of the race of developers. Arrayed before and through this is our opacity, given in and as our otium, that ante-programmatic disorder R. A. Judy speaks of as our speech, arrayed, as Fumi Okiji does and says, with mouths agape, in the curse, the damnation, the incompleteness that we share” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 15).

The struggle beyond-against and beyond the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, is the struggle against the false promise of completion and valorization, to *become uneconomic*. Echeverría notes, that “the realization or actualization of capitalist modernity culminates in the ‘phenomenon of alienation,’ described by Marx and later by Lukács. The human being during capitalist modernity is subjected —‘enslaved,’ Marx would say—to a metamorphosed version of *himself* in which *he* exists only as an economic value that values *himself*. The human being is reified as capitalist commodity value and enslaves *himself* to that self-substituting metamorphosis in which *he* has deified *himself* as an absolute subject whose unquestionable will must be religiously obeyed. The promise of emancipation for the singular individual, which was suggested as a possible response to neo-technics, is fulfilled, but turned into the opposite, into the use of freedom as an instrument for the totalitarian restraint of the life of each and every human being. If the world of modern life is ambivalent, [...] this is due to the fact that subjectness—the character of the human being as subject—only seems able to realize itself as an alienated subject; in other words, the human subject is able to assert *himself*, but only to the extent of, paradoxically, negating *himself*” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 18). Of course it is a man, this subject.

Echeverría comments on the subject and the possibility of enlightenment by way of Horkheimer and Adorno, that enlightenment is a fundamental ontological fact that is implicit in their work. They also argue that humans commit an act of violence when they assert themselves and separate from what is considered “the Other.” It is an act of self-assertion and the realization of freedom, understood as the ability to organize and structure the world. This concept of freedom is also discussed by Sartre, who describes it as the emergence of human existence from the indeterminacy of being, “at the same time that Horkheimer and Adorno work on *Dialectic of Enlightenment*; in the midst of ‘being-in-itself,’ as a failure, appears a crack, a gap, a ‘bubble of nothing,’ which is the ‘being-for-itself: human existence.” This act of violence involves changing one's own way of being or re-purposing elements from the Other to create order in the world. However, this act of violence creates a conflict between humans and the Other that cannot be resolved. A true reconciliation can only occur through the renewed exercise of freedom, which is a new phenomenon that has emerged from the

Other. According to Horkheimer and Adorno, freedom is not simply a matter of good or bad, but it goes beyond these concepts and the natural harmony that is only valid when reconstructed (Echeverría, 2019, p. 30).

According to Echeverría, the potential for enlightenment lies in the inherent ontological “violence” that occurs when a subject asserts its own selfhood in relation to others, forming their concrete identity. This violence is determined to be “trans-natural” or “meta-physical.” However, in certain parts of *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, the violence of enlightenment is only understood as aggression and not as transcendence. It is depicted as a wrongdoing against “creation,” an act of arrogance against the natural order that modern humans increasingly engage in and are punished for. “Civilization is the triumph of society over nature—a triumph that transforms everything into mere nature.” Nevertheless, it allows for the interpretation of enlightenment as a concept where violence towards others can be seen not only as a sin or hubris, but also as a form of respect and exaltation, presented as a challenge (Echeverría, 2019, p. 31).

Echeverría, argues that, “the constitution of subjectness over the substrate of animal naturalness brings with it the attempt or tendency of the subject to ‘persevere in its being,’ to repeat itself as identical to itself in different situations over the course of time and over the extension of space” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 31). However, this tendency can be carried out in two opposing ways. The term “persevere” can have two completely different meanings, just like the term “enlightenment.” This difference is significant in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Perseverance as self-affirmation does not necessarily mean self-preservation. It can be carried out as self-endangerment or self-preservation. Self-affirmation involves remaining faithful to the form that the subject created when transcending the Other and accepting the trace of negated animality. This fidelity entails trying to transform that form into a different substance over time and space. Perseverance in this context is the effort to protect a form from disappearing when faced with changing circumstances. It is not about protecting territory or maintaining a fixed identity. Perseverance is a contingent act of insisting on a form's existence without any foundation or destiny. “It is not capable of founding or submitting to any destiny. It is a gratuitous, contingent act, without foundation, of insistence in a form that must continue to assert its existence” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 31).

And, Moten asks, “what is it to own oneself; to keep oneself in hand; to grasp, and thus also to know, oneself?” (Moten, 2018b, p. xi). When, *we are* still, under the *ethico-onto-epistemic* regime of the individual subject and subjectivity. Under/for the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject.

The urgency is not what the subject is, or how subjectivity has been framed, but to refuse and think differently about our existences, to rehearse new modes of learnings, doings and inhabitings that foster other modes for existence beyond-against and beyond the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject.

White by design: Coloniality of being or what does it mean being ¿human?

“But they don’t want to go to the fundamental issue. Once [Fanon] has said *ontogeny-and-sociogeny*, every discipline you’re practicing ceases to exist” (Wynter & Thomas, 2006, p. 3)

“The regimes of the unconscious are distinguished according to the distribution between active and reactive micropolitics that guide its management. This distribution is manifested in the different degrees of presence and/or absence of social and cultural regulators that encourage desire in its active movements and inhibit the propagation of its reactive movements. Different regimes of the unconscious produce different formations in the social field and their respective politics of subjectivation. The active and reactive movements of desire are defined according to whether or not they make it possible for life to express itself in new modes of existence when it is suffocated in the forms in which it is embodied in the present” (Suely Rolnik, 2022, p. 149)

“The designer works within the class division of society and, to be sure, on the side of his employers, the owners of capital. The designer does so also when designs and builds the factories, workshops and warehouses that will enter as means of production in the inventory of the capitalists. It fulfills the same mission when its technical practice is placed at the service of the construction of premises for the repressive or ideological apparatuses of the bourgeois state. Finally, the urban designer acts in the same sense when, despite its good will, and becomes an instrument of the global programming of urban class segregation and of the strategy of maintaining that ‘urban disorder.’ which is nothing but the inviolable and sacred order of free private initiative; that is, of the free will of capital—reflection in space of the reigning chaos in the capitalist market—, which the bourgeoisie defends with blood and fire as the maximum conquest of the ‘dignity of the individual’” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 57)

For lack of a better term, we shall refer to our bodied lived-experience as ¿human? Are we to become white by design? Again, the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject is not just any/body. It is overrepresented by white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies. This overrepresentation, or this hegemonic presence, is constituted in Abya Yala, through the violent experience of coloniality. By way of Wynter, Barad,

Garcés and Rolnik the following notes draw an entangled and contradictory, or should we say juxtaposed, or *ch'ixi*..., cartography of how the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject has been imposed in Abya Yala, through the colonality of being, *ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia*, and the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious.

By way of Karen Barad and Fernando Garcés, we argue that an ontologic diglossia could be proposed following Garcés' epistemic diglossia, or rather underscoring the inseparability pointed by Barad, an *ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia*. A *diglossia* that in the presence of a variety of modes of being and inhabiting, "one of them occupies a hegemonic place of recognition and valuation of ontological virtue," and the uni-versal human being is produced—emphasizing as Garcés does when he reminds us of the "etymological evocation that implies: a verse, a discourse [...] that displaces all the others"—that shapes, overlaps and limits other possible modalities for existence (Fernando Garcés, 2007, p. 232) (Barad, 2007, p. 185).

Wynter argues that the overrepresentation of the human has moved through the "reinvention of Man1's civic humanist homo politicus as that of liberal monohumanist Man2 as homo oeconomicus, together with its now fully desupernaturalized sociogenically encoded order of consciousness" (Wynter & McKittrick, 2015, p. 35). And is further examined by way of Ferreira da Silva's arguments that, Wynter's radical move, "begins with the ontological question—that which ponders human existence and who/ what we are—alongside 'the idea of race.' Specifically, she focuses on the ways in which the [structures] of colonial juridical-economic power are encoded, and thus sustain, what it means to be human while also offering a refiguring of humanness that is produced in relation to the monumental history of race itself" (Ferreira da Silva, 2015, p. 93).

Suely Rolnik, by way of Fanon and Guattari, proposes the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious or *inconsciente colonial-casfishetístico*. By unconscious, Rolnik refers to the "factory of worlds whose management varies according to the political and socio-cultural systems" (Suely Rolnik, 2022, p. 148). Initially, the notion of the "colonial-capitalistic unconscious" designates "the regime of unconsciousness proper to the system in power in the west five centuries ago (today in power in the whole planet)." (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 98). Rolnik, argues that capital appropriates life itself, specifically its vital potency to create and trans-form worlds, as well as the cooperation necessary to realize this potency. The regime uses this vital force of creation and cooperation to shape a world in line with its goals. This shift means that the regime's power is not solely economic but also cultural, subjective, and even ontological, giving it wider, more subtle, and harder to combat its influence (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 28).

These three fields, colonality of being, *ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia*, and the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious, allow us to situate the colonial process of individuation in so-called colombia and méxico, which calls for a situated account of *mestizaje*. Through the work of Rivera Cusicanqui, Zapata Olivella, Aguilar Gil and Navarrete Linares, we argue that *mestizaje* has been a violent state project of

blanqueamiento—becoming white. As such, it is imbricated with the regime of heterosexuality and whiteness. All this meanderings through, the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, the over-representation of the human, the coloniality of being, the ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia, the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious, mestizaje, patriarchy, cis-heteronormativity and whiteness, in order to better understand the over-representation of the architect by petty-bourgeois mestizo men, through the imbrication and inseparability of class-gender/sex-race asymmetric power relations.

Ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia

“I ascribe a basic importance to the phenomenon of language. That is why I find it necessary to begin with this subject, which should provide us with one of the elements in the colored man’s comprehension of the dimension of the other. For it is implicit that to speak is to exist absolutely for the other” (Fanon, 2008, p. 8).

“...there is a retaining-wall relation between language and group. To speak a language is to take on a world, a culture” (Fanon, 2008, p. 25).

“...one’s identity does not look at the other as in a mirror, but has to break or go through this mirror to find an affirmative meaning to what in principle is nothing but a racist and ethnocentric insult or prejudice. However, this sort of negative reciprocity (you insult me—I insult you) cannot hide the other conditioning element implied by the colonial fact: the hierarchical structure in which the various strata of society are placed on the basis of the position they occupy in the appropriation of the means of power—among them the power over the image and over language, that is, the power to name—and which, therefore, confers unequal capacities to ‘attribute identities to the other’ and, therefore, to ratify and legitimize the acts of power through acts of language that end up being introjected and anchored in the common sense of society as a whole” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 68)

“In the official discourse, self-ascription is enough to be considered indigenous, in fact, and for statistical purposes, only those who speak a language belonging to one of the eleven linguistic families that were spoken in what is now Mexican territory before Cortés arrived with Indo-European on his lips are indigenous. When asked explicitly, my

grandmother denies being indigenous, she is *ayuujk*, she says, and she knows it well, people of the language of the mountain. For me, the world was divided in two and it was very clear: if you did not speak *ayuujk*, you could only be *akäts* (non-mixe); whether you were Japanese, Swiss, Tarahumara, Guarani or Zapotec, you could only be called that: *akäts*. It is no gratuitous that in most indigenous languages there is no word for indigenous. Establishing new and multiple simultaneous contrasts, I realized that behind the name a web was woven, a web that can be a trap” (Aguilar Gil, 2020, p. 39)

“...what the structuralists say is not true: it is not language and communication that engender subjectivity. At a certain level it is collectively manufactured like energy, electricity and aluminum” (Guattari, 2009, p. 74)

If *we are*, as Wynter argues, in “Fanonian-adapted terms, a hybridly auto-instituting, languaging cum storytelling species” what we propose, by way of Wynter and the *coloniality of being*, Barad and *ethico-onto-epistem-ology*, and Garcés’ *diglossic paradigm*, is that through language, through our mythoi capacity, coloniality operates towards a violent and constant domination, homogenization and destruction of language, of our poetic capacity to inhabit, imagine and construct worlds. Towards the homogenization of a uni-versal language, both verbal and spatial. Through *ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia*. Because as Rivera Cusicanqui underscores, if we consider the great biblical figures on linguistic diversity, we find that linguistic diversity is a punishment for earthly pride, that phallic and frighteningly punishing babel-tower of plurality, makes linguistic diversity to be seen as god’s punishment. And, she asks what language would god speak? (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2016) We could answer, now, most probably english, or any other white-imperial language. And Echeverría, notes that “the myth of the Tower of Babel inverts the sense of the facts, as is the way of myths. It presents as a curse, that is to say, as a negative, external and reversible fact, something that (without having to be affirmed as a blessing) constitutes an indispensable richness of the human: its plurality. The inability to conceive the other in its otherness, the need to perceive the other as a version (usually diminished) of the self, is clearly shown here” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 56).

“In 1999 and 2000, Sylvia Wynter was invited to give the keynote address to the 2nd and 3rd Annual Coloniality Working Group Conference at State University of New York at Binghamton. The culmination of these two keynote speeches, published in 2003, was entitled ‘Un-Settling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Toward the Human, After Man, Its Over-Representation’ (Wynter, 2003). In her two keynotes and in the article, Wynter engaged those who had been present at both events, as well as other scholars of the SUNY-Binghamton academic community from a variety of disciplines. The 2000 conference

title, 'Un-Settling the Coloniality of Power,' was in reference to a concept proposed by Anibal Quijano, a faculty member at Binghamton at the time as well as an invited speaker at the 1999 conference. It was the notion of 'Coloniality of Power,' the subject of his 1999 address as well as the title of a subsequent published article (Quijano, 2000) that the Coloniality Working Group took as their main theme. Wynter, in her 2000 keynote address, while paying tribute to Quijano's foundational concept, complicated the matter of 'Coloniality' and hence the central theme of the conference, by insisting that coloniality is never merely a question of 'Power.' Wynter renamed the issue for her audience with the four-part heart-of-the-matter concept of Coloniality—that of 'Being/Power/Truth/Freedom'—and proceeded to illustrate why it was indeed a four-part, and not a one-part, discussion" (Gagne, 2007, p. 256).

Santiago Castro-Gómez (Castro-Gómez, 2007), proposes the *triangular structure* of coloniality, the coloniality of power / knowledge / being, in turn, Wynter (Wynter, 2003), questions coloniality from a *quadruple structure* of being / power / truth / freedom. These structures of coloniality, the coloniality of power / knowledge / being / truth / freedom have modulated and neutralized the forms of being-human into fixed roles that respond directly to the global ontological structure of coloniality. This homogenization does not have a single place of concretion; on the contrary, as Foucault observes, it takes place at an environmental level through processes of production of subjectivity(ies) that are operated from different places, scales and forms (Foucault, 2008). The family, schools, universities, professional associations, international organizations are, amongst other, machines of neutralization / subjectivation that operate from the logistics of desires and aspirations.

Similar to the quadruple and triangular structure of coloniality, that suggest the inseparability of power, perhaps the diglossic paradigm could be re-composed through Karen Barad's concept of *ethico-onto-epistem-ology*, which emphasizes that: "Practices of knowing and being are not isolable; they are mutually implicated. We don't obtain knowledge by standing outside the world; we know because we are of the world. We are part of the world in its differential becoming. The separation of epistemology from ontology is a reverberation of a metaphysics that assumes an inherent difference between human and nonhuman, subject and object, mind and body, matter and discourse. *Onto-epistem-ology*—the study of practices of knowing in being—is probably a better way to think about the kind of understandings that we need to come to terms with how specific intra-actions matter. Or, for that matter, what we need is something like an *ethico-onto-epistem-ology*—an appreciation of the intertwining of ethics, knowing, and being—since each intra-action matters, since the possibilities for what the world may become call out in the pause that precedes each breath before a moment comes into being and the world is remade again, because the becoming of the world is a deeply ethical matter" (Barad, 2007, p. 185). And, question the neutralization of being through ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia.

Fernando Garcés, from a de-colonial reading, by way of Martin Lienhard's elaborations on the *diglossic paradigm* and *cultural diglossia*, extends it: “to the whole spectrum of asymmetric cultural interrelations that characterize Latin America, and makes use of it for reflecting on linguistic and epistemic coloniality.” He then proposes an *epistemic diglossia*: “that in the presence of a variety of knowledges and know-hows, one of them occupies a hegemonic place of recognition and appreciation of ontological goodness” (Fernando Garcés, 2007, p. 232). In line with the coloniality of being.

Diglossia is a concept developed from sociolinguistics, which explains the variants of a language in a certain area. It means “the conflictual coexistence of two or more languages or language variants within a territory under asymmetrical conditions of use and evaluation. In this way, one of the languages in question [in a multilingual system] monopolises all uses and functions for itself, while the others restrict their uses and functions” (Fernando Garcés, 2007, p. 232). Martín Lienhard proposes the concept of cultural diglossia: by applying the diglossic construct to the cultural domain, and stresses that its power lies in the observance of communicative practices rather than in languages as objects (Lienhard, 1996). The same is true for cultural intra-actions: in contrast to the diglossic model, which represents a “radical confrontation between metropolitan and indigenous norms,” the three “interpretative paradigms for the functioning of cultural interaction processes” in so-called *américa* are *mestizaje*, acculturation and cultural pluralism. These are “characterized by a teleological discourse and point to an inevitable cultural homogenization” (Fernando Garcés, 2007, p. 232). The diglossic model proposes the de-essentialization of identities; the study of cultural processes attempts to dispense with fixed categories—absolute axioms. Garcés takes up Lienhard's ideas from a decolonial reading and uses the diglossic paradigm to expand it: “to the entire spectrum of asymmetrical cultural interrelationships that characterize Latin America [...] as well as linguistic and epistemic coloniality.” In this way, he proposes an epistemic diglossia: “that in the presence of a multitude of knowledges and know-hows, one occupies a hegemonic place of recognition and evaluation of ontological virtue” (Fernando Garcés, 2007, p. 232). An ontologic diglossia could be proposed following Garcés' epistemic diglossia, or rather underscoring the inseparability, an ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia following Barad. A diglossia that in the presence of a variety of ways of being and practicing/knowing, “one of them occupies a hegemonic place of recognition and valuation of ontological virtue,” and the uni-versal human being is produced—emphasizing as Garcés does when he reminds us of the “etymological evocation that implies: a verse, a discourse [...] that displaces all the others”—that shapes, overlaps and limits other possible modalities of existence.

Overrepresentation and coloniality of being

“...one cannot ‘unsettle’ the ‘coloniality of power’ without a redescription of the human outside the terms of our present descriptive statement of the human, Man, and its overrepresentation” (Wynter, 2003, p. 268)

“...the Negro, the Native, the Colonial Questions, and postcolonially the ‘Underdeveloped’ or Third/Fourth-Worlds Question can be clearly seen to be the issue, not of our present mode of economic production, but rather of the ongoing production and reproduction of this answer—that is, our present biocentric ethnoclass genre of the human, of which our present techno-industrial, capitalist mode of production is an indispensable and irreplaceable, but only a proximate function. With this genre of the human being one in the terms of whose dually biogenetic and economic notions of freedom both the peoples of African hereditary descent and the peoples who comprise the damned archipelagoes of the Poor, the jobless the homeless, the ‘underdeveloped’ must lawlikely be sacrificed as a function of our continuing to project our collective authorship of our contemporary order onto the imagined agency of Evolution and Natural Selection and, by extrapolation, onto the ‘Invisible Hand’ of the ‘Free Market’ (both being cultural and class-specific constructs)” (Wynter, 2003, p. 317)

“How do we be, in Fanonian terms, hybridly human?” (Wynter & McKittrick, 2015, p. 45)

Who is this hu/man that in the presence of a variety of modes of existence, occupies a hegemonic place of ontological recognition and appreciation, over-representing the species? Such is the question that weaves much of the work by Wynter. “Working alongside W. E. B. Du Bois, C. L. R. James, Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire, and Elsa Goveia, among others, Wynter dedicates her own past and still ongoing work to the furthering of the ‘gaze from below’ emancipatory legacy. This legacy had been born out of the overall global range of anticolonial and antiapartheid struggles against the overtly imperial and colonial liberal monohumanist premises” (McKittrick, 2015, p. 11).

As cuadernos de Negación underscores, “others have said it before us and in an accurate way, therefore, we will continue overusing quotes” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 29). So, let us examine the arguments of Wynter by way of Denise Ferreira da Silva, in *Before Man: Sylvia Wynter’s Rewriting of the Modern Episteme*,

who argues, that “In “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Toward the Human, after Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument,” Sylvia Wynter outlines the potential retrieval of the human (us, all of us, the “human species”) from the bowels of the oversized figure of the human subject produced by modern philosophical and scientific projects, namely, Man. In doing so, she centers the colonial in the examination of the modalities of subjugation at work in the global present. What Wynter brings to the table is a version of the epistemological transformations that constituted modern thought—in the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, respectively—which follows very closely Foucault’s chronology. She adds to this the critical question of how, as Quijano states, “the idea of race” does the work of the “naturalization of colonial relations between Europeans and non-Europeans.” Importantly, Wynter does not seek an answer to the question of how “the idea of race” has served as an ideological excuse for colonial domination. Rather, she proposes an account of the relationship between juridical, economic, and symbolic moments of power that is very faithful to the early tenets of historical materialism. Both the Renaissance and Enlightenment epistemological transformations, she argues, were ‘made possible only on the basis of the dynamics of a colonizer/colonized relation that the West was to discursively constitute and empirically institutionalize on the islands of the Caribbean and, later, on the mainlands of the Americas.’ For Wynter, as for Marx and Engels, the dominant ideas of a *civitas* reflect the conditions of economic production. Hence her path differs radically from the conventional liberal critique, which sees “the idea of race” as a mistaken, false scientific apprehension of the human body. Similarly, her thinking differs from the conventional historical-materialist critique, which sees ‘the idea of race’ as an ascriptive sign without direct correspondence to economic production. What is her radical move here? She begins with the ontological question—that which ponders human existence and who/ what we are—alongside ‘the idea of race.’ Specifically, she focuses on the ways in which the architectures of colonial juridical-economic power are encoded, and thus sustain, what it means to be human while also offering a refiguring of humanness that is produced in relation to the monumental history of race itself. ‘Race,’ she states, ‘was therefore to be, in effect, the nonsupernatural but no less extrahuman ground (in the reoccupied place of the traditional ancestors/gods, God, ground) of the answer that the secularizing West would now give to the Heideggerian question as to the who, and the what we are.’

How does Wynter articulate her version of the secular ontological argument? In the first description of Man (referred to as Man1), she links the epistemological transformation of the Renaissance to the reconfiguring of *civitas*—a reconfiguring that was underwritten by conquest and the architectures and procedures of colonial power it engendered. How did conquest perform this feat? Citing Jacques Le Goff, Wynter reminds us that the medieval, Spirit/Flesh pair established two distinctions, a nonhomogeneity between “the spiritual perfection of the heavens... as opposed to the sublunar realm of Earth.” With this, “the geography of the earth” is also “being divided up between... its temperate regions centered on Jerusalem... and those realms that, because

outside this Grace, had to be uninhabitable.” This spatial and ideological narrative would be disproved by the Portuguese travels to the Americas, as those geographies ‘outside Grace’ were, in fact, inhabited. The emergence of a new framework of political (juridicaleconomic) power set in place in the Americas and the Caribbean yielded an ‘epochal rupture.’ Wynter argues, then, that this rupture ‘was to lead to the gradual development of physical sciences... made possible only by the no less epochal reinvention of Western Europe’s matrix Judeo-Christian genre of the human, in its first secularizing if still hybrid religio-secular terms as Man as the Rational self and political subject of the state, in the reoccupied place of the True Christian Self.’ This is to say that travels of colonial conquest were entwined with the ideological shift away from medieval Christian man and the shift toward secularized rational man as the inhabitants of the Americas, those residing in what was formerly considered to be ‘outside Grace,’ were rendered irrational. From then on, the rational/irrational pair would then remap the ‘space of otherness’ and, significantly, be represented by the bodies and territories subjected to colonial power. As such this distinction—irrational/rational—is always already written as political, ‘civic-humanist,’ and the theory of sovereignty.

In linking the emergence of a secular ontological account of Man to the ‘voyages of discovery’ that instituted the colonial modality of power, Wynter fractures the glassy depiction of the classical thought Foucault has offered. She does so in two moves. On the one hand, she recalls the link between Hobbes’s and Locke’s accounts of the *civitas* as the Empire of Reason (even if still in a conception of nature as the domain of the divine, and a conception of the ‘natural man’ as both effects and tools of secular universal reason). On the other hand, she argues that Man, posited as a natural thing, would also be elevated in such a way that all other modes of being human would be symbolically disavowed. This naturalization of Man, positioning one mode of human as naturally rational and good (a purely natural-biological thing), negates the ability to distinguish the human from other natural things. The production of the human, Man, and nature draws attention to Wynter’s reconceptualization of the classical order. Specifically, her thinking recasts the formal table/ruler and the tools for classification and measurement Foucault describes as being introduced in the colonial juridical-economic context. That is, in Wynter’s description of the mode of thought governed by the ‘table of identities and difference,’ she shows us how Necessity (‘laws of nature’) would serve Freedom (‘the laws of society’). In this context, emancipated reason (Wynter calls it ‘degodded’) is both subjected to the demands of European-colonial societies and to its economic needs and also put forward and calcified as the sovereign, final determinant—the final cause—of everything social. With this, she deploys the colonial to fissure Foucault’s glassy classical order, reproducing at the level of the symbolic, the colonial juridical-economic grid, thereby inviting a return to the kind of critique of ideology Foucault dismisses.

The postmedieval secularization of Man is followed by a second descriptive statement of man (Man2), framed with the evolution paradigm and put forth in Charles Darwin’s insights on natural selection and

science. This ideological shift revised humanness, according to Wynter, to differentially categorize 'all the colonized darker-skinned natives of the world and the darker-skinned poorer European peoples themselves.' The 'new master code,' a purely scientific one, divided the world into the 'selected' and 'dysselected.' Within this Darwinian context, the figure of Man is overrepresented as human according to a 'principle of nonhomogeneity,' which is 'embodied in the new line W. E. B. Du Bois was to identify as the color line: that is, as a line drawn between the lighter and the darker peoples of the earth, and enforced at the level of social reality by the law-likely instituted relations of socioeconomic dominance/subordination between them.' The color line would replace the previous codes (medieval and classical) 'in order to enable the selected/dysselected, and thus deserving/ undeserving status organizing principle that it encoded to function for the nation-state as well as the imperial orders of the Western bourgeoisie.' She adds that the paradox of the Darwinian descriptive statement that 'defines the human as a purely biological being on the model of a natural organism' derives from the fact that it must sustain 'strategic mechanisms that can repress all knowledge of the fact that its biocentric descriptive statement is a descriptive statement.' That is, the biocentric descriptive statement, which casts some as naturally selected and most of the world as naturally dysselected, reflects a particular collective self-representation and not an eternal (extrahuman) truth determined by the immutable, objective, and necessary 'laws' and 'forms' of nature. For Wynter, the distinctions found in the global space—the Negro, the native, the colonial, or Third/Fourth World question—result not from our present mode of economic production but rather from the ongoing production and reproduction of 'the bourgeois answer to the question of what is human and the present techno-industrial, capitalist mode of production [that] is an indispensable and irreplaceable, but only proximate function of it.'

What is important in this argument, then, are the ways in which the relationship between the economic and the symbolic, between material production and ideological production, are inverted, with the latter (symbolic/ ideological production) rendered determinant. More crucially, and through an anti-Foucauldian move, Wynter couches her analysis of modern thought on the promise of an answer to the ontological question that does not represent a particular version of the human as the Human as such. For her, the shifts in episteme described above—medieval, classical, biocentric—'were not only shifts with respect to each episteme specific order of knowledge/ truth, but were also shifts in what can now be identified as the 'politics of being'; that is, as a politics that is everywhere fought over what is to be the descriptive statement, the governing sociogenic principles, instituting of each genre of the human.' What her formulation of the ontological question also does is to unearth a struggle (rewriting Marx's class struggle) between different 'descriptive statements of the human . . . about whose master code of symbolic life and death each human order organizes itself.'

While Wynter and Foucault agree on the selection of the markers of the epistemological transformations that constituted modern thought, what accounts for the fact that Wynter finds Man emerging much earlier than Foucault? [*In Toward a global idea of race* (Ferreira da Silva, 2007), Ferreira da Silva] describes how Foucault's Man, the self-determined (interior/temporal) thing, would only emerge when transcendentalism was manufactured to describe Europe's particularity, to distinguish the mode of being human found in Europe from those encountered in other regions of the globe. For Wynter, however, Man, as the selected ontological signifier for Europeans and the Human in general, makes its appearance before Formal Transcendental (universal/pure) reason became the Living Transcendental (universal/teleological) subject, and also before Hegel's correction of Kant's soulless mapping of the modern onto-epistemological grounds. Now Wynter's critical move is to conceive of the classical order, and the rational grids (measurement and taxonomy) organizing it, as a transmutation (juridical-economic → symbolic) of colonial power. Such a move unsettles modern onto-epistemological assumptions precisely because she subsumes formalization, the distinguishing feature of classical order, to desire. When doing so, she troubles, deeply, Foucault's separation between the order of knowledge and the rules of power" (Ferreira da Silva, 2015, pp. 92–96).

Colonial-capitalist unconscious

"...it is evident that it is not possible to retake the reins of this potency by means of a simple decree of the will, no matter how imperious it may be, nor through the conscience, no matter how lucid and well-intentioned it may be. Much less is it possible to reappropriate it collectively as a single supposedly natural body that would be given a priori and, as if that were not enough, in absolute synergy among all the elements that compose it, as the messianic heralds of an earthly paradise pretend. It is necessary to resist in the very field of the politics of the production of subjectivity and of the dominant desire in the regime in its contemporary version—that is, to resist the dominant regime in ourselves—which does not fall from the sky nor is it ready in some promised land. On the contrary, it is a territory that must be tirelessly conquered and built upon in every human existence that makes up a society, and this intrinsically includes its relational universe. From such connections originate temporary communities that aspire to act in that direction in the construction of the common. However, such communities never occupy the body of society as a whole, for it is made and remade in the inexorable clash between different kinds of forces" (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 30)

Suely Rolnik, by way of Fanon and Guattari, proposes the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious or *inconsciente colonial-cafisheístico*. This idea has its precedents in the works of these two authors, whose writings concur with Rolnik. The first author is Fanon, who discussed the “colonial unconscious” already in 1950. Rolnik admits that she only recently read Fanon's essential work, despite being aware of it since the 1970s when living in paris, where Fanon played a significant role in the psychiatric and psychoanalytic revolution of that time. The second author is Guattari, who introduced the concept of the “capitalistic unconscious” in the early 1980s. This notion even appears in the book *Micropolitics: Cartographies of Desire*, which Rolnik co-authored. However, she confesses that she had forgotten about this inclusion, despite dedicating almost four years to writing the book from 1982 to 1986, when it was first published (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 98). *Shit happens*.

The capitalist economy is based on exploiting labour force and the cooperation involved in production to extract surplus value. But, to this operation, Rolnik adds what she refers to, as *cafisheo*—pimping—, to better capture its impact on our bodies, has evolved over the past five centuries, and explains that “*cafishear* is a neologism based on the verb ‘cafetinar’ in portuguese. [Rolnik] adopted this term to create one of the central notions of [her] theoretical work in the micropolitical field. The notion appears for the first time in the 2002 essay: ‘A vida na Berlinda’ [‘Life in the Spotlight’]. In its usual sense, the term designates the action of the ‘cafetão,’ whose translation varies in spanish-speaking countries: *proxeneta, alcahuete, cafisho, cafiche, chulo, fiolo, padrote, rufián, cabrón, maipiolo, cafiolo, celestina, chichifo, macarra*, among others, being that none of these terms is used in all countries. There is no verbal use of this term in spanish as there is in portuguese; moreover, its use in portuguese is quite common, even in the figurative sense, which is not the case in spanish either” (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 20). Since, capital appropriates life itself, specifically its vital potency to create and trans-form worlds, as well as the cooperation necessary to realize this potency. The regime uses this vital force of creation and cooperation to shape a world in line with its goals. In other words, capital exploits the drive for singular and collective creation of new forms of existence, including its functions, codes, and representations, making it the driving force. This shift means that the regime’s power is not solely economic but also cultural, subjective, and even ontological, giving it wider, more subtle, and harder to combat its influence (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 28).

The colonial-capitalistic system is distinguished by its exploitation of life as a means of creation and trans-formation. This exploitation, or *cafisheo*, is the foundation of the system and encompasses the expropriation and corruption of the vital force found in the entire biosphere: including land, air, water, sky, plants, animals, and the human species. In the case of humans, this exploitation, this “rape,” has unique characteristics resulting from the materialization of the vital force, which allows for multiple options and the choices. This uniqueness expands the potential for “transmutation of world-forms when life asks for it,” but

also presents the risk of neglecting ethical responsibilities. When this neglect occurs, it hinders the germination process and destroys the vital energy sources of the biosphere, including the subjective resources needed for its preservation (Suely Rolnik, 2017, p. 3).

Under the influence of the colonial-capitalist unconscious, people are reduced to their experiences as subjects. This leads to a reactive micropolitics, where the preservation of current forms of existence becomes dominant on various levels. People are detached from their living condition and unaware of the ongoing process of change inherent in vital dynamics, feel threatened by the emergence of new possibilities. *The world* that the subject inhabits and structures is seen as the only reality, and any disruption to *this world* is seen as a threat to its own existence. To restore equilibrium, desire clings to established forms and seeks to preserve them at all costs. The more destabilized subjectivity becomes, the more it fiercely defends and clings to the status quo, even resorting to violence to ensure its permanence. It rejects anything that challenges its belief in the absolute universality of its world (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 103). This use of violence to ensure permanence, explains what Rolnik lately argues that neo-liberalism is not moving towards neo-fascism, but that neo-liberalism is always already fascist, which explains why the first experiment at a national level was violently imposed through pinochet's fascist dictatorship in so-called chile, and the current rise, or rather unmasking, of the right in Abya Yala (Suely Rolnik, 2023).

According to Rolnik, "it is this separation from living condition that paves the way for desire to surrender (with *jouissance*) to the pimping of the drive." This surrender is seen in the transformation of the drive's creative force into mere creativity, which reinforces the established system and creates new opportunities for capital accumulation. During times of crisis, surrender is seen in the drive's investment in collective movements that seek to maintain the status quo, such as the rise of conservatism. In both cases, the subject finds pleasure in the illusion of belonging, which serves as a defense mechanism against the fear of destabilization. Against the fear of losing both social and narcissistic capital (Suely Rolnik, 2022). However, this type of desiring action ultimately hinders the growth of collective life. The abuse of the drive is difficult to understand as it occurs in an invisible sphere of perverse seduction. Nevertheless, its manifestations in the social field are evident to those who can tolerate witnessing the degradation of life. Examples include ecological disasters caused by the exploitation of the environment and power dynamics based on various forms of discrimination and prejudice. These manifestations are not mere epiphenomena of the dominant regime, but symptoms of its core beliefs and practices in the realm of desire and subjectivation (Suely Rolnik, 2017, p. 6).

"In the face of this, it is not enough to subvert the order of the places designated for each character at play in the scene of power relations (macropolitical insurrection); we must abandon those characters themselves and their politics of desire (micropolitical insurrection), which may render the continuity of the scene itself impracticable. The dissolution of the regime depends unavoidably on the insurrection against violence

everywhere and in all human activities in both the macro and micro spheres, which operate with disparate and paradoxical logics and temporalities. This is the necessary condition to achieve an effective transmutation of the present. In its new version, the regime has managed to colonize the whole planet, affecting its macro- and micropolitical guts, to the point that no human activity can escape from it today” (Suely Rolnik, 2017, p. 6).

Together with the regime of the dominant colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious, Rolnik, calls, the reactive politics of knowledge production, ruled by the colonial-capitalist unconscious, “‘anthropo-phallo-ego-logocentric.’ In the face of its power, which is spreading more and more, it is not enough to problematize the concepts that this policy produced and continues to produce: it is necessary to problematize the very principle that governs it. Such a challenge implies reactivating the knowledge-of-the-living in the exercise of thought, so as to free it from its imprisonment in this dry logocentrism and its false problems, the product of its divorce from the vital flows and the real problems that its movements pose to it. It is necessary to be on the lookout for what the knowledge-of-the-living points out to us, on which depend the strength and cunning necessary to resist the power of the team of phantoms born of the submission to the colonial-capitalistic unconscious, which even today commands subjectivities and orients the moves of desire. Hence the sense of affirming that, from this perspective, thinking and revolt becomes one and the same thing” (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 82).

The regime of the dominant colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious, as a fabric of world, re/produces the majoritarian reactive subject that at the same time re/produces *this world, el mundo de uno*, the *architectural world*. As *this world* also re/produces the reactive subject. And so on.

Mestizaje and the political project of/for blanqueamiento

*“Yo no recuerdo mi nombre, pero sé que no me llamo América,
sé que no soy Hispanoamérica tampoco,
para cambiarme el nombre no me bautizaste, sino que violándome
me impusiste otro nombre.*

*Esperabas doblegarme y que me olvidara de quien soy.
Pero yo sé que no te pertenezco,
sé que no soy un pedazo tuyo,
que no soy una parte de ti.*

*Soy otro continente,
otro lugar del mundo,
otra persona,
distinta,
diferente.*

*Yo no recuerdo mi nombre
pero sé quien soy.”*

(Galindo, 2022, p. 29)

*“Because I, a mestiza,
continually walk out of one culture
and into another,
because I am in all cultures at the same time,
alma entre dos mundos, tres, cuatro,
me zumba la cabeza con lo contradictorio.
Estoy norteadada por todas las voces que me hablan
simultaneamente”*

(Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 77)

“Blanco

Chapetón, blanco nacido en España.

Criollo, blanco nacido en Colombia.

Mezclado

a) Cruce de blanco con negro quinterón, (1/32 de negro)

b) Cruce de blanco con india ochavona, (1/16 de indio) pachuela.

Negro. De origen africano.

Indio. Aborígen americano.

Blanco Negro

Blanco y negro igual mulato (1/2 negro).

Blanco y mulato igual tercerón (1/4 negro).

Blanco y tercerón igual cuarterón (1/8 negro).

Blanco y cuarterón igual quinterón (1/16) negro).

Tercerón y mulato igual tente en el aire.

Cuarterón y tercerón.

Cuarterón

o quinterón y mulato.

o tercerón igual salto atrás.

o negro.

Blanco Indio

Blanco e indio igual mestizo (1/2 de india).

Blanco y mestizo igual cuarterón (1/4 india).

Blanco y cuarterón igual ochavón (1/8 de india).

Mestizo o mestiza igual tente en el aire.

Mestiza con indio igual salto atrás.

Indio Negro

Indio con negro igual zambo o zambaigo.

Indio y zambo igual tercerón.

Indio y tercerón igual cuarterón.

Indio y cuarterón igual quinterón”

(Gutiérrez de Pineda, 1997, p. 179)

“La guerra mas grande, la guerra de racismo

Un pobre con un rico, noooo. eso es un racismo

Me han subido los precio del alimento,

En vez de lamento, busquemos el momento,

*De un cambio aunque sea lento,
En este mundo que se ha puesto tremendo
No cambio mi raza ni tampoco la vendo,
Hablo de un cambio que sea externo,
Abre camino, que te cambio bacalao*

*Anda camina, camina bacalao,
Porque este mundo tu lo haz dañado*

*Pero que huele, huele, huele, huele a bacalao
Es este mundo podrido que como ha cambiao*

*Pero que, no, no mi amor,
No queremos mas guerras
No! digan que no
No, no mi amor,
No queremos mas hambre,
No! digan que no
No, no mi amor,
No mas guerra ni explotacion
Digan que no*

*Este sistema no sirve pa nada
Este sistema no sirve pa nada
You me know
You me know”*

Bacalao - El General

We do not remember our name, but we know who *we are*. Do *we* really? A critical overview of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, through the fields and forces of coloniality in so-called américa, must consider four entangled experiences; indigenous peoples, dispossessed and deterritorialized multiple

native communities; black peoples, unrooted and stripped diaspora of enslaved africans; the *mestiza*, the hybrid existences after five centuries of colonial regime; and white peoples, from european-colonial backgrounds.¹⁰

In so-called latino américa, the process of *mestizaje* violently brought together these experiences. If *mestizaje* was violent sexual mixture since the conquer of Abya Yala, from the XIX century on, *mestizaje* would be an imposed political project of/for *blanqueamiento*, that the criollo elites assumed would solve the *impasse* of building modern nation-states in the presence of mixed people: indigenous, blacks, and *mulatos*. White european nation-states were seen as symbols of progress and civilization. The response to this dilemma varied, with some idealizing *mestizaje* (racial mixture) and promoting the idea that everyone is *mestizo*, while others sought *blanqueamiento* of the population through a process of nation-building that ignored cultural and phenotypic differences. These debates were led by figures such as José Vasconcelos and Manuel Gamio in so-called méxico; Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre and José Carlos Mariátegui in so-called Perú; and Gilberto Freyre in so-called Brazil. Vasconcelos proposed the concept of *la raza cósmica*—cosmic race—, which would be a fusion of different races without distinction of color, ultimately leading to whiteness. He believed that inferior races, such as black and indigenous people, would contribute to this new race but eventually be absorbed or voluntarily extinct. Freyre, on the other hand, argued that racial mixture was the defining characteristic of Brazilian society and gave rise to the myth of racial democracy in so-called Brazil (Castillo, 2020, p. 38).

The uni-versal individual subject, is not, any/body. It is overrepresented by white-mestizo-bourgeois-cis-heterosexual-able men. This hegemonic representation, is constituted in Abya Yala, through the violent experience of coloniality, sustained by/for the project of *mestizaje*, always already towards *blanqueamiento*—whitening. From these fields and forces of domination, *encubrimiento*, extermination and homogenisation, these asymmetric power relations, the neo-liberal architect rules. From/through, what Fanon, called the authoritarian or leadership complex of whiteness.

Maura Brighenti and Verónica Gago in *La hipótesis del mestizaje en América Latina: del multiculturalismo neoliberal a las formas contenciosas de la diferencia* (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 54), note that the debate surrounding *mestizaje* started to have a significant place in so-called América Latina from the late XIX to the early XX century. It gained unprecedented global attention in the 1980s and 1990s, when it became a central topic in multicultural theories, particularly in North America (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 53). They argue that *mestizaje* in Abya Yala has been considered both as a theory to understand the continent's becoming and as a reality of antagonisms and violence. These two interpretations, imbricated by various political, historical, economic, and cultural factors, allows to think the problematic status of race, indigenous rights, women's roles, national boundaries, and labour exploitation—they as many forget to include the black experience.

Furthermore, according to Brighenti and Gago this notion also enables us to question neo-liberalization, during its rise to power, during its moments of crisis, and now in its most fascist form and imagine a “post-neoliberal” future. Their analysis focuses on critiquing the nation-centric approach and instead, contemplate the transition from neo-liberal multiculturalism to more contentious forms of acknowledging and addressing differences. By contentious forms, Brighenti and Gago mean recognizing that differences can generate conflict and tension, rather than being simply assimilated into a harmonious diversity. Their text, reconstructs the historic and political occurrence of *mestizaje* in Abya Yala by way of Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui and Rita Segato, who, argue that it is a historical concept that functioned as a means of legitimizing both during the time of colonial oppression and later in the era of republican modernization. It serves as a tool to conceal, and eradicate, the true character of the modern nation-state; therefore, it has played a crucial role in both the liberal and neo-liberal projects (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 53).

It is through this context that Rivera Cusicanqui has written, from the standpoint of her experience in so-called Bolivia, about *mestizaje colonial andino*, andean colonial métissage or crossbreeding. From the beginning, Rivera Cusicanqui opposes the concept of *ch'ixi* to *mestizaje*. “*Ch'ixi*: simply designates in Aymara a type of gray tone. It is a color that looks gray from a distance, but when we get closer we realize that it is made of dots of pure and agonic color: black and white spots intermingled.” Rivera Cusicanqui “learned the word *ch'ixi* from the mouth of the Aymara sculptor Víctor Zapana, who explained which animals come out of certain stones and why they are powerful animals. He then told her *ch'ixinakax utxiwa*, that there are, emphatically, the *ch'ixi* entities, which are powerful because they are indeterminate, because they are neither black nor white, they are both at the same time” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 98). *Ch'ixi* is an explicit challenge to the idea of the One (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 78). “To coexist among different while maintaining the radical nature of difference (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 148). “*Ch'ixi* is a becoming. It is about freeing ourselves from the collective schizophrenia, why we always have to be in the dilemma of one or the other” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 149).

For Rivera Cusicanqui, “the interest in the *ch'ixi* is related to what would be the official ideology of *mestizaje*, the harmonious confluence of the two poles, the Spanish and the Indian, which would give rise to that imaginary fusion: the cosmic race (in the case of México), or on the contrary, the defeated and degenerated race of Arguedas or Moreno, which would bring together the worst, wouldn't it? In this Manichean operation, the nature of the mixture is eluded; a white dominance is tacitly assumed. The process or the drift of this mixture is always towards *blanqueamiento*—whitening. A reverse process is neither imagined nor tolerated, or perhaps even more despised because it would be a kind of voluntary regression. The second effect of this is that both versions seek to erase the trace of the contradiction that gave rise to the desire for identification with a third party... it is erased. It is a domination that erases its own trace. And that has been the ‘conciliatory’ of the

official policy of *mestizaje*, which is also a policy of oblivion, based on the oblivion of contradiction” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 139).

Since 1993, Rivera Cusicanqui has problematized *mestizaje* in so-called bolivia—but we can expand her arguments to other territories along Abya Yala that have been structured through the colonial experience. As Brighenti and Gago note, in Rivera Cusicanqui’s text, *Mestizaje colonial andino. Una hipótesis de trabajo* (Rivera Cusicanqui, 1993), she “approaches the subject for the first time. She points out the ‘three constitutive moments’ of *mestizaje* in so-called bolivia, by which she refers to the ways in which collective behaviors that function, as habitus, in non-discursive planes are embodied” (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 57). In this “first working hypothesis of the early 1990s. Both *india*, *mestiza* and *q’ara* (white) identities are defined by ‘their mutual opposition on the civilizing cultural plane.’ which structures the polarity of native versus westerners. What is clear is that all identities are structured by the ‘colonial fact’ (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 68). Even so, within the *mestizo* strata there is a proliferation of identities that reproduce, as in multiple distorting mirrors, those articulated around the native and the european. Since the eighteenth century what emerges is, then, an ‘*abigarrado*—motley—lexicon of classifications,’ in which four types of hierarchies are superimposed: caste, states, culture and class, creating new types that associate, for example, the *india* and the *campesina*, the *cholo* and the working class. Thus, the native/western binarism breaks down into a much more numerous and complicated series” (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 57).

“The first moment of *mestizaje* is the one that organizes the colonial horizon as violence and segregation. As *mestizaje* of blood, its origin is the rape of indigenous women. It is they, who give birth to *mesticillos* as a result of the abuses of the colonizers, who engender those who later will have ‘...no place in spanish society nor in indigenous society” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 192). “It is a double discrimination that Rivera Cusicanqui highlights as a paradox of colonial society: the indigenous society is patriarchalized to preserve itself against the draining of women at the hands of the conquerors and, on the other hand, the *mestizo* males, children of the raped women, are discriminated more drastically in the *ayllu*” (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 57).

The second moment, of *mestizaje* known as the liberal horizon in the XIX century, involves an attempt to combine liberalism and citizenship. Rivera Cusicanqui sees this as an offer of citizenship that is unstable and deceptive, with a constant threat of exclusion, that perpetuates the racist criteria of the colonial era. The republican oligarchic world, focused on exporting and eurocentric cultural reforms, clashed with the *mestizo* and indigenous sectors, which prioritized internal market circuits inherited from mining cycles. The reforms of the liberal era attempted to generalize the rationality of individual landowners, while new displacements of indigenous lands occurred (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 59).

Finally, as Brighenti and Gago note (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 60), the third moment, or populist horizon, produces the *mestizo* as a key figure of the nation-state imaginary community that for Rivera Cusicanqui will prolong the colonial racist horizon under new languages and forms. According to Rivera Cusicanqui, this community will continue the colonial racist mindset in different ways. In this national-populist project, the masses are seen within the context of western citizenship (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 60).

Later in 1996, Rivera Cusicanqui wrote, *En defensa de mi hipótesis del mestizaje colonial andino* (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, pp. 111–133), between both articles, Rivera Cusicanqui's arguments are revised and mediated through two influences: the work of subaltern studies such as, Bhabha, Chatterjee, and Spivak, and a "gender perspective" driven by an attempt to analyze the construction of historical identities, both helped recognizing several oversights in the previous works (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 116). According to Brighenti and Gago (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 61), after studying works by Indian intellectuals, Rivera Cusicanqui finds new ways for reinterpreting the concept of *mestizaje*. Specifically, she realizes that engaging with this group allows her to delve deeper into the relationship between ideologies, behaviors, imaginaries, and social groups structured as "postcolonial stratification." By doing so, she returns to her skepticism towards language, particularly in relation to the liberal rhetoric of citizenship, but now emphasizes the ideological functions of the discourse of *mestizaje* associated with modernization of the illustrated republican elites. The discourse of *mestizaje*, as Rivera Cusicanqui argues, is not merely superficial; rather, it plays a central role as it constructs identities, regulates economic strategies, influences marital behavior, and shapes collective imaginaries. Consequently, the lines of colonial hierarchization are perpetuated, implicitly utilizing criteria such as place of birth, parental tributary status, mother tongue, detailed classification of skin color, clothing, and even migratory and occupational history. This inheritance from the colonial period becomes effective as internal colonialism and leaves its mark on postcolonial identities through contradictions, conflicts, and a complex blend of affirmations and self-denials. This impact is felt by indigenous people, as well as various strata of *chola*, *mestizaje*, and even the white sectors (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 61).

Rivera Cusicanqui concludes that ambiguity is the only common trait shared by identities in so-called bolivia through this series of disjunctions (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 61). "It is in the case of the discourse on *mestizaje* where the ambiguity reaches schizophrenic levels, becoming an eloquent example of the *split narratives* that, according to Bhabha (Bhabha, 1990), characterize subject formation in postcolonial societies. In fact, the split narratives of *mestizaje* do not question—rather they prolong—the monologic discourse of the Subject-Nation, another typical construct of the modernizing republican elites" (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 117).

During the XIX century, which was characterized by liberal ideals, the concept of citizenship became crucial for a society that aimed to embody masculine and western values. Within this context, "the discourse of *mestizaje* is in charge of integrating only to exclude, to accept in order to consolidate forms of segregation."

Eventually, in the mid XX century, the celebration of *mestizaje* was solidified as an official ideology of the imaginary community that sought the consolidation of a modern and united nation. This populist moment emphasized the discourse of *mestizaje* as a means of civilizing action, utilizing labour unions, educational institutions, and political clientelism to foster homogeneity and construct a supposed collective identity (Brighenti & Gago, 2017, p. 62).

Along the coming sections we will unravel the relations between the white-colonial-project of *mestizaje* and the re/production of the architect, sustained by/for the imbrication of class-race-sex-gender privileges in Abya Yala, with particular attention to so-called colombia and méxico.

The case of so-called Colombia

“By introjecting the discriminating gaze of the *conquistador*, the mestizo unconsciously accepted the undervaluation to which *he* was subjected, considering *his* hybridity as a cultural burden. The sublimated response to this complex is reflected in the concealment of our identity and in the unbridled imitation of foreign cultural patterns” (Zapata Olivella, 2020a, p. 58).

“The phenomena of foreignizing alienation are more apparent in scientists, architects, engineers, doctors, psychologists, historians, and not a few anthropologists. In general, professionals dependent on methods, techniques, work tools, etc., as well as industrialists and traders, underestimate their own inventiveness and that of their people, to accept, with little or no creative effort, the comfortable and passive position of receiving, implementing and adapting the needs of the country to the latest advances in industry, science and scientific thought of the great metropolitan centers” (Zapata Olivella, 2020a, p. 59)

For Manuel Zapata Olivella *mestizaje* was a trans-versal “topic in his work; part of his early intellectual concerns, expressed in several articles [...] and in his celebrated autobiographical book *Levántate mulato* (1990)” (Arboleda Quiñónez, 2020, p. 17). But, particularly Zapata Olivella problematized *mestizaje* in three books beginning in 1974 with *El hombre colombiano* (Zapata Olivella, 2020a), dedicated to racial and cultural *mestizaje* as the foundation of so-called colombian and latinamerican societies. In 1989, he wrote *Las claves mágicas de América: raza, clase y cultura* (Zapata Olivella, 2020c), in which “he deepens the African contribution with a historical vision of the slave trade. He analyzes caste racism in colonial society, based on the

studies of Herskovits, Bastide, Fernando Ortiz and Escalante” (Castillo, 2020, p. 32). Later, in 1997, with *La rebelión de los genes. El mestizaje americano en la sociedad futura* (Zapata Olivella, 2020b), he continues his approach to *mestizaje*, which does not eradicate diversity or otherness, but rather produces the *tri-ethnic* peculiarity of so-called colombian and american peoples, resulting from: the violent biologic and cultural mixture of indigenous, african, and european, people. However, this does not imply the existence of a superior race, as Vasconcelos suggested in his work *La raza cósmica*, who was heavily criticized by Zapata Olivella, in articles such as *Vasconcelos, filósofo de la reconquista* (Zapata Olivella, 1948) (Castillo, 2020, p. 32).

Zapata Olivella’s work was largely influenced by Aimé Césaire, León Damas and Leopoldo Senghor, pioneers of the negritude movement that vindicates the African heritage, but also of Frantz Fanon (Castillo, 2020, p. 34).

In *El hombre colombiano*, Zapata Olivella argues that, “ethnic crossbreeding was the basis for mestizaje acculturation in all areas: formation of the colonial caste system, development of agriculture, exploitation of salt mines and emerald deposits, handicrafts, new religious practices, clothing and customs. If racial relations imposed by mestizaje constituted the link for the formation of the social strata, the economic and political system of *capitulaciones*, *encomiendas*, *mita* and the tributes outlined the norm that would determine their character” (Zapata Olivella, 2020a, p. 371). And distinguishes three phenomena of acculturation, “the transculturation of extracontinental values added to the aboriginal strain; the imposed acculturation of indigenous, hispanic and african contributions; and the endoculturation of the same from the creativity of the mestizo. The first two were forced on the culture subdued by the colonizer, while the latter—endocultured—belong to what Roger Bastide calls free exchanges, within the relative independence of a country that has suffered colonization. [...] according to our criteria, he says, there are three types of contact: ‘free’ contacts, ‘forced’ contacts—for which the colonial situation would provide the best example—and, finally, ‘planned’ contacts.

The latter would correspond to the neocolonizing situation, in which foreign values are manufactured and planned in a few metropolises to be technically ‘imposed on Colombia by means of *criollo* interveners. The degree of violence required for the imposition of foreign values varies to the extent that the mestizo community accepts them as their own. During the initial period—transculturation and acculturation—the oppressive action falls on adults who oppose their own traditional entity. Later, once the values have been assimilated and recreated, it is the same mestizo adults who transmit them as something innate to their descendants” (Zapata Olivella, 2020a, p. 282).

Later, the focus of Zapata Olivella in *Las claves mágicas de América: raza, clase y cultura*, lies in identifying the intimate connection between race, class, and culture in the political economy of european conquest and colonization in so-called américa (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 19). Zapata Olivella, starts by way of

Fanon, arguing that a new species of the human was born both by the european circumnavigation of Africa and landing in Abya Yala (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 25). And, to reconcile their religious beliefs and ambitions, they disregarded the supposed teachings of the holy scriptures and created a new doctrine called *civilization*, which justified the genocide and subjection of entire cultures. This led to the glorification of white europeans and their domination over “blacks, yellows and redskins,” and those with mixed heritage. In the name of civilization, *mestizaje* was the forced mixing of races through carnal violence and firearms (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 26).

In a similar line to Hartman, Zapata Olivella, notes that, the first *Leyes de Indias*, introduced in 1503, were meant to control the mistreatment of slaves but instead acted as a cover-up. Slaves were not freed or returned home, and new slaves continued to arrive. These slaves came to be known as *encomiendas*. Like the *piezas de Indias*, *encomiendas*, were not just abstract concepts, but actual human bodies who were exploited, controlled, and forced to work. They were chained, caged, threatened, whipped, and baptized to be identified and counted. They were distributed according to the needs of their masters and concentrated near mines and plantations for better control and indoctrination. *Encomienda* was a new form of ignominy, comparable to or even worse than slavery (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 28).

As for the indigenous communities, the “virginity of the primitive people” was so remarkable that Columbus, amazed, wrote that he could not believe he had encountered people with such kind hearts and willingness to give. However, despite this admiration, he did not hesitate to bring back chained *indios* on his ships and suggest to the catholic monarchs in 1498 that all the slaves that could be sold should be sent under the name of the holy trinity (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 35).

Zapata Olivella notes that indigenous and black women have suffered the most by colonization since its beginning. The profound harm inflicted upon women cannot be fully addressed. Various disturbing justifications have been made, such as: seeing indigenous women as soulless beasts, blaming indigenous customs, christian beliefs, and lack of white women for both the satisfaction of european men’s sexual and reproductive needs. Zapata Olivella points to a fundamental difference, between the process of settler colonialism by the english and spanish colonialism, with the latter resulting in *mestizaje* through the rape and impregnation of indigenous and black women, as most spanish soldiers and colonists arrived without wives or families (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 43,53). Some white men had also started the *trata de blancas*, to so-called *nueva españa*, “with the smuggling of Greek women to satisfy the demand for women by colonists eager for concubines of their own blood: the first racists interested in establishing *apartheid*” in Abya Yala (Aguirre Beltran, 1984) in (Zapata Olivella, 2020b, p. 259).

Mestizaje produced a system of castes, similar throughout so-called latino américa; “spaniards made up the bureaucratic caste that governed the colonial enterprise, adjusted to the civil and ecclesiastical government;

criollos or mixed race—frequently classified as white by royal certificates of ‘clean blood’ that made them worthy of privileges reserved for pure spaniards—, managed most of the agriculture and commerce; *pardos* who preferably called themselves *oscuros*, formed the craftsmanship and the populace; blacks remained in the field work with the greatest weight in agriculture and transportation; surviving” indigenous communities were often controlled by christian missionaries. According to Zapata Olivella, this classification system was based on class rather than racial prejudice, ensuring that slaves and their descendants remained in the lower class within the colonial system (Zapata Olivella, 2020c, p. 59).

The last of these three books, *La rebelión de los genes. El mestizaje americano en la sociedad futura*, published in 1997 when Zapata Olivella was 77 years old, examines the effects of historical colonialism and advocates for embracing mestizaje and decolonization. The book emphasizes the resistance of indigenous and black communities as the foundation for new identities that celebrate hybridization of blood and culture. It serves as a synthesis of Zapata Olivella's interdisciplinary inquiries and promotes a cautious optimism and utopian ideals. From a transdisciplinary approach, the book composes a decolonial narrative that promotes fraternity and human communion. As an invitation to revisit the landscape of prejudices, fallacies, and euphemisms that have been constructed over the past five centuries by hegemonic historical narratives, by educational systems, media, and state institutions, perpetuating Darwinist and eugenic ideologies (Arboleda Quiñónez, 2020, p. 17).

Zapata Olivella, calls *amerindio-afroeuropéo* the *trie-ethnic* mestizaje, which is not meant to imply that every person is necessarily a mestizo, mulatto, or zambo biologically. One could be solely black, criollo, or indigenous. However, this does not mean that if someone's so-called colombian or american identity is a result of a historical process and not from another continent, they can detach themselves from the multiracial and multicultural heritage of their origin. In some way, they will be influenced by the underlying tri-ethnic spirit (Zapata Olivella, 2020b, p. 159).

Zapata Olivella argues that in a tri-ethnic mestizaje, white supremacy can only be understood as a dominant class. Within this class, “we will find a multiracial oligarchy in which there is no lack of pure afro-americans acting as *gamonales*; indigenous *caciques* with their subordinate tribes; and, of course, tycoons with german, north american, french, anglo-saxon and jewish surnames who consider themselves purer than their european ancestors.” However, the analysis of race cannot be limited to ethnicity alone, as linguistic connotations of racial characteristics can be contradictory. For example, in some regions of the colombian atlantic coast, the term “white” is used to describe a rich person, regardless of their actual ethnicity. This connotation extends beyond cultural differences, as the wealthy “white” person could be highly educated or completely illiterate (Zapata Olivella, 2020b, p. 243).

Within this white system, in Abya Yala, “a multiracial continent based on caste hierarchies, the words ‘bourgeoisie,’ ‘middle class’ and ‘workers’ came to have other connotations, different from those of Europe. The new bourgeoisie would be the *criollos*, whites or mestizos, heirs of colonialism; only those who, due to mestizaje, had lost their pigmentation, were called ‘free’ citizens. Illiterate people and women were deprived of the vote, which was only granted to the former at the beginning of this century and to the latter fifty years later. African-Americans and Amerindians remained and remain in the fields as slaves and indentured servants, even though today, with the right to vote, they are called ‘workers’ and ‘citizens’” (Zapata Olivella, 2020b, p. 333).

The case of so-called México

“...in México, not only does the official narrative of mestizaje erase phenomena of appropriation, the Mexican State itself bases the mythology of its creation on elements it has misappropriated; Aztec symbols are the most common: the very coat of arms of the Mexican flag is an appropriation of a Nahuatl cultural symbol. At the same time that the Mexican government was allocating public resources and intense campaigns to the disappearance of indigenous languages, it was taking elements from these same cultures to create that artificial mixture that today is called “Mexican culture”: a dance from this culture, the gastronomic elements of another plus the symbols of these other cultures, and so on” (Aguilar Gil, 2018, p. 133).

“*Amestizarse* is not to lose identity, it is to reconfigure it, it is to adhere to a trait that an ideological system has created and determined as the norm” (Aguilar Gil, 2017, p. 23)

Yásnaya E. Aguilar Gil argues, that “the case of México is quite eloquent. As Federico Navarrete has already pointed out in the book *México racista: una denuncia*, the national project had as one of its main objectives the misleading creation of the category ‘mestizo’: ‘The new Mexican mestizos—writes Navarrete—[...] were not the product of a ‘racial’ or ‘cultural’ mixture, but of a political and social change that created a new identity. In historical and cultural terms, this way of being, baptized as mestizo, was closer to the western culture of the criollo elites than to any of the indigenous or African traditions that coexisted in the territory’” of so-called México (Navarrete Linares, 2016).

According to Aguilar Gil, the categories of *mestizo* and *indígena* are in opposition to each other because the Mexican state created this distinction. The term *indígena* did not have its current meaning during colonial times and only began to be used as such in the XIX century. During the Spanish empire, people were referred to

as *indios* and were part of a complex caste system. After the *non-event* of independence, the Mexican state simplified this into a binary opposition of *indígena* and *mestizo*. However, different struggles for the recognition of stateless nations relate to these categories in different ways, as the Mapuche and Aymara. Aguilar Gil, underscores that, “given that the creation of a world divided into nation states is recent, then the condition of *indígena* is not essential but a product of the ‘unfortunate historical accident’ referred to by Pedro Cayuqueo. As historian Sebastián van Doesburg points out, the categories ‘Mixe,’ ‘Mapuche’ or ‘Mixteco,’ for example, allow us to glimpse a different future—and in fact a different present—in which identity is not constructed exclusively in relation to the nation-state, as is the case with the label *indígena*. The term *indígena*, it should not be forgotten, only covers two hundred years of the nine thousand years of Mixe or Mesoamerican history (taking the domestication of corn as its genesis)” (Aguilar Gil, 2022, pp. 96–97).

Perla Valero argues that, *mestizaje* was an important state ideology in so-called México between 1850 and 1950, which aimed to modernize and homogenize the country. This ideology also existed in other parts of so-called Latino América, but with regional variations that leaned towards either a more Hispanic or Indigenous perspective. In so-called México, the nation-state's construction was accompanied by the ideology of *mestizaje*, which idealized the *mestizo* figure. This ideal *mestizo* was someone who had shed their Indigenous roots, became a laborer, and ultimately assimilated into urban culture. Despite resistance and agency from Indigenous communities, it is important to emphasize that the state ideology behind this process operated under the logic of whiteness. In so-called México, the promotion of *mestizophilia* gained momentum after 1850, during a time when liberalism was attacking Indigenous communal property and so-called Latino América was being integrated into the globalitarian market. The Porfirian intelligentsia constructed an idealized image of the *mestizo*, focusing more on their moral qualities rather than their physical appearance. The *mestizo* was seen as representative of the values of modern society, embodying traits such as versatility, entrepreneurship, and a desire for progress. Essentially, the *mestizo* embodied the subjectivity demanded by capitalism: whiteness (Valero, 2023, p. 6).

The Mexican case exemplifies how the idealized figure of the *mestizo* during Porfiriato embodied the ethos of whiteness. This whiteness was expressed as *mestitud*, representing a colonial version of the capitalist ethic. This idea serves as a working hypothesis for Valero. Certainly, the Porfirian hygienist officials were not the only ones responsible for promoting whiteness or the capitalist-modern ethos. Exploring the cultural, political, and technological factors that contributed to the process of sociocultural whitening in so-called Latino América, as well as identifying the resistance faced, is a task that must consider the complex geography and different temporalities of the *mestizo* and white populations. To create this imaginary *mestizo* figure that represents whiteness, the Porfirian ‘scientific’ elites developed strategies to counter Indigenous communal ways of life, which were seen as incompatible with modern capitalist logic. The *Consejo Superior de Salubridad* and its

hygienist officials played a role in implementing policies that aimed to regulate daily life in order to eliminate communal practices and promote modern individualistic behaviors. These efforts included legislation on popular housing, with the goal of eradicating extended families (considered indigenous remnants) and promoting the emergence of the proletarian ‘nuclear family’ with its modern, rational, and productive habits. Additionally, the adoption of new clothing norms and recommendations for a ‘hygienic’ diet promoted the consumption of a mestizo diet consisting of wheat, meat, and milk, rather than the traditional indigenous diet of corn and beans. All of these measures can be seen as part of a project to whiten everyday life under the capitalist ethic of whiteness (Valero, 2023, p. 6).

In this line, Federico Navarrete Linares argues that *mestizaje*, the concept of racial mixture in so-called México, is an ideology that was developed in the late XIX century and became dominant with the success of the Mexican revolution. He argues that *mestizaje* is a coherent set of beliefs and discourses created by those in power to justify social inequality and privilege. However, he acknowledges that the actual social processes and policies of the time were more complex and varied than the ideology itself. He focuses on how the ideology of *mestizaje* promoted the superiority of whiteness and contributed to a hierarchical social order. The creators of *mestizaje* mainly saw it as the blending of European and indigenous races, while excluding African and Asian races. They believed that this mixture would resolve racial conflicts and eliminate animosity between indigenous people and white elites. However, Navarrete Linares suggests that this idea is a fictional solution to an imaginary conflict (Navarrete Linares, 2022, p. 143).

Navarrete Linares argues that it is an imaginary solution, firstly, because in so-called México the frequency of mixture between people of different continental origins—referred to as “races”—was much lower than what was advocated. Furthermore, this mixture was not the cause of the effects known as *mestizaje*. Instead, the ideology of *mestizaje* served to create a new vocabulary for describing, explaining, and attempting to control the process of modernizing society. This included the emergence of new collective and individual identities associated with liberalism and capitalism, as well as linguistic and cultural changes and the reconfiguration of social relations within national society after 1850. Contrary to its intended purpose of overcoming racial polarities in Mexican society, the ideology of *mestizaje* actually racialized identities and social relations in accordance with the prevailing scientific thought of the time, known as racist science. This dominated various biological and human disciplines. Therefore, according to most proponents of this ideology, the process of racial mixing should be guided by state and technical agents based on clear scientific principles. The goal was to direct the mixture towards the dominance and imposition of positive racial traits, while preventing the increase of negative traits. The list of desirable virtues associated with the white “race” was much longer and more appealing than those attributed to the indigenous “race.” This ideology effectively functioned

as a peaceful, scientific, and inclusive form of whitening, in contrast to the violent and exclusionary practices of the nineteenth century (Navarrete Linares, 2022, p. 144).

During the twentieth century, the revolutionary regime pushed for the creation of new shared identities and subjectivities that were aligned with nationalist ideals. This effort reached a wide range of people in both rural and urban areas, thanks to various factors. Firstly, economic growth and developmental policies brought more people into the national capitalist economy. Additionally, the state established educational and social security institutions that catered to an increasing number of groups. Lastly, the regime's authoritarian and corporative practices successfully integrated large portions of society into its project. From the perspective of the individuals involved, this integration process was seen as *mestizaje*, which was based on the belief in inherent racial differences in behavior, physicality, and values. The changes brought about by the state, its agents, and social interaction were viewed as the desired outcome of racial mixing, or condemned. In the latter part of the century, as racialist ideas and science lost credibility, proponents of this doctrine shifted to a culturalist interpretation. However, there is a clear continuity in discourse, politics, and ideology between the concepts of racial and cultural *mestizaje* (Navarrete Linares, 2022, p. 145).

Navarrete Linares proposes then, that *mestizo* ideology defines a new form of whiteness, more inclusive and hegemonic than it was in the XIX century, embodied in thoroughly modern *mestizo* peoples based on class consciousness and national identities defined their own subjectivity. This new approach of *mestizos* is clearly against social groups that defend *criollismo* and its traditionalist whiteness—*blancura*. Advocates of the *mestizo* ideology, however, created a new privileged identity that was used to establish a new racialized social hierarchy, as all social relations were governed by such ideology. This new form of whiteness de-emphasizes ancestry, adherence to the religions and values inherited from the colonial period, and is more future-oriented, while promoting cosmopolitanism and identification with the subjectivity, discourses, practices and fashions produced by the so-called global north. However, as in the XIX century, this new definition of social and cultural privilege was defined as white complexion and preserved the practices of personal and social whitening encapsulated in ideals of “improving the race” (Navarrete Linares, 2022, p. 145).

The *mestizo* racialized social hierarchy sustains the architectural caste system, both in so-called colombia and méxico. Whiteness inhabits design stardom. Indigenous and blacks are relegated to construction labour.

Juan Albañil, the building you built

With all the hard work you did

It's closed, it's sealed

It is forbidden for you, Juan Albañil

As it's Sunday, Juan Albañil along the avenue

He goes for a walk looking at how much he built

Hotels, condominiums, how much luxury

And now that he is not a member, he can't go in.

Juan Albañil, he can't go in, he can't go in

Juan Albañil, hombre vecino

How much have you dreamed with so-called equality

Juan Albañil but tell your children

That there is no future in cement

Juan Albañil - Cheo Feliciano - 1980

The political regime of cis-heterosexuality

“Race is no more mythical and fictional than gender, both powerful fictions” (Lugones, 2016, p. 28)

“to change [...] and to be neither homosexual nor heterosexual, and, more than bisexual, to be that which we do not yet know, because it is repressed” Felix, in Lambda, Vol 2, 1977 cited in (Tari, 2016, p. 145)

The uni-versal individual subject is not, as we have seen, *anybody*. It is overrepresented by white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies. This overrepresentation, or this hegemonic presence, is constituted in Abya Yala, through the violent experience of coloniality, sustained by/for what, Ochy Curiel calls the heterosexual regime in relation to the domination of nation-states, what María Lugones has pointed and expanded through the coloniality of gender, and the anti-patriarchal praxis of María Galindo and what she calls *bastardismo*. From these fields and forces of domination, these asymmetric power relations, the *patriarchitect* rules, from/through, what Fanon, has called the authoritarian or leadership complex of whiteness.

Under the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, heterosexuality is not sexual preference, but a political regime of domination and homogenisation. As we have seen previously, regarding coloniality in the introduction, Quijano defines four axis of the global pattern of power, the coloniality of power that started with the constitution of both so-called américa and europe in 1492. According to Quijano the first two axis are: the idea of race, that imposed the “first global form of social domination,” and the control of labour through capital, that imposed the “first global form of social exploitation” (Quijano, 2013, p. 145).

Black feminists, communitarian feminists, autonomist feminists and anti-patriarchal practices, amongst others, have problematized and expanded Quijano’s work, by arguing how imbricated asymmetric power relations operate through class, race, gender, and sexuality (Cuero, 2022, p. 12). Astrid Cuero, by way of anti-racist and black feminists, decolonial, anticolonial and indigenous intellectuals, in Abya Yala, as Sueli Carneiro, argues that today, race still serves as a means to exploit the labour of racialized people, both men and women. This appropriation and exploitation of their bodies continues to exist, although no longer under the colonial model, but through the pattern of coloniality of power (Quijano, 2014). Racism plays a role in determining the hierarchy of gender, with black and indigenous women being positioned as subordinate to white women, often seen as “domestic servants of liberated women” (Carneiro, 2014). Therefore, the theoretical perspectives of anti-racist feminism, decolonial turn, and decolonial feminism helps understand how for example paid domestic work was established within the framework of power’s coloniality. This means that the modern

capitalist organization of labour was not only based on class and gender exploitation and domination, but also on race (Cuero, 2022, p. 12).

Although coloniality of power aims to explain how the exploitation and domination of the reproductive and productive worlds are connected through racial classification, Cuero argues that Quijano's understanding of race as a form of domination is correct and non-essentialist, his view on sex and the resulting domination is essentialist and biologicist. By way of Lugones who argues that sex is not solely a biological fact, but also a social construct, similar to skin color and race. She emphasizes that both sex and gender are historical constructions that emerged within colonial relations. Instead of focusing on the coloniality of power, Lugones examines the coloniality of gender. She asserts that gender was a colonial construction, as patriarchal relations and the concept of gender did not exist prior to colonization. The coloniality of gender encompasses not only the hierarchy between males and females in terms of sex and gender, but also the hierarchy between humans and non-humans, where racialized men and women were considered non-human ((Lugones 2011) (Lugones 2008, pp. 81–82)) (Cuero, 2022, p. 13).

Cuero notes that, in a similar vein to Lugones, Brenny Mendoza also critiques Quijano's formulation for its essentialism in how it understands the connection between sex and gender. Mendoza also takes issue with the fact that Quijano's formulation only considers the processes of racialization in defining the division of labour, without taking into account its gender implications. Mendoza argues that the invention of race led to the division of labour between free wage labour, initially reserved for white european men, and unfree labour—such as slavery and servitude—, reserved for racialized men and women—specifically black and indigenous. However, what Quijano does not delve into deeply, but Mendoza clearly demonstrates, is that after european colonialism supposedly ended in Abya Yala and industrial capitalism emerged in england and the so-called united states of america, wage labour became widespread and primarily reserved for white men, even if they were impoverished. This resulted in the establishment of a gendered social agreement between capitalists and workers, granting them citizenship status through wage labor, at the expense of excluding racialized workers from the realm of wage labour (Mendoza, 2010, p. 25). However, racialized men and women continue to face widespread exclusion from wage labour (Cuero, 2022, p. 14). A violent push towards *forced entrepreneurialism*.

Ochy Curiel from an anti-racist and lesbian-feminist field, unveils the imbrication between heterosexuality as a political regime and the nation-state. Particularly, Curiel works through so-called colombia's political constitution of 1991, that as we have seen, not only as Almendra Quiguanás argues, served to neo-liberalize so-called colombia by constitution, but as Curiel argues given the importance of judicial power through coloniality, the constitution served also to further institutionalize the regime of heterosexuality through “law and writing as means and technologies for the establishment of power and hegemony” for/by those that were already in power (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 27).

Curiel is compelled to analyze the relationship between the heterosexual regime and the nation for several reasons. Firstly, in order to contribute to the decolonization of anthropology by studying not only the practices of marginalized groups such as indigenous people, afro-descendants, and women, but also the mechanisms and technologies that have created the concept of “otherness” through modernity. Secondly, to examine the theoretical and political perspectives offered by the lesbian feminist movement, which views heterosexuality as a political regime that pervades various social relations within a nation, challenging the notion that it is solely a sexual practice, orientation, or choice (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 26).

There have been, according to Curiel, various contributions from lesbian feminists to the analysis of the political nature of heterosexuality, including works by Anne Koedt (Koedt, 1968), Jill Johnston (Johnston, 1973) and Gayle Rubin (Rubin, 2000). However, it is Adrienne Rich, a north-american feminist, lesbian, and poet, and Monique Wittig, a french materialist feminist lesbian, who have provided a deeper explanation (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 29).

Rich, Curiel highlights, examines heterosexuality as an institution, which she synthesizes with the concept of compulsory heterosexuality described in her 1980 text, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence* (Rich, 2002). Rich argues that heterosexuality, motherhood, economic exploitation, and the nuclear family should be analyzed as political institutions supported by ideologies that diminish women's power. Rich relates the obligation of heterosexuality to capitalist forms of production, which result in gender segregation in the labour market. This segregation assigns women lower-value positions, such as domestic employees, secretaries, nannies, educators, or waitresses. It also leads to sexualization in the workplace, where sexual harassment frequently occurs. Rich portrays heterosexuality as more than just a “sexual practice,” “preference,” “orientation,” or “choice” for women. Instead, she sees it as an institutionalized imposition that ensures men's physical, economic, and emotional access to women (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 30).

But, according to Curiel, “the theoretical-political leap on heterosexuality was undoubtedly offered by Wittig, who made a shift from the ‘women's point of view’ to an analysis of heterosexuality as a political regime that contains several important aspects: a materialist point of view and the re-evaluation and conceptual transformation as political action” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 30). According to Wittig, sex is a category that exists in society through its association with heterosexuality, whereby women are heterosexualized. This means that women are compelled to engage in reproductive and productive activities based on collective and individual agreements, primarily through the institution of marriage. Wittig asserts that women are assigned specific roles and obligations within the sex class, such as place of residence, forced intercourse, reproduction for their husbands, and the legal notion of conjugal relationships, which ultimately subjugate them to their husbands. Wittig, through her analysis of heterosexuality as a political regime, provided a significant theoretical-political breakthrough. She shifted from the “women's point of view” to examine heterosexuality's

aspects, such as a materialist perspective and the re-evaluation and conceptual transformation as political action. Wittig defines heterosexuality as a political regime based on the ideology that there exists a sexual difference. In *The Category of Sex* (Wittig, 1996), she argues that this difference is an imaginary construct that attributes it to nature, while in reality, it is an ideology that conceals economic, political, and ideological relations. Wittig believes that oppression creates the concept of sex, rather than the other way around. Wittig further argues that even outside of marriage, women are seen as available to men, which produces a form of forced sexual servitude, where women are visible as sexual beings but rendered invisible as social beings. According to Wittig, women cannot be perceived outside the category of sex, as they are solely defined by it. The State, laws, and police institution, among other systems of control, reinforce and naturalize these oppressive norms (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 30).

Curiel then argues that the “regime of heterosexuality is based on sexual difference” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 36), but most importantly that “one of the main mechanisms of the heterosexual regime, is to maintain sexual difference as its ontological basis” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 38). And explains by way of several feminists, that with the exception of the more naturalistic differentialists, nearly all theoretical currents of feminism agree that women and men are not biological categories, but rather social constructs. This fundamental premise has been used to explain the central nuclei of women's oppression and subordination. One of the key texts that supports this idea is the work of north american anthropologist Margaret Mead in *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (Mead, 2001), conducted in New Guinea. Mead analyzed the temperaments of both sexes to understand “social personality,” and found that the different gender roles of the Arapesh, Mundugumor, and Tchambouli ethnic groups were explained by the sexual division of labor and kinship structures. These findings demonstrated that temperamental differences were not innate, but rather influenced by society (Mead, 1963). Simone de Beauvoir's contributions in the book *Second Sex* (Beauvoir, 2015) were also crucial in understanding the social construction of womanhood. She famously stated that “one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” (Beauvoir, 2015). Building upon Mead's work, british sociologist Ann Oakley (Oakley, 1972) introduced the concept of gender to explain the cultural construction of being a woman or a man, as well as the power relations between the sexes in social, material, and symbolic spheres. Since then, it has been proposed that gender is the social construction of sex. Joan Scott, an american historian, has further emphasized the importance of gender as one of the primary forms of social power relations and structures. Scott argues that these power relations are expressed through cultural symbols, normative concepts, and various doctrines that define identities in subjective terms (Scott, 2000). Anthropologist Gayle Rubin's concept of the sex-gender system has also played a significant role in understanding the construction of gender. Rubin defines the sex-gender system as “the set of dispositions by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity” (Rubin, 2000) (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 35).

Delving further into the relativity of sex and gender, Curiel, notes that Nicole Claude Mathieu has proposed three ways of culturally understanding the relationship between sex and gender in different societies and time periods. Her analysis is summarized in the text *¿Identidad sexual/ sexuada/ de sexo? Tres modos de conceptualización de la relación sexo y género* (Mathieu, 2005). Mathieu identifies a first mode called sexual identity, which is based on individual self-awareness and assumes a psychosociological understanding of biological sex. In this mode, sexual identity is considered natural and predetermined, with femininity being associated with women and masculinity with men. The second mode is sexed identity, which emphasizes the importance of social factors over biological ones. Identity is connected to a collective gender consciousness that is stronger than sex. It is based on a cultural understanding of the differences and complementarity between genders. In this conceptualization, collective gender belonging takes precedence over the rigid categorization of “biological” sex. The third mode, referred to as “sex” identity by Mathieu, relates to the concept of “sex class.” It involves a social relationship that is material and historical between gender and sex. This mode recognizes that the relationship is political, changeable, and unrelated to biology or nature. The third mode highlights how societies use ideology to create and hierarchize sexes based on a division of labour. Therefore, prior to sexual difference and as a result of it, there is what the french anthropologist calls differentiation. This is seen as a political act that constructs difference and stems from the sexual division of labour, encompassing not only material aspects but also emotional and subjective ones (Mathieu, 2005). The construction of difference, rather than the cultural construction of gender, indicates the cultural construction of sex (and sexuality) (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, pp. 35–36) Finally, Curiel underscores that, “much later, from other disciplines, authors based in the United States, such as Teresa de Lauretis and Judith Butler, became famous for saying something similar, although in a much weaker form. In fact, this weakness of their approaches (hidden behind a sophisticated, elitist and incomprehensible phraseology) made them more ‘digestible’ for the system and guaranteed them rapid international success” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 35).

Most professional identities, as the architect, are racist, sexist and classist categorizations, modes to comply, modes to secure the authority complex proper of whiteness. The regime of cis-heterosexuality sustains the neo-liberal architect. The *patriarchitect*.

Co-moving beyond-against and beyond the gender regime of cis-heteronormativity, means as Bey underscores by way of Black. Trans. Feminism. As *black trans, black feminism, and trans feminism*, “a modality of worldly inhabitation, an agential and performative posture in and after this world.” Through the potency of indeterminate transness, which “marks primarily a movement away from an imposed starting point to an undisclosed (non)destination.” Indeterminacy as an invitation “to inhabit the world as unfixed, [which] requires to let go profoundly.” Beyond the racialized-sexualized gender colonial regime, “the gender self-determination affixed to black trans feminism is a social dance, but a sociality not really here; black trans

feminist gender self-determination avows a subjective cultivation of ways to do illegible genders, genders that abolish the bestowal of gender, genders that allow us all to be and become expansively outside of the very desire to have to bestow onto ourselves gender [...] gender radicality is radical insofar as it is presented as the undoing of roots (not a going back to the roots), indeed rootedness itself; radicality is an extirpation, not a tending. Radicality refuses to reduce its aim to static templates of what is only possible in the current discourse. Thinking of radicality as a departure rather than a return shifts the line of thought toward a fundamental dismantling of the current order of things. To be radical is not to wish to go back; to be radical is not to want to go back to a prelapsarian image of perfection, but rather to seek that which can be possible— or maybe even to seek that which is impossible. Gender radicality yearns for genders that might have been but for the normative binary regime of gender. They are otherwise genders that imagine what might be possible and impossible; they are imperfect and molten genders that subjectivate us differently.” Towards fugitive inhabitations that co-move ungendered modalities for existence. As, in “the vein of Cathy Cohen’s recalibration of queerness in her landmark essay *Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens* (Cohen, 2001), the kind of nonnormativity expressive of black trans feminism urges for rethought modes of inhabitation. Cohen argues that queerness, instead of being a possessed sexual identity ascribed to lesbian, gay, or bisexual people, should be understood as an existential orientation, as a relation to power, which broadens the ambit through which queerness is interacted.” And, “transness becomes a way of doing oneself as nonnormatively related to a coercive gender binary that saturates the world, a deployment of oneself as ill-fitting with the tenets of this world, escaping the circumscriptive reach of hegemony.” Because, “the colonial record does not have the last word on who we can be.” Even if “we don’t know, and that is okay. We just want something else, a something we do not know yet” (Bey, 2021, pp. 5–65).

If gender is always already a racial and class marker, and the amalgam of capitalism colonial-patriarchy domination is sustained by the *class-sexual-racial* division of labour, in other words labour and all the identities it imposes, from worker to professional identities as the architect. Then co-moving beyond-against and beyond such professional identity as the architect, which is to say: white-cis-hetero-bourgeois-men designer of space, means the *trans-figuration* (Bey, 2021) of other modalities for existence against class-race-sex/gender domination, towards the autonomy of other modalities of inhabitation and existence. Because, as we have noted, the inseparability of modes of inhabitation and modes for existence, means that rehearsing other modalities for existence beyond the architect, entails also imagining and constructing together, spatialities, as modes of inhabitation beyond cis-hetero-mono-functional modern space, all in the image of hegemonic mono-humanism.

Whiteness by design

“I am quite straight-faced as I ask soberly: ‘But what on earth is whiteness that one should so desire it?’ Then always, somehow, some way, silently but clearly, I am given to understand that whiteness is the ownership of the earth forever and ever, Amen!” (Du Bois, 1999, p. 30)

“Whiteness will claim whomever it wants, and whomever will listen” (Bey, 2021, p. 179)

Architecture is one of the main professional and disciplinary apparatuses of whiteness as a socio-spatial regime. Mabel O. Wilson argues that “the power of architecture and its archive is to produce ‘whiteness’ by design” and that “modern architecture builds the world for the white subject, maintaining the logics of racism while also imagining a future world in which nonwhite subjects remain exploitable and marginal” (Wilson, 2019). We could not agree more. Architecture is a factory of whiteness. Yet, Wilson also argues, that just as the power of architecture and its archive is to produce whiteness by design, architecture’s whiteness by design can change. We could not disagree more. Architecture cannot and will not change. To ask architecture to change its whiteness by design is to ask whiteness to change its *whiteness authority complex* as Fanon would say. In other words, it means to obviate the imbrication and inseparability of architecture and the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. For architecture to change its whiteness by design, we would need not the end of whiteness, but the end of the standpoint from which whiteness and its uni-versal spatial ideology, in other words architecture, make sense. We would need the end of *this* world. The end of the need for the architect and architecture.

Architecture is a constant reminder of the violent push towards the inseparability of the white-totality of being and the white-totality of inhabiting.

In the introduction to *Race and Modern Architecture: A Critical History from the Enlightenment to the Present*, Irene Cheng, Charles L. Davis II, and Mabel O. Wilson, underscore and unveil architecture’s whiteness, and note that, architecture has traditionally avoided discussing race and downplayed its significance. It suggests that other scholars have indirectly addressed race through related topics such as nationalism and evolution, while ignoring the entanglement of these topics with racial theories. The book contends that modern western epistemology is deeply racialized, with europe using concepts of human difference to uni-versalize its ideologies and practices while disregarding other ways of knowing. Modern architecture played a role in this racialized system through practices like classification, mapping, and planning. Ultimately, the book aims to fill the gap in architectural history by exploring how race has influenced architectural discourse and practice from

the enlightenment to the present (Wilson et al., 2020, pp. 3–4). We recognize this important effort in the historiography of architecture, yet the editors fall back into the modern paradigm of differentiation and inclusion, by arguing that, the “book contends that to understand the imbrication of race in modern architectural history, we must not only incorporate previously excluded building practices, but we must also look to the heart of the canon, deconstructing that which appears universal, modern, and transparent” (Wilson et al., 2020, p. 4). Incorporate is a synonym of inclusion, as Curiel underscores, “one of the great characteristics of modernity: at the same time that it generates a differentiation of groups that do not correspond to its paradigm (male, white, heterosexual and with class privileges), it needs this difference to legitimize itself, as analyzed by Wittig (Wittig, 2018) in how the heterosexual regime acts. The inclusion of these others has only been possible to the extent that the dominant referent, which considers itself as unique, keeps its ontological bases intact, and maintains the ‘otherness’ that marks modern thought and practices(Wittig, 2018)” (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 32). There is no future in incorporation.

Let us turn our gaze now to the imbrication of whiteness and *mestizaje*. By way of Echeverría in works such as *Modernidad y blanquitud*, we aim to unveil the imbrication of whiteness and *mestizaje* through the experiences of coloniality in so-called colombia and méxico, which enable the overrepresentation of the architect through whiteness, and its re/production of class, race and gender privileges.

As Valero notes in, *El devenir–blanco del mundo: debates Sur-Norte sobre la blanquitud desde Latinoamérica*, the studies and problematizations of whiteness are recent, around the XIX century (Du Bois, 1999, p. 30). As a topic of inquiry “‘white’ was first and inevitably questioned by racialized peoples (Roediger, 2008): colonized and enslaved. This can be seen in the critiques of racism and colonial exploitation formulated by representatives of the black radical tradition (Robinson, 2020), and something similar could be found in a counterpart radical indigenous tradition, [anti-colonial resistance embodied in Cuitláhuac, Cuauhtémoc, Atahualpa, Lautaro, Jacinto Canek, Túpac Amaru II, Micaela Bastidas, Túpac Katari, Bartolina Sisa and Třatřanka Iyotřanka, to mention a few]. Both would constitute the first critical thought formulated against whiteness, as they were forced to reflect on the hegemony of the white within the modern-colonial system, long before the discussion reached the universities” (Valero, 2023, p. 1).

Conceptual and academic reflections on whiteness within Abya Yala, writes Valero, have been recent. However, in the last years, there has been a greater focus on understanding the meanings of whiteness, particularly in relation to debates on racism. Despite this, in some parts of Abya Yala, the dominant belief in *mestizaje*, or mixed-race identity, has led to reluctance in acknowledging the existence of *blanquitud*—whiteness. For example, in so-called méxico, the slogan of *we are all mestizos* has not only concealed indigenous, afro-descendant, and asian identities, but has also hidden white political identities that are masked under the ambiguous category of mestizo. It is important to note that historically, the ruling elites in so-called méxico—as

many other—have predominantly been white, even if they identify as mestizo, revealing the entanglement of whiteness, mestizaje and power (Valero, 2023, pp. 1–2).

Modernidad y blanquitud was published posthumously in 2010, and unfortunately, Echeverría did not have the opportunity to finalize a number of pieces that it contains (Ferreira, 2019, p. xix). The main argument through the book attempts to problematize the humanist trust placed in two apparent conditions, “traditional” and new identities “related to the indispensable plurality of the human. The purpose of this volume is to explore the mechanisms that lead to that powerful homogenizing impulse to elude, and if not then to integrate, the forms of resistance presented by natural identities—both traditional and new and to prevail over the centrifugal and multiplying tendency that they bring.

‘Whiteness’ [blanquitud]—not whiteness [blancura]—is the pseudo-concrete identitarian quality destined to fulfill the absence of a concrete human identity in established modernity” (Echeverría, 2019, p. xxii).

Echeverría’s considerations on “whiteness” continue his life-long project on problematizing modernity and capitalism, which, as we have already seen, he does not identify as the same process. Diana Fuentes, in the *Foreword*, to *Modernity and "Whiteness"* notes that “the actually existing modernity, in its effort to constantly tame any unwanted expressions, demands a certain type of behavior functional to the logic of the valorization of value, a human being fit to succeed in capitalist production. This is why the process of capitalist accumulation has entailed the systematic oppression and repression of previous identities, ones that had to be replaced or reconstructed according to a new ethical model adequate to profit production” (Fuentes, 2019, p. xiv).

Thus, writes Fuentes, Echeverría proposes the concept of historical ethos to understand the various ways in which society is shaped under capitalism. Echeverría criticizes Weber’s characterization of the protestant ethic as being too narrow, as it only focuses on one historical mode of existence that prioritizes economic productivity. Echeverría believes that the spirit of capitalism creates a new type of person who is solely driven by capital and is willing to make sacrifices for wealth. However, Echeverría argues that this productivist or realist ethos is just one of many ways to confront capitalism. He identifies other possible forms, such as the classical, baroque, and romantic ethos. So, there are four different ethos of capitalism and each “refers to a different successive impulse of capitalism”: mediterranean, nordic, western, and central european. Each represents a different way capitalism has affected society. The realist ethos has always played a dominant role and has forced others to combine with it. And “questions the alleged unidirectional relationship between modernity and Protestant, white identity. He argues that the historical relationship between the capitalist way of life and the Puritan non-European population has been hypostatized to become both a general identity and an essential condition for the ordering of national states.” This promotes a certain way of life that can be adopted by people, becoming “white” even without white skin (Fuentes, 2019, p. xv).

According to Echeverría, as we have seen, the individual subject emerges through the enlightenment and the negation of the other. He then continues through Weber and argues that, the concept of “spirit” in Weber's work refers to the demand placed by society's economic life on its members for a certain type of behavior. This “spirit of capitalism” requires everyone to adapt to the demands of capitalist life, including work discipline, productivity, and the pursuit of profit. Weber believes that protestant christianity, particularly puritanism, best represents this ethos requested by capitalism. However, Echeverría criticizes Weber's approach, suggesting that it may involve a form of racism that requires individuals to possess a certain “whiteness” as a condition of modern humanity (Echeverría, 2019, p. 38). Echeverría, refers to a “zero point” in regard to the concrete identity of modern humans, which is focused on their ability to accumulate wealth through capitalist systems. This identity is shaped by the characteristics that align with the values of capitalism. Throughout history, traditional elements of life, such as language and customs, have been suppressed in favor of market dynamics. These elements hinder the development of the type of person needed for capitalist production and must be replaced or reconstructed according to capitalist values (Echeverría, 2019, p. 39).

Echeverría, argues then, that the “identitarian-civilizational feature that is meant by ‘whiteness’” that originated from the ethnic appearance of northwestern europeans, gradually—from the XV to the XVIII century—became necessary and essential to being considered modern, relegating peoples of color or non-western backgrounds to a pre-modern or non-human category. However, during this transition, the condition of whiteness for modern identity became subordinate to the identitarian order imposed by capitalist modernity. This means that peoples of color can obtain modern identity without completely assimilating into whiteness, as long as they demonstrate their whiteness in some way (Echeverría, 2019, p. 41). “Whiteness” refers to “the visible aspect of capitalist ethical identity insofar as it is overdetermined by racial whiteness—a racial whiteness that relativizes itself when exercising that overdetermination. It is a character's composure, a composure that denotes ‘whiteness,’ and not racial whiteness, that stands out in the representations of the new human dignity across numerous portraits of bourgeois or modern human beings” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 42).

Thus, Echeverría argues, that we can say that, modern capitalism promotes a form of racism that is based on civilizational identity rather than ethnic identity. This type of racism is more tolerant and can accept certain racial and cultural differences, but it still remains a form of racism. It is more focused on subtle indications of internalization of capitalist values rather than only physical appearance. Even individuals who are racially white can be rejected if they do not exhibit the desired capitalist ethos. “The ‘racism’ of ‘whiteness’ only demands that the internalization of the capitalist ethos be made manifest in some way, with some sign, in external or corporal appearance. The biological traits related to racial whiteness are a necessary but not sufficient expression of that internalization, and they are also rather imprecise within a wide range of variations” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 42). Yet, “it is enough for the capitalist state to enter into one of its stages of sovereign

recomposition, to be forced to restructure and redefine the national identity that it imprints on its population, for the definition of ‘whiteness’ to return to fundamentalism and resuscitate ethnic whiteness as an indispensable proof of obedience to the ‘spirit of capitalism,’ as a sign of humanity and modernity” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 44).

Echeverría, warns us, by saying that “original or pure whiteness” must not be confused with the “*mestizo* whiteness [*la ‘blancura’ mestiza*] that had hidden under the tolerant ‘whiteness’ that prevailed in modern liberal capitalist nations” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 44). And, that “the standard racism of capitalist modernity is a racism based on ‘whiteness.’ This is the case because the type of human being required by the capitalist economic system is characterized by a willingness to submit to a determining fact: that the logic of the accumulation of capital dominates the logic of concrete human life and imposes on humans every day the need to self-sacrifice. According to this view, this is a disposition that can only be guaranteed by the ethics embodied in ‘whiteness.’ As long as this system and this type of human being prevail, racism will be an indispensable condition of civilized life” (Echeverría, 2019, p. 50).

The architect is sustained by both the desire of whiteness, as the desire for whiteness. *Blanqueados* to be architects. Fanon argued white superiority creates colonized inferiority. We could say that the architect—which is always already white—“acts in obedience to an authority complex, a leadership complex” (Fanon, 2008, p. 73) proper of whiteness. The authoritarian or leadership complex of whiteness.

The soft police of power, technocrats and the bourgeoisie

“Design (industrial, architectural, urban, regional or environmental, etc.) as a particular practice within the whole of social practice, is objectively a technical-empirical practice framed and determined in the capitalist mode of production and in the colombian social formation, by the relations of exploitation established between capital and wage labor. Therefore, the designer is an instrument of such exploitation. As a non-scientific practice, its theory is nothing more than a systematic elaboration of partial aspects of bourgeois ideology” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 45)

“The designer, in carrying out his technical practice, is thus an instrument at the service of the relations of production in force in society; its practice is committed to capital both in economic terms by serving as an instrument in the exploitation of the salaried construction worker, and in ideological terms by acting as a means—very effective at times—of the reproduction of the bourgeois ideology contained not only in the function

of his work, but also in the very form that the designer gives it, for the "satisfaction" of his client and the eternal glory of his personal genius" (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 53)

"...to what social class does the designer belong? If we understand as social class the 'effect' of the set of structures of the mode of production or social formation on the social agents that support it, an organization ultimately determined by the relations of production (economic structure), we can affirm: —Those who possess the means of production and/or invest capital-money in the production of the objects of design, exploiting the salaried labor force; or who employ other designers and auxiliaries as salaried workers in the production of the design itself, belong to the bourgeoisie, large or small. — Designers who sell their labor power to the State, to real estate capital or to other designers, in exchange for a salary, are wage laborers located in their highest social stratum; but the fact of acting as technical cadres and docile instruments of capital in the exploitation of construction workers, the profound domination exercised by bourgeois ideology over the general components of the 'ideology of design,' the consequent reproduction they carry out of it in their practice and teaching, and the political support they give, generally, to the bourgeoisie and its State, objectively places them in a social category at the service of Capital: technocracy" (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 58)

As Curiel remarks, anthropology has been hegemonically *otrológica*—other-logic. Which is to say, that still otherness, mostly subalternized otherness, continues to be the research subjects of most anthropologists and social theorists, continuing the knowledge-power relation, and "do not sufficiently question the place of privilege of those who construct knowledge about the 'others.' It is not enough to perceive them as contemporaries of the same world; it is necessary to question the place of reference of those who construct anthropological thought." Which is why, Curiel, puts forward the notion of "*anthropology of domination*, which consists of unveiling the forms, ways, strategies, discourses that define certain social groups as 'others' from places of power and domination" (Curiel Pichardo, 2011, p. 27).

This is important because, we are not aiming for a critical analysis of the otherness that architecture produces, neither through the concealment, domination and destruction of inhabiting practices nor existences. But, most importantly we are compelled to unveil, architecture and the architect, from within, as the subject and object of problematization, both architecture as a uni-versal hegemonic technology and the architect as a

uni-versal hegemonic identity, from the standpoint of coloniality in Abya Yala. This means, digging into the privacy, the privilege, the comfort of the upper classes, unveiling the white bourgeois patriarchitect.

All this meanderings through; the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject; the over-representation of the human; the coloniality of being; the ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia; the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious; mestizaje; patriarchy; cis-heteronormativity; and whiteness, in order to better understand the over-representation of the architect by the white petty-bourgeois cis-hetero mestizo man, through the inseparability and imbrication of class-gender/sex-race asymmetric power relations. And, most importantly to underscore how entangled the architect is to the *latinfundista* bourgeoisie, the industrial bourgeoisie and now the financial bourgeoisie, through the building industry, financial and real estate speculation, either as a class member or a serf. It is not by accident that the de-professionalized architect and anarchist Braulio Hornedo Rocha calls the architect the “soft police of power.”¹¹ A violent *softness*.

We write from the *entrañas* of white-mestizo bourgeoisie. We know. We have lived how their privacy operates. That is to say, de-prived of the public, not to mention the common. We write from the spatio-temporal possibility of white-colonial bourgeois privilege. Fuck the privacy of their: homes, schools, offices, faculty associations and professional associations! Fuck the bourgeoisie! We know! We know how power and privileges are trafficked, commercialized and speculated from the *baño turco* and bar of their country clubs, we know how biennial prizes are distributed and the violence’s and abuses committed from their summer houses in cartagena. We know how success is inherited. We have inherited success. We have seen the elites. And also the avant-garde *anti-elites* as Fals Borda would say (Fals Borda, 1970) (Fals Borda, 2008b) (Fals Borda, 2014). We have been *blanqueados* to be architects.

The modality of existence that over-represents the architect in so-called méxico and colombia is the white-cis-hetero-petty-bourgeois mestizo man. Although, today, any/one *can be* an architect. Architecture schools are, like all other disciplines now, a site of inclusion. Even if today any/one *can be* an architect, power is still concentrated by/for the support of the white-mestizo-bourgeoisie and the colonial-state, the *freedom* to be an architect does not imply surviving or complying with the imposed aspirations of the logistics of desires. But, let us have something very clear, just as we said previously, that we are not promoting the need to be better and ethical architects, we are also not promoting the need for more diverse modalities of being architects, the need for black architects, queer architects or indigenous architects. No. We have seen the tramp of identity politics in the so-called global north. Becoming architect is becoming white. By way of Moten and Harney, and through Fanon, we argue, we are co-moving not to end the architect or architecture, but the end of the standpoint from which it makes sense to need the architect and architecture.

Again, the uni-versal individual subject is not, any/body. It is overrepresented by white-bourgeois-male-cis-hetero-able bodies—yes there are multiple ways to name *esta gonorrhea*. This overrepresentation, or this

hegemonic presence, is constituted in Abya Yala, through the violent experience of coloniality. We feel it is important, to underscore, what Zapata Olivella notes regarding the white-caste system, in Abya Yala, “a multiracial continent based on caste hierarchies, the words ‘bourgeoisie,’ ‘middle class’ and ‘workers’ came to have other connotations, different from those of europe. The new bourgeoisie would be the *criollos*, whites or mestizos, heirs of colonialism; only those who, due to mestizaje, had lost their pigmentation, were called ‘free’ citizens. Illiterate people and women were deprived of the vote, which was only granted to the former at the beginning of this century and to the latter fifty years later. African-Americans and Amerindians remained and remain in the fields as slaves and indentured servants, even though today, with the right to vote, they are called ‘workers’ and ‘citizens’” (Zapata Olivella, 2020, p. 333).

A class critique calls for a historical gaze. As Ramón de Armas argues in, *La burguesía latinoamericana. Aspectos de su evolución*, regarding the rise of criollo-bourgeoisie, during spanish colonization in Abya Yala from the XVI to the XVIII century, the spanish colonies became an important part of the global mercantile system and world market. They were initially incorporated into european economic life through the extraction of precious metals, which fueled european development. Eventually, the colonies transitioned into producing economies that exported materials and products demanded by europe, while also becoming significant consumer markets for european goods. In the late XVIII century, european capitalism entered a stage of rapid industrialization, and spain was forced to partially break its commercial monopoly over its colonies. This led to an expansion of export possibilities and specialization within the colonies. However, the criollo landowning class and merchant bourgeoisie, who had benefited from an export-focused economy heavily reliant on contraband trade, saw the spanish colonial power as a hindrance to their further growth. The spanish power represented a commercial monopoly, loss of profits, customs collections, bureaucratic oppression, and the barrier separating them from european industrial advancement and capitalist development (de Armas, 1970, pp. 58–59).

The revolutionary wave that occurred in spanish-controlled so-called américa from 1810 to 1826, resulting in the *non-event* of liberation of all colonies except so-called cuba and puerto rico, is part of the overall emancipation of the mestizo bourgeoisie during the XVIII and XIX centuries. This period of liberation began with the freedom of the 13 north american colonies in 1776. These revolutions served as a means to strengthen capitalism, remove barriers to connecting with the growing world capitalist system, establish free trade, and promote the further development of capitalism (de Armas, 1970, p. 60).

After spain was expelled from the former colonies, power was taken over by the export-producing mestizo bourgeois classes. However, those that gained power were still in the early stages of class consolidation and economically weak. They participated in the struggle for independence alongside other groups, but once independence was achieved, they were not able to play a significant role. The main productive function in these

colonies was production for export, which led to a political revolution that did not address the agrarian question nor the re-distribution of land. The groups in power were not interested in transforming the colonial economic structure based on *latifundia* ownership of land, but instead sought to consolidate their economic dominance. As a result, *latifundia* ownership of land continued to grow even after the so-called independence, in the hands of the local bourgeoisie (de Armas, 1970, pp. 60–61).

During the late XIX century, there were constant conflicts between landowner bourgeoisie and the emerging industrial bourgeoisie. These struggles often turned violent and resembled civil war, but the industrial bourgeoisie eventually gained temporary power in countries like so-called Colombia, Chile, and Uruguay. This bourgeoisie, still in its early stages of capitalist development, mobilized and gained support from the masses. However, their progress was hindered by imperialism, as English capital began to dominate the colonial economy (de Armas, 1970, p. 65). de Armas, underscores, that “as a whole—and together with the foreign imperialist bourgeoisie—the *terrateniente* bourgeoisie, the industrial bourgeoisie producing for export, and their corresponding merchant bourgeoisie, are bearers of the economic and political relations of dependence with the imperialist country of which they are its local representatives and its junior partner. They belong, in fact, to a productive structure which only relates to their own country with regard to the possibilities of cheapening production and increasing its profits” (de Armas, 1970, p. 69).

Moten, notes that in *The Weapon of Theory*, Amílcar Cabral, “says that the petty bourgeoisie are best placed to take over after colonialism in part because this class does, indeed, have an understanding of imperialism. After all, who would feel more keenly the denial of personhood, which imperialism administers as politico-economic instrument and effect, than those who feel they are most proximate to it? Who is more aware of the unbridgeable distance between themselves and personhood than those who suffer the constant and brutally apparent nearness of this impossible subject and object of desire, which imperialism imposes with such diabolical rigor? In a complicated way, both in and against the grain of Cabral (and Septima Clark and Frantz Fanon and Elma Francois and Fred Hampton and Claudia Jones and Paule Marshall and George Padmore and Funmilayo Ransome-Kuti and Walter Rodney and Barbara Smith), we have grown accustomed to the unspoken notion that those who are so poised speak most naturally and effectively of and for the anti-colonial impulse and aspiration. But when Cabral says so clearly that there is no contradiction between having an analysis of imperialism and being part of the petty bourgeoisie, and when he suggests so emphatically that such an analysis is an essential feature of the petty bourgeoisie in and after colonialism, and when we remain aware of the labor the petty bourgeoisie does in the construction and maintenance of colonialism and imperialism in and after colonialism and imperialism, in the countries and peoples who continue to be subjected to them, where aftermath and immersion are consubstantial, we might be able to accept the chance—which Cabral offers us—to reconsider our habits” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 145).

If the basis of domination and the maintenance of colonial power was given through/by/for the dis/possession, enclosure and privatization of life and land, this is the terrifying paradigm of territorial coloniality, which still today sustains white mestizo-colonial bourgeoisie. This is important because architecture has been always already an important cog of territorial coloniality, by connecting the landowner bourgeoisie—*latifundistas*—, industrial bourgeoisie and commercial bourgeoisie, through enclosing the territory but most importantly through real estate speculation, and the building industry, constructing spatial commodities i.e. buildings, and violent state spatial apparatuses as prisons, borders, schools, and so on. And the architect—through its social climbing expertise—both or either a member of these social classes or as serf. A full account of the genealogy of real estate speculation in relation to territorial coloniality is yet to be written.

Neo-liberal by design: Economic subject(ion) Or when are we?

“If the marxist tradition, originating in industrial capitalism, brought us the awareness that the expropriation of the human vital force in its manifestation as labor power is the source of capital accumulation, the new version of capitalism (neoliberal and ‘neo’ conservative) leads us to recognize that the object of such expropriation is not reduced to this domain. In this new fold, expropriation is refined and it becomes more evident that it is from the pulsional movement at its very origin that the regime feeds. That is to say, it is nourished by the very impulse whose destiny would be the creation of forms of existence and cooperation in which the demands of life are concretized, transfiguring the scenarios of the present and transvaluing its values. Deviating from its own ethical destiny, the drive is channeled by the regime to build worlds according to its designs: the accumulation of economic, political, cultural and narcissistic capital” (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 97)

“Economics are the method; the object is to change the heart and soul” (Thatcher & Butt, 1981)

“Neoliberalism sealed the global deal on democratic despotism. As Du Bois explains, democratic despotism was an innovative form of the global color line. Workers would be designated as white and offered deputy positions in the rule of each country, in exchange for aligning with the ruling classes against people of color inside and outside the borders of that nation. But in reading Du Bois we see a second dimension to this deputization,

securing the deal through a promised, though always thwarted, individuation for these workers. Or, today, for these homeowners. That is, democratic despotism was also about the democratization of despotism. We have referred to this democratization as policy. But such a hacked word should not hide the brutality of the agreement. Each of these persons was offered the opportunity to individuate through despotic violence against blackness (best understood, here, as the refusal of refused access to the unity of whiteness and personhood). Indeed, this despotic violence was the core manufacturing process of the thwarted individual. The production of white people on an industrial scale required this democratization of despotism. Of course, signing up to a world of despotism, proving one's 'self' through ongoing predatory violence against those who claim the differences they enact, required accepting the democratization of despotism as a general principle, and that meant accepting it in the military, in the state, and especially at work—as, in other words, Fordism, and later, logistical capitalism, each of which, in their own way, necessitate and manufacture a brutal little dictator in every workplace. And once despotism is accepted by white people, in and as every little ritual of their own self-acceptance, all of which amount to an endless lag, an eternal deferral, the interpersonal becomes the only way to mollify it. If interpersonal relations form the reservoir of whiteness into which the people tap for dead energy and unsustainable sustenance, then the intersectional becomes the only way for the ones who wait on waiting, whose doubly interminable wait takes the form of critique, to mollify the constantly redoubled despotism they face. Either way, every body waits in vain.” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 119)

If the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination ask of us to become economic existences, to become fit for labour subjection, which is to say, to become white. What are the current technologies, the modalities and the logistics of the neo-liberal re/production of subjectivity, if neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life as a ubiquitous form of our existence (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 3)?

In the previous chapter we drew a genealogy of the neo-liberalization of both so-called México and Colombia, through various and in some aspects contradictory understandings of neo-liberalism: neo-liberalism as an ideological hegemonic project; neo-liberalism as policy and programme; neo-liberalism as state form, neo-liberalism as governmentality; neo-liberalism as rationality; neo-liberalism as pure theoretical shit and fourth world war; and neo-liberalism as unconventional forms of exploitation.

And, argued five points in no particular order: first, we need to focus diverse readings of neo-liberalism as modes of government of freedom through the conduct of conduct; second, if neo-liberalism is an unfinished and ongoing project we need to situate through the neo-liberalization of so-called colombia and méxico; third, if neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life and an ubiquitous form of our existence, we must problematize such production of subjectivity, as a regime of life and the false promise it sustains of the uni-versal individual economic subject, *homo œconomicus*; fourth, we must problematize the particular neo-liberal semantic dispositifs, and its logistics; and fifth, situating such processes and dispositifs, asks to problematize neo-liberal territorialization through the *longue durée* of territorial coloniality.

The previous two sections, *Uni-versal by design: The individual subject* and *White by design: Coloniality of being or what does it mean being human?*, intend to draw a broad cartography to study how the current modalities for existence, that is, economic existences under neo-liberalism are imbricated through the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, the over-representation of the human, the coloniality of being, the ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia, the colonial-racial-cishetero-patriarchal-capitalist unconscious, mestizaje, patriarchy, cis-heteronormativity and whiteness. With the purpose of better understanding the over-representation of the neo-liberal architect by petty-bourgeois mestizo men, through the imbrication and inseparability of class-gender/sex-race asymmetric power relations. The false promise of neo-liberal uni-versal individual subject.

In order to frame how the neo-liberal labouring subject poses as the current modality of the majoritarian subject, in the coming sections we argue that the imbrication of *homo œconomicus*, human capital, entrepreneur and consumer-citizen, are all modes of neo-liberal subjection that not only compose the basis for the ethno-class or western-bourgeois genre of the human as Wynter would say, but also lay the ground for the modulation of the neo-liberal architect, overrepresented by mestizo-white-bourgeois-male-heterosexual-able bodies, in so-called colombia and méxico. In the coming chapters we will examine how through the uni-versity and abstract labour, in other words, vocational education and professionalization, the neo-liberal architect is further modulated and sustained.

Jason Read argues that neo-liberalism “scrambles and exchanges the terms of opposition between ‘worker’ and ‘capitalist.’” And by way of Balibar notes that, “the capitalist is defined as worker, as an ‘entrepreneur’; the worker, as the bearer of a capacity, of a human capital” (Balibar, 2016) in (Read, 2009, p. 31). Labour, Read argues, has expanded beyond just the workplace and now includes any activity that leads to desired outcomes. The terms “labour” and “human capital” have merged, with “labour” referring to the activity and “human capital” referring to the effects and history of that activity. This has resulted in the economy becoming a way of life, where every action is evaluated based on maximizing output while minimizing costs.

This idea has been generalized to all aspects of society, erasing the recognition of exploitation. Neo-liberalism can be seen as a version of capitalism that maintains existing wealth distribution while eliminating the social insecurity and antagonism of traditional capitalism (Read, 2009, p. 32).

Economo-subjectivization

“We have here a radicalization of what the German ordoliberals had already defined with regard to governmental action: leave the economic game as free as possible and create a Gesellschaftspolitik. The American liberals say: if you want to maintain this Gesellschaftspolitik in the order of the law, you must consider everyone as a player and only intervene on an environment in which he is able to play. An environmental technology whose main aspects are:

- the definition of a framework around the individual which is loose enough for him to be able to play; —the possibility for the individual of regulation of the effects of the definition of his own framework;
 - the regulation of environmental effects
 - non damage
 - non absorption
 - the autonomy of these environmental spaces. [6th page] Not a standardizing, identificatory, hierarchical individualization, but an environmentalism open to unknowns and transversal phenomena. Lateralism. Technology of the environment, unknowns, freedoms of [interplays?] between supplies and demands.
 - But does this mean that we are dealing with natural subjects?” [end of the manuscript]”
- (Foucault, 2008, p. 261)

Manuel Schwartzberg in *Foucault’s “environmental” power: Architecture and neoliberal subjectivization*, draws from the notion of *techniques of environmental technology* briefly commented by Foucault in *The Birth of Biopolitics*, in order to consider how the processes of neo-liberal “economization” produces a specific modality of subjectivity. Neo-liberalism is seen as a new mode of capitalism and government that has disseminated through its regulatory and epistemological frameworks. These ideas and paradigms have become deeply ingrained in our socio-ontological and onto-epistemological systems. “It is not a question of posing a one-to-one relation between neoliberal architecture and neoliberal subjects, but of showing how the rationality and the metrics—the epistemologies; social and technical systems of symbolization—that configure both are intimately

entangled and effectively produce each other. Among these metrics, the popular notion of ‘creativity’ is particularly interesting because it has become a generalized imperative of neoliberalized societies: creativity (and its proxies, ‘innovation’ and ‘disruption’) are seen today as an essential component of any ‘competitive’ worker. Creativity is a fundamental metric within what neoliberals call ‘human capital’—a concept that, as we shall see, lies at the core of neoliberal subjectivization” (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 181).

As Schvartzberg notes, in the *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault discussed the concept of “governmentality” and how it relates to neo-liberalism. He explains that there is a difference between liberal and neo-liberal rationality, as well as the conceptual differences between liberal and neo-liberal subjects. Foucault described liberalism as a form of “governmental naturalism,” where the governing principle is based on the market. The market is seen as a source of truth, representing the natural truth found in the exchange between independent individuals. Liberalism believes that the market is the best mechanism for governing, finding the right balance between too much and too little intervention. According to Foucault, neo-liberal thinkers believe that the market is not a natural mechanism but an ideal model for society. They view market society as a way to prevent excessive government authority, drawing from Germany’s experience with the Weimar Republic and the Nazi regime. Neo-liberals believe that the social processes of markets, such as rewarding utility and punishing inefficiency, can counteract authoritarian tendencies. However, they argue that the market cannot simply be accepted as it is, but must be actively constructed and induced. Neo-liberalism represents a shift in thinking, as it governs for the market rather than because of it, and embraces a constructivist approach to social policy (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 182).

Thus, Schvartzberg writes, neo-liberalism creates a paradox where the government must use policies to promote competition in the economy, but not traditional economic policies. Instead, the government focuses on shaping the social and technical aspects of society in order to encourage certain socio-economic behaviors. “Foucault argues, the ultimate horizon and ‘object of governmental action is what the Germans call ‘die soziale Umwelt’: the social environment” (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 183).

Foucault focuses on how the neo-liberal subject is established through environmental controls, which define individuals and the population as entrepreneurial. The goal is for the market to become the basis of society, encouraging economic competition among individuals. This process is achieved by redefining labour and life as human capital. Neo-liberals criticize how classical economists define labour, arguing that it has been treated as an empty concept without any real meaning. They ignore the actual experiences of workers and instead discuss labour in terms of its potential for capital accumulation, which they call “human capital.” In this view, people are not exploited by external forces but instead become entrepreneurs of themselves. All qualities, whether innate or acquired, are seen as functions of human capital that can be invested in and regulated by the individual subject to make them more productive and profitable. According to this perspective, everyone has

some form of human capital that can be optimized, regardless of their social class. The individual's abilities, skills, and knowledge are seen as a “machine” owned by the individual and can be used to generate income through wages or other means (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 183).

This shift in the understanding of labour as human capital, Schvartzberg argues, has expanded the field of economics to include all aspects of human activity. This has redefined the discipline and placed a focus on human behavior and rationality. “Human capital” allows for the measurement and comparison of behaviors and conditions, aligning them with an adaptive and responsive environment. Behavioral economics emerged alongside neo-liberalism and seeks to qualify previously non-economic behaviors, such as family life or education, without requiring them to be rational. Environmental governmentality treats individuals as economic operators, responsive to calculable factors, and translates all behavior into economic terms. It operates like a cybernetic system, optimizing the system by analyzing and modulating environmental controls rather than directly controlling the individual. Neo-liberal environmental economization allows governmentality (power) to remain hidden in plain sight. It is difficult to detect because it is ubiquitous. As Schvartzberg proposes, through this specific type of *econo-mo-subjectivization*, which is closely tied to competition and productivity as social norms, neo-liberal subjects are produced through their actions in their environment. This creates a purely formal subject; a subject without subjectivity in terms of power, but still highly governable. Instead of relying on normative, economic, or ideological regulations, cultural techniques are used to shape social reality in the form of a socio-technical “game.” Similar to a chess board or computer interface, an artificial “environment” brings together a set of protocols and a material plane. Environmental power brings the ideological paradigm of a market-based society to life. It allows for an epistemology, rationality, and valuation system to be put into action in society, and consequently impact socio-political reality in a practical and accessible manner, rather than being imposed from above (Schvartzberg, 2015, pp. 183–185).

This internal subjugation as Foucault refers (Foucault, 2008, p. 277), modulated through environmental logistics, re/produces the neo-liberal architect. A labour identity, subsumed as Echeverría argues, “human life in its ‘value form’ is like a ‘double’ or a ‘ghost’ of what it is itself in its ‘natural form’; it is an objectified projection of its own reproduction process in what it has, among other things, of capacity for the creation and destruction of economic value within the world of capitalist commodities or, what is the same, in what it has, abstractly, of sufficient vehicle for the process of self-valorization of capitalist value or process of capital accumulation [...] Nothing is produced or consumed in purely modern society if its production/consumption is not the vehicle of capital accumulation. As far as social life itself is concerned, this subsumption consists in the phenomenon of ‘alienation’: the subjectivity of that life, its political capacity to identify itself or decide on itself, on its form, is replaced by its ghostly representative, by the ‘will’ of self-valorization that is in the economic value of the world of capitalist commodities, ‘will’ that acts automatically,

‘from the things themselves,’ which acquire for this reason the function of ‘fetishes.’ of objects that ‘miraculously’ socialize the private owners, who would be asocial by definition [...] The devastating effect that the fact of capitalist subsumption has on human life, and on the actual figure of nature that shelters it, is evident: the goal achieved again and again by the process of reproduction of wealth in its capitalist mode is genocidal and suicidal at the same time. It consists, first, in the ‘perfection’ of the process of exploitation of the human being as a labor force, the same that implies a condemnation of entire populations to the living death of marginality (if not to death without further ado) in order to lower the ‘price of labor’ on a global scale, and, second, in the ‘perfecting’ of the irrational or counterproductive exploitation of present-day nature (treated as a simple reservoir of certain materials and certain energies), which insists on destroying the equilibrium proper to it, if such destruction serves the interests—in truth always conjunctural—of capitalist accumulation” (Echeverría, 2008, pp. 48–50).

Homo Œconomicus

“How was Homo Œconomicus foisted on us? In spite of his elegant foreign name, he is selfish and unmannered, brutish as Caliban, naïve as Man Friday. We all love to speak scathingly of him. Judging from the bad press he receives, we actually dislike him a lot and cannot believe anyone could really be so greedy and selfish. He is logical, but even that is unattractive. His shadow stretches across our thoughts so effectively that we even use his language for criticizing him. [...] Economic *man* is an easy target for attack, with retaliatory complaints that he is drawn wrong. Our subject is about his origins: Where did someone without social attributes come from in the first place, and why has he expanded from a small, theoretical niche to become an all-embracing mythological figure? He is like a republican parallel to the imperial microcosm of former civilizations” (Douglas & Ney, 1998, p. 23).

“...able to *separate* the being of being human (in its hitherto innumerable local particularities) from our present globally hegemonic, and homogenized conception of being human in the now purely secular, because biocentric terms, of *Man*, in its now second reinvented, since the nineteenth century, concept/self-conception as Liberal/NeoLiberal humanism’s *homo Œconomicus*, in the reoccupied place of the Renaissance ‘lay intelligentsia’s’ original invention of Man in civic humanist terms as *homo politicus*). Yet like the latter, also now rhetorically discursively, and institutionally

overrepresented and enacted as if its prototype's *member class* of being human were isomorphic with the *class of classes* of our species being; its referent 'we' thereby also isomorphic with the referent 'we...of the horizon of humanity'" (Wynter, 2007, p. 6).

Homo œconomicus as a concept, or as a *modality* of existence, of the economic ¿human?, "emerged from the methodological debate on the economic agent of political economy. If John Stuart Mill gave birth to the economic *man* in his 1836 essay *On the Definition of Political Economy*, he certainly did not baptize him. The expression was introduced by Francis A. Walker after Mill passed away in the 1870s. Economic *man* acquired its Latin name of *homo œconomicus* under the pen of French Catholic economist Claudio Jannet in 1878. Yet, only at the end of the century did Maffeo Pantaleoni (1889) proudly reclaim *homo œconomicus* as a building block of pure economics. In reaction to the evolutionary hedonism of Pantaleoni, Vilfredo Pareto then cleansed the concept of *homo œconomicus* and realized the Millian project of an abstract science based on an economic agent" (Bee & Desmarais-Tremblay, 2023, p. 1).

In *Human being as noun? Or being human as praxis? Towards the autopoietic turn/overtun: A manifesto*, regarding the "western-bourgeois prototype of being human, in its second reinvented biohumanist form of Man, as *homo œconomicus*" (Wynter, 2007, p. 21), Wynter argues by way of J.G.A Pocock, *Anglo-American Civic Humanism in Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History* that the scottish school's historical cosmogony led to a shift in the understanding of human history. According to Wynter, the political state was no longer the main determinant of history. Instead, the code of symbolic life and identity of the ruling caste landed gentry, known as *homo politicus*, had to be replaced by the bourgeois enterprise of manufacturing and the industrial revolution. This shift was seen as inevitable and necessary within the framework of the "mode of production" schema. The new bourgeois self-conception, *homo œconomicus*, was legitimized by its economic decision making and pursuit of capital accumulation as the means of production. This pursuit was framed as serving the "common good" as defined by Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. This new understanding of the "common good" was crucial for the western bourgeoisie to maintain their ruling class status and the hegemony of the western world system in its current ethno-class configuration (Wynter, 2007, p. 32).

Vladimir Safatle, Fábio Franco, Julio Cesar Lemes de Castro, Ronaldo Manzi and Yasmin Afshar, in *Neoliberalismo como gestão do sofrimento psíquico* (Safatle et al., 2023, pp. 3–5), draw a genealogy of the market rationality of the neo-liberal subject and its action not "through the unfolding of the liberal conception of freedom as 'self-ownership' that appeared with the Levellers in the political effervescence of XVII century england and quickly reached its liberal formulation with John Locke." But, through, "the exploration of another path, namely, the one that starts from the constitution of a sort of 'empirical-transcendental dyad' through the unfolding of the economic-psychological articulation of the concept of 'interest.' Since the

emergence of political economy in the middle of the 18th century, the concept of interest has served as a foundation for the liberal conception of human action. The fact that ‘interest’ also means ‘interest rate’ already indicates its affinity with the market (extrapolating this relationship to the realm of neoliberalism, it is worth recalling that the purpose at the basis of the concept of ‘human capital’ is self-valorization through education, just as interest valorizes capital). Such an affinity refers to the fact that the rise of the liberal doctrine is confused with the rise of the industrial bourgeoisie” (Safatle et al., 2023, p. 3).

According to Hume, in professions that require hard work, the desire for financial gain is more important than the desire for pleasure. Over time, it became widely accepted that the pursuit of wealth can help regulate our emotions. Adam Smith and Mandeville also emphasize the importance of pursuing personal interest and wealth. They argue that individual self-interest can lead to collective benefits. Utilitarian thought, particularly through Bentham and Mill, which focuses on maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain, gained popularity in the XVII and XIX centuries. Utilitarianism was embraced by the urban bourgeoisie in England and challenged the privileges of the aristocracy and tried to establish their own principles of individual freedoms, property rights, and trades (Safatle et al., 2023, pp. 4–5).

Through another path, Read in *A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity*, by way of Foucault examines how “neo-liberalism can be viewed as a particular production of subjectivity, as a way in which individuals are constituted as subjects of “human capital” and argues “that neo-liberalism entails a fundamental reexamination of the tools of critical thought, an examination of how freedom can constitute a form of subjection” (Read, 2009, p. 25).

Read, argues then, that when examining neo-liberalism, it is important to focus on how it has transformed our understanding of “human nature” and social existence. This requires looking at the role of ideology, power, and subjectivity in shaping neo-liberalism. By studying neo-liberalism, we can gain a better understanding of how power and ideologies impact our material reality. Foucault's lectures on neo-liberalism expand on this idea and emphasize the importance of examining how truth and subjectivity are constructed in the present. Foucault's analysis distinguishes between classical liberalism and neo-liberalism, with the difference lying in their respective focuses on economic activity, through exchange and competition. Both forms of liberalism have a concept of homo oeconomicus, but neo-liberalism places more emphasis on competition rather than exchange (Read, 2009, pp. 26–27).

The shift, Read notes, from viewing humans as purely economic beings to competitive beings has changed how we define ourselves and how we are “made subjects.” Neo-liberalism has expanded the influence of economics, seeing all human actions as economic calculations and treating workers as human capital. Any activity that improves earning potential or satisfaction is seen as an investment in oneself. However, there are limitations to improving one's human capital, which can be overcome through technologies like plastic surgery

and genetic engineering. As Foucault underscores “homo oeconomicus is an entrepreneur, an entrepreneur of himself” (Foucault, 2008) in (Read, 2009, p. 28). And, argues that neo-liberalism is not just a victory for capitalist ideology, but a new way of governing and creating a different type of subject. Neo-liberalism governs through interest, investment, and competition rather than rights and laws, influencing individuals' desires and interests through the affordability or costliness of certain activities (Read, 2009, p. 29).

The new form of governmental reason seeks freedom, but in doing so, it actually controls and organizes it. This new approach to governing is focused on managing freedom rather than commanding people to be free. The freedoms of the market are not separate from government, but are an integral part of its strategy. Neo-liberalism, as a mode of governmentality, operates by influencing people's interests, desires, and aspirations rather than through rights and obligations. It does not directly control individuals' bodies or restrict their actions, but instead acts on the conditions that shape their actions. This approach to government leads to a paradox where power becomes less physically restrictive but more intense, permeating all aspects of people's lives and possibilities (Read, 2009, p. 29).

Human Capital

“Human capital would appear to be a strategic category, involved as Michel Feher suggests, with a strategy of investment in and speculation on the self. But as Marina Vishmidt reminds us, the automatic subject of capital that human capital seeks to emulate, is a hollow subject, and a subject dedicated to hollowing itself precisely by expelling the negativity of labor, by exiling the one who, in being less and more than one, are his figure, his other, his double, the bearers of a generativity without reserve. Now, human capital is the automatic subject's substitute, carrying out its engagement with the skills of daily financialisation and logistics, both of which act on it as if it were an impediment to movement and not a vehicle in motion. Human capital, in other words, departs from the strategic subject of neoliberalism, generalizing through selfinfliction the departure that subject ritually imposes upon its exiled interiors and making of itself a porous object that still talks like a subject, as if in some burlesque enactment of philosophy's dream of the ultimate reconciliation. It is for this reason that human capital cannot be strategized, or indeed managed, in any traditional sense, and therefore in turn we can see the hollowing out of the field of business strategy, including the decline of the MBA degree, and the rise of ‘leadership studies’” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 97)

“Education and training are the most important investments in human capital” (Becker, 1994, p. 17)

The concept of *human capital* can be traced back to Adam Smith (Smith, 2018), who discussed the acquisition of talents through education, study, or apprenticeship as a form of capital. He recognized that these talents are not only valuable to the individual but also to society as a whole. The term *human capital* was first formally used in economics by Irving Fisher in 1897, but it didn't gain significant attention until the late 1950s. It became more popular after Jacob Mincer's article *Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution*, in 1958, and was further worked by Gary Becker in his 1962 article *Investment in Human Capital* and 1964 book, *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Becker was initially hesitant to use the term in the title of his book and included a long subtitle to address potential criticism (Goldin, 2016, p. 56).

Michael A. Peters, in his book *Education, neoliberalism, and human capital homo economicus as 'entrepreneur of himself.'* discusses the concept of north-american neo-liberalism as analyzed by Foucault. Foucault identifies Becker as a representative of north-american neo-liberalism, who introduced the theory of human capital into political economy based on the work of Theo Schultz and others. And, examines the origins of human capital theory and interprets it in relation to Becker's perspective of 'capital-ability.' rather than simply labour power. Foucault summarizes this as the shift from homo oeconomicus as a partner of exchange to homo oeconomicus as an entrepreneur of oneself, where individuals become their own capital, producer, and source of earnings (Peters, 2016, p. 298).

Peters notes (Peters, 2016, p. 299), that north-american neo-liberalism and, specifically, the version associated with Becker's human capital theory, is focused on the analysis of investing in education. And notes, the question raised by Foucault “what does it mean to form human capital, and so to form these kinds of abilities-machines which will produce income, which will be remunerated by income?” (Foucault, 2008, p. 229). And, answers that it means, of course, making what are referred to as educational investments. In reality, we do not have to wait for the neo-liberals to measure some of the effects of these educational investments, whether it involves school instruction or professional training. However, the neo-liberals emphasize that educational investment encompasses much more than just schooling or professional training, and that there are many other factors that contribute to the development of human capital. What constitutes this investment in the development of skills and abilities? Through experiments and observations, we know that it is comprised of various elements, such as the time parents spend with their children outside of formal educational activities. We

understand that the amount of time a mother spends with her child, even from a very young age, is crucial for the formation of skills and abilities, and that the child will be more adaptable if their parents or mother spend more time with them. This means that we can analyze the time parents spend feeding and caring for their children, as well as the parents' level of education, as investments that contribute to the development of human capital. We know that more educated parents will develop a higher level of human capital in their children, even if they spend the same amount of time with them. In summary, the various cultural stimuli received by the child all contribute to the formation of the elements that make up human capital (Foucault, 2008, p. 229).

Foucault explains how north-american neo-liberalism functions as a form of governmentality that shapes individuals as *human capital*. In his ninth lecture (Foucault, 2008), he specifically compares north-american neo-liberalism to its german counterparts and explores its global influence. He examines human capital theory, which expands economic analysis to include all aspects of behavior previously considered non-economic. Within this framework, Foucault explores how north-american neo-liberalism shifts the focus from analyzing economic processes to producing human subjectivity, redefining homo œconomicus as an entrepreneur of oneself. And, examines the components of human capital, such as innate qualities and genetic enhancements, as well as the role of education and health in its formation. These elements collectively represent a new model of growth and economic innovation. During the discussion, Foucault makes reference to Becker multiple times. He mentions Becker's roles as the Vice-President of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1989, the winner of the Nobel Prize in 1992, and the author of *Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis*, later expanded into *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education* in 1964. Foucault considers Becker to be the most radical of the north-american neo-liberals. According to Becker, economic analysis can effectively find its basis and effectiveness if an individual's behavior aligns with the condition that their conduct responds to reality in a non-random manner. In other words, any behavior that systematically reacts to changes in the environment can be subject to economic analysis. Becker defines homo œconomicus as someone who accepts reality and rational conduct as behavior that is sensitive to modifications in the environment and responds to them in a systematic way. Therefore, economics can be defined as the study of the systematic nature of responses to environmental variables. Foucault views Becker's analysis as pointing towards manipulation and control of the individual. However, there is another aspect that interests Foucault, which is that in the eighteenth century, homo œconomicus was someone who pursued their own interest and whose interest naturally aligned with the interest of others. From a government standpoint, homo œconomicus was someone who should be left alone. Yet, Becker's definition presents homo

œconomicus as someone who accepts reality and systematically responds to modifications artificially introduced into the environment. In this sense, *homo œconomicus* becomes someone who can be easily governed (Peters, 2016, p. 303).

Entrepreneur

“The enterprise culture and the spirit of enterprise can be learnt at school, just like capitalisms advantages over all other forms of economic organization. Ideological struggle is an integral part of the smooth functioning of the machine” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 116)

“The pure dimension of entrepreneurship—alertness to business opportunities—is a relationship of self to self which underlies the critique of interference. We are all entrepreneurs, or, rather, we all learn to be; we train ourselves exclusively through the play of the market to govern ourselves as entrepreneurs. This also means that, if the market is regarded as a free space for entrepreneurs, all human relations can be affected by the entrepreneurial dimension, which is constitutive of the human” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 112)

“Neoliberalism assumes that all individuals, even those on the margins of society, have the capacity to increase their ‘human capital’ through creation, innovation and entrepreneurship. But to achieve this it is necessary to create an ‘environment’ of freedom from state surveillance, so that subjects can market themselves, acquire new immaterial competencies and slither as flexibly as snakes. We have gone from the disciplinary mole to the neoliberal snake” (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 51)

“If someone wants to be competitive in a risk economy, then must be able to innovate, to become a creator of new knowledge that is profitable for the company. In this way, entrepreneurship is not only the domain of the great universities, but becomes a *mode of individual existence*. The biopolitics of neoliberalism no longer has anything to do with the government of *biological* variables, as Foucault asserted in 1978, but emerges hand in hand with the techniques of entrepreneurial self-direction. It is the *molecularity* of life that is now the object of government” (Castro-Gómez, 2010, p. 21)

If homo oeconomicus is mostly mobilized in intellectual-academic spheres, and human capital in educational-corporative spheres, it is the entrepreneur the modality that has permeated the most in all spheres of life. *Emprender o morir!* Such is the entrepreneurial dictum under the neo-liberal regime of life. And, as we have seen, and Read underscores, “neo-liberalism scrambles and exchanges the terms of opposition between ‘worker’ and ‘capitalist’” (Read, 2009, p. 31). The entrepreneur is then, not just the capitalist, but all workers, as entrepreneurs of the self.

As Castro-Gómez notes, by way of Foucault, “what is at stake is the idea of the active, calculating, responsible individual, capable of making the most of his or her competencies, that is, of their human capital. We are thus faced with a significant change in the concept of capital, which can no longer be thought of under the marxian categories of analysis, but neither under the terms of the classical theory of the ‘subject of interest’ [...] We find ourselves, rather, in front of a new theory of the subject as entrepreneur of himself (Foucault, 2007a, p. 264). We do not have here the Homo oeconomicus understood as a partner in exchange, as in classical liberalism, but a subject that behaves as an entrepreneurial machine. The subject as a machinic singularity that produces the means for its own satisfaction. Therefore, all the actions of this subject (in terms of ensuring its health, education, welfare, etc.) are seen as investments that seek to increase its own human capital” (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 205).

Dardot and Laval, draw a genealogy of the entrepreneur, in *The new way of the world: on neoliberal society*, through *entrepreneurial man*, *entrepreneurship as a mode of self-government*, forming the *mass entrepreneur*, and the uni-versality of the *man-enterprise*. Dardot and Laval, note that von Mises and Hayek, argue that individual action and the market process lead to equilibrium in the economy, as long as there is no interference from moralism or destructive political and social intervention. They also highlight the “dimension of humanity—entrepreneurship—is constructed in general competition, which is the potentially universal principle of conduct most essential to the capitalist order” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 102). This perspective on the role of entrepreneurship—human enterprise—sets the austro-american current apart from ordo-liberal sociology. Neo-liberalism, unlike neo-classical economics, emphasizes the creation of market situations and the development of entrepreneurial individuals. Neo-classical economics focuses on competition as a static concept and uses it as a benchmark for judging market situations and achieving equilibrium. Any deviation from pure competition is seen as an anomaly. However, neo-liberalism views competition as a dynamic process of discovering new opportunities for profit, emphasizing the importance of individual action and rivalry. The entrepreneur is seen as the main actor in economic life, driven by the entrepreneurial spirit. The only hindrance to free competition is the state when it restricts or eliminates it (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 102). “The touchstone of this neo-liberalism is not, initially and essentially, the man of exchange who makes calculations

on the basis of the available data, but the man of enterprise who selects a goal and seeks to achieve it. Von Mises provides its formula: ‘In any real and living economy every actor is always an entrepreneur’” (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 107).

Unlike the German ordo-liberals, who believe society should limit human actions, the Austro-Americans believed in “subjectivism” or self-governance. They believed that individuals learn to behave rationally through market situations, which serve as a process of education. Neo-liberal governmentality aims to create market situations that facilitate a gradual learning process. Economics is not just about maximizing utility, but also about choice, creativity, and indeterminism. The theory of choice applies to consumers who seek the best deal and product, based on their own goals and plans. The contribution of subjectivism is to convert the theory of market prices into a general theory of human choice. “This point is fundamental. If von Mises’s magnum opus is entitled *Human Action*, the title must be taken with the utmost seriousness. It precisely involves a redefinition of homo oeconomicus on broader bases. As von Mises argues the theory of choice and preference goes beyond just economics and material well-being. It encompasses all human actions, including decisions about material and non-material things. This theory encompasses all human values, from the highest to the lowest, and allows us to prioritize and choose between them. This theory expands the scope of economic studies and connects them to a broader science called praxeology. Economics is now seen as a subset of this larger science, which focuses on human action and choice (Dardot & Laval, 2013, pp. 107–108).

“Self-government has a name: entrepreneurship” Dardot and Laval, note that entrepreneurship is a form of self-government that goes beyond traditional economic theory. It is the ability to recognize and take advantage of new opportunities for greater exchange value. Both Kirzner and von Mises define entrepreneurship as more than just profit maximization; it involves the discovery and exploitation of good opportunities. The market economy allows individuals to freely experiment, learn, and adapt. The entrepreneur is someone who takes action to improve their situation by exploiting price differences and speculating on future demand. Their success depends on their ability to anticipate future events better than others (Dardot & Laval, 2013, pp. 110–111).

Later in 1911, the promotion of entrepreneurialism gained momentum with Joseph Schumpeter and his *Theory of Economic Development*. Schumpeter emphasized the importance of considering historical changes and disruptions in economic theory. He believed that economic development came from new combinations of productive, technical, and commercial elements, as well as innovations in business. The entrepreneur, according to Schumpeter, played a central role in adopting these new combinations and was seen as an innovator who deviated from traditional methods. However, Schumpeter believed that not everyone could be an entrepreneur, as it required leadership qualities and the ability to realize latent possibilities. He viewed the entrepreneur as a creator and competitor who loved the struggle and sought financial success as a measure of their success.

Schumpeter also recognized the inseparable link between innovation and competition. However, he later expressed pessimism about the future of entrepreneurship, predicting its obsolescence due to routinization and bureaucratization of innovation (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 117).

The idea of individuals as entrepreneurs, who are both innovative and opportunistic, is the result of various lines of thinking, including von Mises's *praxeology* and the spread of a management model believed to be uni-versally valid. Education and the media played a significant role in promoting this new model, and international organizations like the OECD and the European Union also supported it. However, this current of thought has a fear of the state, which limits its understanding of how government and individual self-governance can work together. Despite this limitation, Hayek legitimized the use of state coercion to enforce market or private law (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 119).

Consumer-citizen

“The entrepreneurs and capitalists are not irresponsible autocrats. They are unconditionally subject to the sovereignty of the consumers. The market is a consumers' democracy. The syndicalists want to transform it into a producers' democracy. This idea is fallacious, for the sole end and purpose of production is consumption” (von Mises, 1998a, p. 284)

“The Sovereignty of the Consumers... The direction of all economic affairs is in the market society a task of the entrepreneurs. Theirs is the control of production. They are at the helm and steer the ship. A superficial observer would believe that they are supreme. But they are not. They are bound to obey unconditionally the captain's orders. The captain is the consumer. Neither the entrepreneurs nor the farmers nor the capitalists determine what has to be produced. The consumers do that. If a businessman does not strictly obey the orders of the public as they are conveyed to him by the structure of market prices, he suffers losses, he goes bankrupt, and is thus removed from his eminent position at the helm. Other *men* who did better in satisfying the demand of the consumers replace him” (von Mises, 1998a, p. 270)

“The discourse of citizenship presupposed a masculinist subject on which to drape the attendant rights and privileges of liberty and equality, explaining why the transition from

slavery to freedom was usually and quite aptly narrated as the journey from chattel to man” (Hartman, 2022, p. 215)

“The process of *ciudadanización* implied by capitalist penetration and mercantile reorientation was, crossed and blocked by diachronic contradictions anchored in the colonial horizon, which provoked a particularist and caste stratification even in the market” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 83)

The illusory uni-versality of citizenship has been consolidated again and again, through “mechanisms of racial subjection” (Hartman, 2022, p. 206). As Rivera Cusicanqui underscores from a situated account from so-called bolivia, the foundations of the nationalist project and *mestizaje*, centered around expanding the domestic market, capitalist production, state control over the export economy, and cultural reform to promote *mestizaje* and citizenship. However, these changes had to be imposed authoritatively to prevent resistance, “the school, the barracks, the private ownership of land, the vote and the trade union should no longer be offered freely” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 93).

Let’s examine, the imbrication of the colonial character of citizenship, and the capitalist character of the consumer, in neo-liberalism. Rivera Cusicanqui argues in *Violencias (re) encubiertas en Bolivia*, that the “process of individuation and *mestizaje* implied in the citizenship proposal has its most effective lever of realization” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 173), and notes through the case of so-called bolivia that, the exclusion of indigenous communities has taken different forms throughout history. The liberal reforms of the 1870s, granted formal citizenship to indigenous people but still considered them inferior to the *criollo* minority. As a result, their land was taken away and they were forced to work as serfs on haciendas. Through the reforms during the 1950’s, land was re-distributed, however, the rights of indigenous communities were not fully recognized and a commercial approach to land redistribution was imposed, indigenous citizenship was promoted by privatizing communal lands, forcing the learning of spanish, and eradicating ethnic identity. Indigenous citizenship, although more substantive than formal, was still based on exclusion, similar to the christianization imposed by early colonizers. In order to be recognized as rational beings deserving of human rights, *indios* had to deny their own culture and adopt the ways of the dominant minority (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 173).

As Rivera Cusicanqui argues, the citizen model aligns with the mercantile owner, while the “ethnic economy” focuses on the collective's social and economic well-being. However, government practices aimed at improving rural poverty actually prioritize increasing peasant supply for urban consumption through the market. The idea of civil rights, which is supposed to ensure equality for all citizens, is ironically only

recognized by the dominant society on the condition that indigenous peasants adhere to their norms and values. Still “the ideal of equality continues to be based on the western model of the citizen: modern, ‘rational,’ proprietary, capable of carrying out transactions in the market and of entering into the fetishistic logic of the commodity” which “continues to prolong and reproduce this process of exclusion that ultimately forms the matrix of the colonial fact” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 174).

Homo oeconomicus as a consumer is first and foremost a consumer of narcissistic desire. Narcissistic capital Rolnik would say. Consumption, that is the desire and supposed “freedom” to transform, accumulate, appropriate and discard, finds its contemporary form in hand with industrial transformations, the transition of fordism to post-fordism and the development of advertising. Mass production demands mass consumption. “Consumerism, the mass participation in the values of the mass-industrial market, thus emerged in the 1920s not as a smooth progression from earlier and less ‘developed’ patterns of consumption, but rather as an aggressive device of corporate survival” (Ewen, 1976, p. 54). Consumption conflates two fundamental values of capitalism, exchange and freedom. The promotion of consumerism equated freedom as the possibility to acquire any good and converted consumption through acquisition, the prime mode of exchange (Ewen, 1976, p. 89). As Read has noted through a re-reading of Hegel, and grasps “consumption not only as a social relation, but as a relation that is transindividual, constituting needs and desires as much as it actualises them” (Read, 2016, p. 56).

Desire and labour have created a need to yield ourselves in the benefit of others in order to satisfy the needs and desires that an overly consumerist society has created. We desire in order to produce and consume desires. Domination functions fundamentally through getting bodies to set themselves in motion in the services of other, the capturer, hence mobilising is domination’s constitutive condition. The force of habit formation, resulting from distinct power structures, causes loss of sight of the immense amount of labour that is required to set oneself in motion for another (Lordon & Ash, 2014, p. 14). In this sense workers do not produce themselves; they produce a force independent of themselves, having to pass through another to access the object of desire. The basic triad of employment, being recruited in the services of another person, could be framed under: one person’s desire, other’s power of acting, and the affects produced by this relation. At this intersection, or the triad of worker-employer-affects, lies the question of heteronomy and autonomy. Primitive accumulation created the fundamental conditions for radical material heteronomy, of all desires and needs, capitalism currently begins with money, or bare life, life in need of reproduction (Lordon & Ash, 2014, p. 15). Money becomes the sovereign of the objects of desire-interest, the one object on which the pursuit of all other desires depends—including nonmaterial ones (Lordon & Ash, 2014, p. 18). But radical heteronomy is counterpoised by the notion of “voluntary servitude.” Spinoza develops a different notion of alienation, one

framed under the constraints of affects and desires, asserting, “there is no such thing as voluntary servitude.” There is only passionate servitude (Spinoza, 1994) in (Lordon & Ash, 2014, p. 21).

Dardot and Laval argue that, “ordo” refers to an organization that is economically efficient and respects the moral dimension of man, which can only be achieved through a market economy. Economic legislation aims to create a stable framework for the optimal functioning of the economy based on free competition and the coordination of economic agents’ plans through the price mechanism. The market economy is considered superior because it overcomes scarcity of goods and allows individuals to live freely. Competition is the principle at the heart of this economic order, as it allows for the spontaneous plans of individuals to harmonize with consumer desires without coercion. This promotion of competition is a shift from classical liberalism, as the market is now defined by competition rather than exchange, which implies inequality (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 83). Ordo-liberalism seeks to establish a social and political system based on free and fair competition between individuals who have complete control over their own lives. Any manipulation of competition is seen as an illegitimate form of domination by either the state or private interests. The main concern of ordo-liberalism is power, both the legitimate power individuals have over their own lives and the illegitimate power of interest groups that undermine competition. The ideal society is one with independent small entrepreneurs “none of whom is in a position to wield exclusive, arbitrary power in the market, and to a democracy of consumers who daily exercise their individual power to choose.” This includes recognizing the rights of consumers and workers as fundamental by every citizen (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 87).

The political promotion of competition, is then, as Dardot and Laval, argue, “far from being insignificant, is directly bound up with the constitutional principle of competition. Certainly, individuals are bound to one another by economic actions where they intervene as both producers and consumers.” The difference is that as producers, individuals aim to meet society's demands, while as consumers, they have supposedly the power to make choices. The ordo-liberals argue that consumers have common interests that are not shared among producers. Producers often seek special treatment or privileges, while consumers prioritize fairness and competition. The economic constitution of competition can be seen as a contract between consumers and the state, where the state supports the general interest by upholding consumer sovereignty (Dardot & Laval, 2013, pp. 87–88).

Spencer notes the role of an architecture of circulation has had in “fashioning other hybrid and paradigmatically neoliberal subject positions, those of the ‘citizen-consumer’ and the ‘student entrepreneur’” (Spencer, 2016, p. 9). The neo-liberal version of the individual has two distinct features. First, the term “consumer” is now being used in areas beyond just commerce, such as politics, education, and health. This expansion of the term helps to lessen its negative connotations. Second, the emphasis on choice and

competition in society has led to the promotion of personalization and customization (Eagleton-Pierce, 2016, p. 20).

These are some of the current discourses and technologies of economo-subjection that re/produce the neo-liberal individual subject. The modulation of the neo-liberal architect, moves through the imbrication of *homo æconomicus*, human capital, entrepreneur and consumer-citizen, all modes of neo-liberal subjection, that sustain the legitimizing of the *hu*Man and the “categorizing hegemon,” the *hu*Man which re/produces “the integrity of an ontology constituted by a white symbolic order” (Bey, 2021, p. 67,71).

Coda

“My ‘awakened dreams’ are about shifts. Thought shifts, reality shifts, gender shifts: one person metamorphoses into another in a world where people fly through the air, heal from mortal wounds. I am playing with my Self, I am playing with the world’s soul, I am the dialogue between my Self and *el espíritu del mundo*. I change myself, I change the world” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 70)

“...the individual will not be cured on the *diván* or by the subsidy of the drug factory, the cure is collective and is found within the structure and its possible dismantling, because to end the plague it is necessary to stop sustaining the *monocultivo*, to assume individuality as one more political fiction to dilute, to reforest our imaginaries, allowing that it is the articulation in the invisible that leads us not towards freedom but towards the rupture of the delirium that this causes us” (valencia sepúlveda, 2022)

“Society is not friendly association with others; it’s friendly association without others, in the absence of the other, in the exhaustion of relational individuality, in consent not to be a single being, which is given in the sharpness of a differentiating touch, in the movement of hands, in *caminhando*” (Moten, 2017a, p. 282)

“If one is human, as a matter of sheer biological determination, then to feel more human, which is given only in the experience of having been made to feel less human, is, in fact to feel more than human, which is given, in turn, only in the experience of having been made to feel less than human. What if the human is nothing other than this constancy of being both more and less than itself? What if all that remains of the human, now, is this

realization? What if the only thing that matches the absolute necessity of remaining human is the absolute brutality of remaining human? Is there any escape from the interplay of brutality and necessity?” (Moten, 2017a, p. 208)

“In the clear, critical light of day, illusory administrators whisper of our need for institutions, and all institutions are political, and all politics is correctional, so it seems we need correctional institutions in the common, settling it, correcting us. But we won’t stand corrected. Moreover, incorrect as we are there’s nothing wrong with us. We don’t want to be correct and we won’t be corrected. Politics proposes to make us better, but we were good already in the mutual debt that can never be made good. We owe it to each other to falsify the institution, to make politics incorrect, to give the lie to our own determination. We owe each other the indeterminate. We owe each other everything” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 27)

“When we move we move to access, which is to say we assemble and disassemble anew” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 37)

“Freedom through work was never the slave’s cry but we hear it all around us today” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 41)

“I should constantly remind myself that the real leap consists in introducing invention into existence. In the world through which I travel, I am endlessly creating myself. I am a part of Being to the degree that I go beyond it” (Fanon, 2008, p. 179)

“Decolonization never goes unnoticed, for it focuses on and fundamentally alters being...” (Fanon, 2005, p. 2)

“Far from coinciding with what is ordinarily understood by subjectivity, it no longer relates to I don't know what subtle and ineffable essence of a subject in search of a vertiginous adequation to himself (with God as the only witness). Schizoanalytic subjectivity is established at the intersection of Flows of signs and machinic Flows, at the junction of the facts of sense, of material and social facts, and, above all, in the wake of transformations resulting from their different modalities of Assemblage. It is these last

that make it lose its character as human territoriality and project it towards the most original and the most 'futuristic' processes of singularization at the same time - becomings animal, vegetable, cosmos, becomings immature, multivalent sex, becomings incorporeal... Without entirely ceasing to be thinking reeds, through this subjectivity, humans are at present adjacent to a reed that 'thinks for them; an abstract machinic Phylum that carries them well beyond their previous possibilities" (Guattari, 2013, p. 20)

Again. How well must *we* know what *we are* in order to refuse that which *we are*? Probably... we just need to know what we are doing in order to refuse ourselves. Let go in order to lose ourselves and fall into an abyss. Perhaps, following Krenak, we have been conditioned to a specific mode of existence, the uni-versal individual subject. Perhaps challenging this norm would cause our minds to crumble, akin to being engulfed by an unfathomable void, "swallowed by an abyss." Moreover, why should we believe this is beyond our capacity? Who can assert that we have not already experienced such a state? (Krenak, 2020, p. 31).

The subject is a contested concept, as a self-theorizing concept. Through this meanderings of historical and discursive compos(t)ing we aim to draw a situated cartography of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject. That in turn, such false promise, sustains the narcissistic and authority complex, as Fanon would say, of the patriarchitect. A cartography that might draw an ontological field from the colonial *fact* to neo-liberalization, that allows us to problematize through the following two chapters, how the neo-liberal architect, overrepresented, in so-called colombia and méxico, by the white-male-cis-hetero-bourgeois-mestizo modality of existence, is re/produced by/for the uni-versity—vocational education through architecture schools—, as a factory of whiteness, and by/for abstract-alienating-subordinated architectural labour, and its current neo-liberal modalities of homo oeconomicus, human capital and citizen-consumer.

The willing slaves, the voluntary prisoners, the voluntary workers, the passionate serfs of architecture, are re/produced through this false promise towards completion. What they find is neurosis, Rolnik would say. The violent dispossession through territorial coloniality and its architectural dispositifs, as well as the violent push towards the neo-liberalization of life through abstract labour and professional identities as the architect, reminds us constantly of the violent push towards the inseparability of the white-totality of being and the white-totality of inhabiting.

The *conventional* being, the *majoritarian* hegemonic mode of life, that is the white-bourgeois man, is accompanied, or better, re/produces a *conventional* spatiality, a hegemonic form of inhabiting, that is the white-bourgeois mono-functional modern space, and binaries as city-countryside, public-private amongst other. And in return this hegemonic territoriality re/produces hegemonic forms of existence. Again indicating the violent inseparability between the white-totality of being and white-totality of inhabiting. We are modulated into such

totalizing existence and bound to be refused, but most importantly we refuse such modulation. Not only architecture produces a professional labouring individual-subject, the architect, but modulates-spatializes the conditions for the production of all individual-subjects, all under mono-functional modern space, all in the image of hegemonic *mono-humanism*.

Problematizing the architect through a situated account of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject in so-called México and Colombia, means, as we have seen, studying not only the *mestizaje* processes but also the formation of the colonial bourgeoisie. Even if now architecture dresses and wears a mask of race-class-sex inclusion, the profession has been sustained by/for white bourgeois men. But as Rivera Cusicanqui underscores, all identities in Abya Yala are structured through *el hecho colonial* (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010b, p. 66). The petty-bourgeois whitened *mestizo* carries also *la herida colonial*, or as Galindo notes (Galindo, 2022, p. 35), it hates its inner black and indigenous, and desires the white-totality it will never be able to fully be. Some lucky subaltern bodies might drink from the fountains of stardom, but control has been, and will remain, in the hands of white-power. Such is the desire of/for whiteness.

We need to constantly remind ourselves that neo-liberal multi-culturalism and pluri-nationalism hide/cover up *el silencio de la raza* as Segato underscores (Rita Laura Segato, 2010). *Homo æconomicus arquitectonicus* does not inhabit the mountains of Chiapas, does not carry her babies in a *rebozo*, does not sing and laments collectively with a *bullerengue*. The entrepreneur, even if the neo-liberal project has a universalizing character, is destined—desired by many—for a few bleached ones. For the rest, what remains is violent and dispossessing proletarianization. For some being architects, for the many *racialized-sexualized* construction workers. After all, not much has changed since Cicero and Vitruvius considered that architecture was “one of the learned professions for which *men* of good birth and good education are best suited” (Briggs, 1927, p. 35) in (Sarfatti Larson, 2013, p. 3).

Architecture allows whites and wanna-be whites only. As Anzaldúa would have said, the only legitimate *architects* are those in power, the whites and those who align themselves with *whiteness* (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 3).

To reiterate, if gender is always already a racial and class marker, and the amalgam of capitalism colonial-patriarchy domination is sustained by the *class-sexual-racial* division of labour, in other words labour and all the identities it imposes, from worker to professional identities as the architect. Then co-moving beyond-against and beyond such professional identity as the architect, which is to say: white-cis-hetero-bourgeois-men designer of space, means the *trans-figuration* (Bey, 2021) of other modalities for existence against class-race-sex/gender domination, towards the autonomy of other modalities of inhabitation and existence. Because, as we have noted, the inseparability of modes of inhabitation and modes for existence, means that rehearsing other modalities for existence beyond the architect, entails also imagining and

constructing together, spatialities, as modes of inhabitation beyond cis-hetero-mono-functional modern space, all in the image of hegemonic mono-humanism.

In the coming chapters we will examine how through the uni-versity and abstract-alienating-subordinated architectural labour, in other words, vocational education, or the *education-based mode of study* and professionalization, the neo-liberal architect is further modulated. There is nothing new in writing, that subjectivity is multiple or hybrid. Yet, architectural education, as a cog of the building industry and real estate-financial speculation, as an ideological apparatus, as Guattari refers, a collective equipment, a “semiotic subjection machine for the selection, the modelling, of an elite adapted to the semiotics of power” (Guattari, 2016, p. 67), continues modulating, and re/producing, essentialist and uni-versal modalities of architectural subjectivity: neo-liberal colonial architects.

“ ...It's not good enough to imitate the
models proposed for us that are answers to
circumstances other than our own.

It isn't even enough to discover who we are.

We have to invent ourselves”

The eternal feminine, Act III - Rosario Castellanos
(Castellanos, 1988)

Chapter 3

Architectural education: pedagogies of the new, industries of the self

The central myth-making ritual of education

“Discipline is the act of relentless categorization. In many academic worlds categories are organizational tools; categories are often conceptualized as discrete from each other. Categories are things, places, people, species, genres, themes, and more, that are grouped together because they are ostensibly similar. Categories are classified and ranked and sometimes divided into subcategories (genus). Academic disciplines make knowledge into categories and subcategories; methodology and method make discipline and knowledge about categories. Canons and canonization are very clear and obvious examples of this. The weight of discipline is evidenced by the density of disciplinarity and the method of making disciplined categorization happen: around every corner, at every turn, disciplinary practitioners provide disciplined narratives that confirm the solidity of disciplinary knowledge and its categorical difference from other ways of knowing” (McKittrick, 2021, p. 35)

“But they don’t want to go to the fundamental issue. Once [Fanon] has said *ontogeny-and-sociogeny*, every discipline you’re practicing ceases to exist” (Wynter & Thomas, 2006, p. 3)

How, when and where is the architect produced? What are the fields and forces that both model and modulate the architectural subject? What kind of architect is produced by neo-liberal pedagogy? How is the labouring subject produced through education, through the fields and forces of the uni-versity, through architectural education? How are architects produced through neo-liberal games of truth and practices of power? What/who is the neo-liberal architect? How has such rationality been questioned? What are the heteronomous and autonomous fields at stake? Is there such a thing as *homo æconomicus-architectonicus*? And if so, where, when and how is such a subject produced? What are the core values that the neo-liberal student ‘learns’ through its passing by architecture schools in order to later best perform at work? What are the pedagogical techniques and spaces used for such production?

Regardless of the system used to define the subject, what the subject is, education as an assemblage of power, as a site of re/production, is fundamental in the modulation of labouring subjectivities, labouring selves, labouring bodies. Specially education under neo-liberal rationality, under the regime of advanced capitalism. What the subject signifies, could be a contested site, but that education is a primary site of production of whatever the subject is, this is not easily contested.

The questions raised will be studied through the relation of particular historical modes of architectural pedagogy, its methodological forms and spaces, and the subjectivities produced, drawing parallels between the discipline, pedagogy and modes of existence. In order to better understand the specific subject produced under neo-liberal education. A trans-versal genealogy of *educational machines* will be composed with specific attention to the neo-liberalization of so-called colombia and méxico.

Architecture has been obsessively producing new forms—buildings—and reflecting on their modes of composition and construction. This permanent obsession has also re/produced, as Igea Troiani also argues, a hegemonic modality of architect, overrepresented by white-capitalist-man. It is through the uni-versity that such labouring identity is modulated. The schooling of whiteness. “Whiteness will claim whomever it wants, and whomever will listen” (Bey, 2021, p. 179). We understand currently the uni-versity as a *pedagogical technology of environmentality* a social *colonial machine of neo-liberalism* (Adams, 2016, p. 249).

This chapter presents a genealogy of education under/for territorial coloniality. It begins with an introduction to the uni-versity as a uni-versal machine for the modulation of life and the coloniality of knowledge that still operates in Abya Yala. It then discusses the neo-liberalization of the uni-versity in so called colombia and méxico, focusing on the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject under the regime of *competences*. The chapter traces the neo-liberalization of architectural education through professionalization, fetishization, commodification, financialization and cultural colonialism or education as imperialism, in order to provide a situated critique of architectural education in so-called colombia and méxico. It considers the influences of global modulation apparatuses such as the UIA-International Union of Architects, and local student and school associations and the fields and forces of coloniality. After these accounts, the chapter briefly discusses neo-liberal dispositifs related to entrepreneurialism and the new, and how they operate through architecture and the building industry. Finally, the chapter closes with three examples of struggles *with and for*, or within and against the uni-versity and architectural education in so-called colombia and méxico.

Ultimately, weaving the previous chapters, *Architectural education: pedagogies of the new, industries of the self* focuses on the re/production of the architect through vocational education, and the labour simulation sustained by architectural education. It moves through the false promise of the individual subject, the impossibility, incompleteness of such modulation and its violent constant effort to pursue completion through neo-liberal creative and pedagogies of *la crueldad*.

Uni-versal machine

“Of course, school is not, by any means, the only modern institution which has as its primary purpose the shaping of *man's* vision of reality. The hidden curriculum of family life, draft, health care, so-called professionalism, or of the media play an important part in the institutional manipulation of *man's* worldvision, language, and demands. But school enslaves more profoundly and more systematically, since only school is credited with the principal function of forming critical judgment, and, paradoxically, tries to do so by making learning about oneself, about others, and about nature depend on a prepackaged process. School touches us so intimately that none of us can expect to be liberated from it by something else” (Illich, 1971, p. 47)

“Some words become so flexible that they cease to be useful ‘School’ and ‘teaching’ are such terms. Like an amoeba they fit into almost any interstice of the language” (Illich, 1971, p. 25)

Uni-versities produce two fundamental commodities for neo-liberal capitalism: knowledge and workers. Uni-versities are then, more and more *factories of knowledge, industries of the self*. Factories of *world*. Uni-versities are the prime site for individuals to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge for the “progress” of the nation state, and become citizens (Castro Gómez, 2015, p. 80). Or such is the claim. The university derived from the Latin *universitas*, meaning “the whole,” epitomizes a totalizing condition, (Daniel Jacobs & Utting, 2019, p. 261) uni-versities are fundamentally sites for the re-production of power relations, capital and subjectivities through the modulation of disciplined subjects, able and willing to perform in the labour market through professional normativization. Gerald Raunig refers to modulation as the combination of discipline and control society, with the contemporary uni-versity/knowledge factory as the most clear example where discipline and control are intertwined (Raunig, 2013, p. 46). At the uni-versity, vocational education becomes instrumental to capital by focusing primarily in the production of professionals, willing serfs of capital, individualized and able to creatively solve capitalism’s problems and innovatively produce value, rather than socially conscious and critical persons able to innovatively question the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination and creatively co/trans-form the world.

Harney and Moten by way of Foucault, argue that we are under total education, “if prison/school are two sides of a common institutional structure that operates by way of individuation, then perversion is a pre-carceral breaking out of prison, a pre-scholarly dropping out of school, that continually reveals the ubiquity of

the total education that hunts it down and puts it to work. Insofar as it is the case that in prison and in school one's job is to learn, to get it straight, to straighten out, then it is also the case that every citizen and non-citizen, every person and non-person, every worker who is in or out of work—even the enemy combatant, the prisoner, and the supposedly unemployable—is subject to a total education. Indeed, the rampant speculation on improvement made possible today by finance requires an all but universal diagnosis of perversion, a diagnosis that requires instructional methods and institutional structures that are, at once, extremely narrow and hierarchically subdivided. This suggestion may seem to run counter to our common sense about today's price-making market. This market appears to create an atomized landscape that leaves each individual to his or her own devices, free to choose and to act. Indeed, we hear a lot about states that are hollow, and institutions that are dysfunctional. In such a landscape, the idea of a total education requiring a total institution to set it in motion and a totalizing method to set in motion may seem misplaced. Certainly, the assertion that such a total education effectively dominates this landscape appears counterintuitive” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 63).

Total education. Total institution. The establishment of the eurocentric construct of the architect and architecture, and the modern eurocentric uni-versity as departure point—but not origin—are fundamental to understand the intra-action between architecture and pedagogy. As Amit Basole underscores, “there is no such thing as ‘The University,’ there are only universities. However, today, as a result of European colonialism, universities in far-flung corners of the earth show some striking similarities” (Basole, 2009, p. 33). The eurocentric model of the uni-versity could be traced back to 1088 and the *Università di Bologna*, but particularly to the “humboldtian” model established by the *Universität zu Berlin* in 1810.

One of the earliest elaborations on the eurocentric construct of architecture, specifically the architect's relation to the discipline, was presented by Leon Battista Alberti in his 1452 book *De re aedificatoria*—Ten Books on Architecture. It is important to note that architecture was first a craft and later became a discipline and a profession, a tension that continues until this day. From the XV century until the XVII century, architecture mostly shared pedagogical and disciplinary methods and spaces with academies of arts and small workshops where crafts were transmitted from hand to hand. Although in 1671 Louis XIV established the *Académie Royale d'Architecture*, it was not until a century later that the first full-time school opened at the *École des Beaux-Arts* also in Paris by Jacques-François Blondel in 1743 (Collins, 1979, pp. 2–6). The Beaux-Arts model expanded throughout europe and its colonies and remained almost unchanged until the early XX century.

As we will see in further sections, the colonial project rapidly started founding uni-versities though Abya Yala. Santo Domingo was the first in 1538, and until 1812 32 uni-versities were established as colonial outposts in order to control and spread whiteness (Tünnermann Bernheim, 1991, p. 35). Uni-versities as factories of whiteness, industries of subjectivity, more and more monopolize intellectuality.

Genealogy of education

“...one does not need education or encouragement to cherish a dream of freedom”
(Moten, 2018a, p. 116)

By way of Viníciux da Silva, we might say that if the history of education in Abya Yala “is the history of the colonizer, this implies in recognizing that it is the colonization, in its political, ideological, epistemological, and pedagogical actions, that defines the way things are done, the way the subjects within the educational process are seen, and the way education itself is seen” (da Silva, 2022, p. 3).

Education as we are subjected today in Abya Yala arrived by boat. It arrived and spread initially through the religious and moral enterprise of catholic missions. Educating was evangelizing. Evangelizing was civilizing. Civilizing meant violent whitening, becoming white through dispossession, deterritorialization, homogenization, colonization at large. Yet, some were not even considered human enough to be civilized.

This does not mean education came by sea. Long before Spain colonized Abya Yala there were educational centers. The knowledge we have about education in Abya Yala before colonization comes mainly from accounts written by friars and indigenous people in the XVI century. As an example, these sources provide a comprehensive view of education among the *Nahua* people in now central México, where educational practices and experiments were most concentrated. The main educational institutions were the *telpochcalli*, literally “house of young men,” which was for *macehual tin* or commoners and focused on military training. The *calmécac*, meaning “in the line of the house” or “in the lineage of the house,” which was for the elite and emphasized government and priesthood preparation. The *calmécac* was a significant place for the preservation and transmission of knowledge in Mesoamerica. Young people had to study the “*amoxxtli* (i.e. the codex, the book) and the *tlacuiloalli* (i.e. pictographic art).” *Calmécac* students had to learn to interpret three types of books: the *tonalámatl*, *xiuhámatl*, and the book of dreams. The *tonalámatl* contained the divinatory calendar of 260 days and tables of divination and astronomical cycles. The *xiuhámatl* was similar to a history book, recording governments, wars, alliances, and other events. The *cuicacalli*, “house of singing,” was a place where all gathered to practice singing and dancing, whereas the *ichpuchcalli*, meaning “house of maidens,” was exclusive for women (Escalante Gonzalbo, 2010, pp. 13–29).

“The indigenous informants who worked with Sahagún describe the master with these words: ‘*tlacazcaltiani, tlacaoapaoani, in teixcoioniani, in tenacaztlapoani. In imac, in icamac ca in alcecec, in tzitzicaztli.*’ The translation: ‘the one who teaches, the one who educates, the one who pierces people’s faces, the one who uncovers people’s ears. In his hands, in his mouth, is the cold water, the nettle.’ The verbs from which the terms *enseñar*—teach—and *educar*—educate—are constructed are *izcaltia* and *uapaua*, respectively: to make

grow, in a biological sense, the first, and to harden, the second. The teacher helps the child to grow and to harden. The idea of opening or uncovering the orifices that allow vision and hearing suggests a training of perception” (Escalante Gonzalbo, 2010, p. 22).

“*Mexica* society, like *nahua* societies in general, reserved almost all positions of priesthood, the judiciary, the militia and the government for males. In this the *nahuas* resembled other mesoamerican groups, such as the *purépechas* and *otomíes*. While the *maya* and, above all, the *mixtécos*, conferred priestly dignities and public offices for women” (Escalante Gonzalbo, 2010, p. 24).

A complete study of the genealogy of education and schooling falls beyond the scope of this research. The following are some accounts of how colonial education was advanced in order to dominate indigenous people in Abya Yala, and later as a fundamental dispositif of *mestizaje*, aka: *blanqueamiento*, for the sustainment of the nation-state project, through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

The rise of *homo educandus*. As Illich, reminds us in *In lieu of education*, included in *Toward a History of Needs*, “we often forget that the word ‘education’ is of recent coinage. It was unknown before the Reformation. The education of children is first mentioned in French in a document of 1498. This was the year when Erasmus settled in Oxford, when Savonarola was burned at the stake in Florence, and when Dürer etched his Apocalypse, which speaks to us powerfully about the sense of doom hanging over the end of the Middle Ages. In the English language the word ‘education’ first appeared in 1530—the year when Henry VIII divorced Catherine of Aragon and when the Lutheran Church separated from Rome at the Diet of Augsburg. In Spanish lands another century passed before the word and idea of education became known. In 1632 Lope de Vega still refers to ‘education’ as a novelty. That year, the University of San Marcos in Lima celebrated its sixtieth anniversary. Learning centers did exist before the term ‘education’ entered common parlance. You ‘read’ the classics or the law; you were not educated for life.

During the sixteenth century the universal need for ‘justification’ was at the core of theological disputes. It rationalized politics and served as a pretext for large-scale slaughter. The Church split, and it became possible to hold widely divergent opinions of the degree to which all *men* were born sinful and corrupt and predestined. But by the early seventeenth century a new consensus began to arise: the idea that *man* was born incompetent for society and remained so unless provided with ‘education.’ Education came to mean the inverse of vital competence. It came to mean a process rather than the plain knowledge of the facts and the ability to use tools which shape a *man’s* concrete life. Education came to mean an intangible commodity that had to be produced for the benefit of all, and imparted to them in the manner in which the visible Church formerly imparted invisible grace. Justification in the sight of society became the first necessity for a *man* born in original stupidity, analogous to original sin.

Schooling and education are related to each other like Church and religion, or in more general terms, like ritual and myth. The ritual created and sustains the myth; it is mythopoeic, and the myth generates the curriculum through which it is perpetuated. ‘Education’ as the designation for an all-embracing category of social justification is an idea for which we cannot find (outside Christian theology) a specific analogue in other cultures. And the production of education through the process of schooling sets schools apart from other institutions for learning that existed in other epochs” (Illich, 1977, p. 75).

Eli Meyerhoff, in *Beyond Education: Radical Studying for Another World*, argues that “education is just one possible mode of study among many alternatives. Modes of study are bound up with different modes of world-making—ways of making ourselves, politics, economies, communities, cultures, and so forth. [Meyerhoff argues] that the education-based mode of study supplements modes of world-making that are associated with modernist, colonial, capitalist, statist, white-supremacist, heteropatriarchal norms. In the course of political struggles between conflicting modes of world-making, education has been presented as the best and only option for study. Because it is romanticized in this way, the possibilities of alternative modes of study have become almost unthinkable. Against the grain, [Meyerhoff] takes aim at the romance of education” (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 4).

By modes of study, Meyerhoff, understands “study, generally, as an activity in which people devote attention to the world. This sustained attention modifies their capacities and dispositions for understanding the world. A mode of study is a way of composing the means and relations of study. [Meyerhoff sees] this distinction between means and relations as a fluid one, posited for analytic purposes. The means of study are the various actors involved in any activity of studying. These actors include both who is studying as well as what they are studying with—the tools, objects, and techniques with which they study. There are infinite possibilities for such means” (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 13).

Education-based mode of study, for Meyerhoff, entail “seven main features that have powerful effects for composing the means and relations of study:

- a vertical imaginary— students rise up the levels of schooling (e.g., pre- K through twelfth grade through higher education)

- a romantic narrative— students face obstacles, and overcome them as heroic individuals, along their journey up education’s levels

- relations of separation between students as producers and the means of studying— the teacher enforces this separation and regulates relations across it

- techniques of governance— students’ subjectivities are shaped with dispositions of obedience to the teacher’s authority as an expert

a zero- point epistemology— the teacher’s expert knowledge is seen as universally valid, from a position above any particular bodies and places in the world

an affective pedagogical economy of credit and debt— students are disciplined to desire honor and avoid shame in the eyes of their teachers and fellow students, often taking the form of grades on exams

binary figures of educational value and waste (e.g., the success vs. the failure, the college- bound vs. the remedial, the graduate vs. the dropout) (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 15).

Genealogy of the uni-versity

“What is a university? A social institution in which the majority of the work produced is by workers who receive no wages in order to work, and conversely are expected to pay in order to work” (Mitchell, 2023a)

The current tripartite modern-colonial eurocentric educational system finds its way to 350 BCE where greek school education was divided into three different levels. The first level was primary education, which focused on reading, writing, arithmetic, and chanting and was taught by a grammarist. The second level was secondary education, which covered geometry, drawing, and a music course, with some grammar and rhetoric added later on. The third level was higher or uni-versity education, which was taught after the age of sixteen (Cubberley, 2005, p. 61).

Systematic vocational education eventually replaced craft guilds and apprenticeship education (Cubberley, 2005, pp. 232–233). *Studia publica*, *studia generalia* and later uni-versities would monopolize the third level of education. For those who had the privilege of attending primary and secondary education. A privilege sustained until today particularly in colonized territories as Abya Yala, by white-mestizo bourgeoisie, even under the regime of mandatory and free public education.

In europe “the development of a uni-versity out of a cathedral or some other form of school represented, in the Middle Ages, a long local evolution. Universities were not founded then as they are today. A teacher of some reputation drew around *him* a constantly increasing body of students. Other teachers of ability, finding a student body already there, also ‘set up their chairs’ and began to teach. Other teachers and more students came. In this way a *studium* was created. About these teachers in time collected other university servants—‘bedells, librarians, lower officials, preparers of parchment, scribes, illuminators of parchment, and others who serve it’”(Cubberley, 2005, p. 241). “The term *universitas*, or university, which came in time to be applied to these associations of masters and apprentices in study, was a general Roman legal term, practically equivalent to our modern word corporation. At first it was applied to any association, and when used with

reference to teachers and scholars was so stated. Thus, in addressing the masters and students at Paris, Pope Innocent, in 1205, writes: ‘*Universis magistris et scholaribus Parisiensibus*,’ that is, ‘to the corporation of masters and scholars at Paris.’ Later the term uni-versity became restricted to the meaning which we give it today” (Cubberley, 2005, p. 241).

The colonial project rapidly started founding uni-versities. Santo Domingo was the first one in 1538. The last one was León de Nicaragua, established on 1812. During this time, 32 uni-versities were founded, but some did not function fully before the end of the colonial period, while some others were extinguished before the end of the colonial regime, including some established by the jesuits (Tünnermann Bernheim, 1991, p. 35).

Most uni-versities founded by the spanish colonial regime, followed the model of Alcalá and specially Salamanca, both in Spain. Although Santo Domingo was the first to be founded, due to its insular condition, it remained isolated. During the colonial period, the foundations of the uni-versities in so-called Lima and México were of great significance. Both were established in 1551 by the Spanish crown and had the character of major, royal and pontifical uni-versities. Their impact on other uni-versities in Abya Yala was significant and their constitutions and statutes were adopted or imitated by many other uni-versities on the continent. These two universities evolved to become known as *Universidades del Virreinato* and were the early models of the “national uni-versities” in Abya Yala. In comparison, Santo Domingo can be seen as the precursor of catholic or private uni-versities (Tünnermann Bernheim, 1991, p. 46).

In so-called México, by 1551, *La Real y Pontificia Universidad de México*, was founded and opened by 1553 in Tenochtitlan, now Ciudad de México. The king Carlos V served as the patron of the uni-versity, although, this was unusual for the time as uni-versities were typically governed by clergymen and bishops granted degrees. However, at the time, there was no consolidated church and the bishops had little power. The uni-versity had five faculties, including the minor faculty of Arts and the four major faculties of Medicine, Civil Law, Ecclesiastical Law, and Theology.

During the XVIII century, under Bourbon rule, a series of measures were implemented to reform the political, economic, and cultural systems of both the metropolis and the kingdoms that comprised the Spanish empire. However, *criollos* saw these reforms as a threat to their political, economic, and social power in Nueva España. The Bourbons favored peninsular Spaniards over American *criollos*, which reinforced the former's importance in the kingdom. Additionally, during the Bourbon regime, the establishment of three new educational institutions posed a threat to the *Real Universidad* privileges and status as the leader of higher education. These new institutions, including *Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Carlos*, founded on 1784; *Jardín Botánico*, founded on 1788, and the *Real Seminario de Minas*, founded on 1787, taught the illustrated lectures of the time, which competed with the traditional teaching of the *Real Universidad*. Despite this competition, the *Real Universidad* remained unchanged throughout the XVIII century (Marsiske, 2006, p. 13).

After so-called México gained its supposed *independence* from the colonial regime—but not the local bourgeoisie—between 1810-1821, the *Real Universidad* experienced a period of closures and reopenings. Emperor Maximilian finally closed the uni-versity in 1865, leaving higher education to several professional schools under government control. The uni-versity disappeared until 1910 when president Justo Sierra re-established it as the *Universidad Nacional de México*. What is important is the fact that its reinstatement took place on the eve of *la revolución*. Its advocates sustained the uni-versity would seek to represent the “Mexican” in a uni-versal dimension, as suggested by the white Vasconcelian motto: *Por mi raza hablará el espíritu*—Through my race shall the spirit speak. In its beginning, it consisted of National Preparatory Schools and Professional Schools of Medicine, Jurisprudence, Engineering and Fine Arts. In 1929, the uni-versity, due mainly to a student strike, gained autonomy—México has several understandings of autonomy, this one in particular, refers to a state institution with certain governance freedom—and became the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, with its grand *Ciudad Universitaria*. The campus plan was designed by Mario Pani and Enrique del Moral (Tünnermann Bernheim, 1991, p. 101).

Renate Mareike argues that with “Plutarco Elías Calles as the new president of Mexico in 1924, José Manuel Puig Casauranc as Secretary of Public Education and Moisés Sáenz as Undersecretary of the same agency, a new educational project was devised: Vasconcelos' Christian humanism was followed by American-style Protestant pragmatism. Education was considered as part of the economic policy that would contribute as ideological support to the consolidation of the revolutionary State. The undersecretary used the institutions created by Vasconcelos, expanded them and created new ones; but his educational project was different: now, education would be limited to training that would serve Mexicans to better perform at work and thus raise their standard of living” (Marsiske, 2006, p. 21).

In so-called Colombia, by 1580, the order of preachers, or dominican order founded the first uni-versity, *Colegio-Universidad Santo Tomás*, in Muyquytá, now Bogotá. In the capital of the viceroyalty, other uni-versities were established by different religious orders such as the *Universidad Javeriana* by the Jesuits in 1622, the *Universidad de San Nicolás de Mira* by the Augustinian Calzados in 1694, and the *Universidad San Buenaventura* by the Franciscans in 1747. Conventionally, each uni-versity also administered a school.

Initially in 1571 lectures of art and theology were held at the convent of *Nuestra Señora del Rosario*, and later, the first uni-versity in Santa Fé de Bogotá was established in the same convent by means of the *Papal Bull* of June 13, 1580 (Soto Arango, 2005, p. 106) (Ariza, 1980). The establishment of uni-versities in so-called Colombia took place in two distinct stages. The first stage, from 1580 to 1768, was marked by the church's complete control over education. During this stage, higher education focused on the training of lawyers and priests, which were crucial professions in the colony's operation. The second stage, from 1768 to 1826, began

with the expulsion of the Jesuits and saw the attempt of the civil sector to take control and intervene in education.

Since 1774 it was promised under the order of Viceroy Güirior, who entrusted the prosecutor Francisco Antonio Moreno y Escandón with the elaboration of a plan to found a public uni-versity. In this way he echoed the new spirit advocated by the Bourbon kings, especially Carlos III (Bernal de Rojas, 2010, p. 41).

After so-called colombia gained its supposed *independence* from the colonial regime—but not the local bourgeoisie—in 1810, republican governments, specifically those of Simón Bolívar and Francisco de Paula Santander, had a strong emphasis on education. They understood the need to train and expand the ruling class in order to manage public administration, foreign relations, and private activities. Technical education and useful sciences were considered crucial for the country's development. Therefore, organizing the educational system was a top priority for the new republic. In 1826, Santander established public uni-versities in Quito, Bogotá, and Caracas, divided into five faculties: Philosophy, Jurisprudence, Medicine, Theology, and Natural Sciences. The Plan of 1826 introduced novelties limited to the teaching of political economy using the text of French liberal economist Jean-Baptiste Say, as well as law and philosophy using the works of Bentham, Montesquieu, Mably and Candillac. This liberal approach to uni-versity education was met with strong opposition from traditionalists who viewed it as a danger to the moral and political well-being of the country (Bernal de Rojas, 2010, pp. 42–43).

In 1867 the *Universidad Nacional de los Estados Unidos de Colombia* was founded with seven faculties: Law, Medicine, Natural Sciences, Engineering, Arts and Crafts, Literature, and Philosophy, with access to free education. The Organic Law of the National University, of 1935, was enacted during the government of Alfonso López Pumarejo. It replaced the previous religious character and granted autonomy to the uni-versity. Fritz Karsen, a German educator, led the educational reforms and conducted a review of the courses in each curriculum, categorizing them based on their scientific fields and identifying any overlapping topics. As a result, Karsen created 14 semi-autonomous departments that fell under Social and Political Sciences, Natural Sciences, Arts, and Physical Education. Leopoldo Rother designed the campus (Bernal de Rojas, 2010, p. 45).

Both so-called México and Colombia were influenced by the Argentinian *Reforma Universitaria de Córdoba*—which reached all Abya Yala. As José Carlos Mariátegui argues in *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*: “The student movement that began with the struggle of the students of Córdoba, for the reform of the University, signaled the birth of a new Latin American generation” (Mariátegui, 1958, p. 105).

In *Historia de la universidad en América Latina: de la Época Colonial a la Reforma de Córdoba*, Carlos Tünnermann Bernheim underscores that, in 1918, the uni-versities in Abya Yala were seriously questioned for the first time. These uni-versities reflected the social structures that were established after national

independences. Previously, the uni-versity and “society” had coexisted without major issues, during the colonial period and the first century of the republics, the uni-versity served the interests of the dominant classes who held political and economic power—as they do today. The *Movimiento de Córdoba* marked the first significant clash between a society undergoing internal changes and a uni-versity that clung to outdated practices. This movement did not arise spontaneously, but occurred as a response to a new social situation (Tünnermann Bernheim, 1991, p. 112). According to Augusto Salazar Bondy, in order to assess the uni-versity reform movement, it was important to acknowledge that it was a response to a wide-ranging and significant social upheaval. This was brought about by changes in the political-economic landscape due to war and internal shifts, mainly by the expansion of capitalism, the emergence of a larger and more active middle class, and a growing restlessness among the urban proletariat. These factors created a climate that encouraged profound trans-formations (Salazar Bondy, 1968).

The *Movimiento de Córdoba* was driven by the emerging middle class who wanted to open up the uni-versity that was previously controlled by the landowning oligarchy and the clergy. The uni-versity was seen as a means for the middle class to achieve social and political progress, in other words inclusion, to gain power, ultimately, to claim a seat at the table. Initially, the *Movimiento* was motivated by anti-clericalism due to the dominance of the Jesuits in the uni-versity of Córdoba. Later on, this transformed into anti-militarism. Different ideologies such as liberalism, socialism and anarchism contributed to the movement's complexity, ultimately enriching it (Tünnermann Bernheim, 1991, pp. 113–118).

As Mariátegui notes, “the ideology of the student movement initially lacked homogeneity and autonomy. It was overly influenced by the Wilsonian current. The demoliberal and pacifist illusions that Wilson's preaching brought into vogue in 1918-19 circulated among the Latin American youth as good revolutionary currency. This phenomenon is perfectly explainable. In Europe, too, not only the bourgeois lefts but also the old reformist socialist parties accepted as new the demoliberal ideas eloquently and apostolically refurbished by the north-american president.

Only through the ever-closer collaboration with workers' unions, through the experience of struggle against the conservative forces and the concrete criticism of the interests and principles on which the established order rests, could the university vanguards achieve a definite ideological orientation” (Mariátegui, 1958, p. 105).

Regarding the relation of the movement with worker unions and anarchism, Hanns-Albert Steger in *El movimiento estudiantil revolucionario latinoamericano entre las dos guerras* underscores that the Córdoba uprising “was included within a larger anarcho-syndicalist movement: that of the *Federación Obrera Regional Argentina* at that time at the forefront of political discussion, a movement in which the idea of creating universities for the people and the workers was very common, all things in clear connection with Italian anarchism and the *Università Popolare* of Luigi Fabbris” (Steger, 1972, p. 15).

The movement spread rapidly and in 1921 the *Primer Congreso Internacional de Estudiantes* was held in so-called méxico. Mariátegui notes that the fundamental propositions of the Córdoba Reform, throughout Abya Yala, were: “México in 1921 advocated: 1st the participation of students in the government of the universities; 2nd the establishment of free teaching and free attendance. The students of Chile declared their adherence to the following principles: 1st autonomy of the University, understood as an institution of students, professors and graduates; 2nd reform of the teaching system, through the establishment of free teaching and, consequently, of the free attendance of students to the chairs, so that in the case of two teachers teaching the same subject, the preference of the students freely consecrates the excellence of the best; 3rd revision of the methods and content of studies; and 4th university extension, acted as a means of effective linkage of the University with social life. In 1923, the students of Cuba concretized their demands in this formula: a) a true university democracy; b) a true pedagogical and scientific renovation; c) a true popularization of teaching. The students of Colombia demanded, in their 1924 program, the organization of the University on the basis of independence, student participation in its government and new working methods. The program suggests that the seminary should operate next to the professorship, with the introduction of specialized courses and the creation of journals. It also recommends the appointment of associate professors alongside full professors and the establishment of a teaching career with a solid foundation to ensure its sustainability and provide fair opportunities for deserving individuals to hold a position at the university. [...]

It results from this quick review that the main postulates of the University Reform can be considered: first, the intervention of students in the government of the universities and second, the operation of free professorships, next to the official ones, with identical rights, in charge of teachers of accredited capacity in the subject” (Mariátegui, 1958, p. 110).

Through the coming sections, we will delve deeper into the particularities of the uni-versity in so-called colombia and méxico.

Coloniality of knowledge

Although after the córdoba reforms, throughout Abya Yala, uni-versities gained a certain *independence* from the church and conservative education, *la hacienda académica*—academic estate/plantation—as Vilma Almendra Quiguanás points out, continues to be a violent site where the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is sustained, a site of re/production and modulation of whiteness, workers and citizens for the proper functioning of the nation-state. And as Mariátegui underscores, “national education [...] has a colonial and colonizing spirit” (Mariátegui, 1958, p. 91).

The whole educational system from kinder to uni-versity reproduces capitalist, colonial and patriarchal social relations.

The following notes aim to problematize euro-north-ameri-centrism, through knowledge and education, by way of notions such as: intellectual colonialism, internal colonialism, epistemic coloniality, epistemic diglossia, and the coloniality of knowledge. Chapter 5 expands through a problematization of schooling by way of autonomous learnings.

As we have mentioned, the *mundo de uno*, by way of Edizon Muj Cumes through the work of Aura Cumes, and how she understands the *mundo de uno* is “a system of colonial domination, which places western corporealities as universal subjects with pretensions of the totalization of the world based on their specific reality, that is, a skin color, a language, a truth and a way of understanding the world; therefore, only one way of creating knowledge” (Cumes Simón, 2019; Muj Cumes, 2023). This *world*, Denise Ferreira da Silva, argues, is sustained by “three onto-epistemological pillars (the theory of knowing, theory of being, and a theory of practice)—namely, *separability*, *determinacy*, and *sequentiality*—that sustain linear temporality” (Ferreira da Silva, 2021, p. 83). What Viníciux da Silva, derivates and calls the *colonial bases of knowledge*, as “descriptors necessary to sustain the Ordered World, that is, the world as it has been made known to us” (da Silva, 2022, p. 2).

Western hegemony moves from north to south. But it also reproduces internally in all directions. Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui has been very critical to the decolonial fashion. In a 2016 debate on intellectual coloniality, after asked: “Many authors have insisted that one of the fundamental traits of Latin American social theory is its intellectual or epistemic dependence on the concepts and frameworks of central countries. Some have given theoretical status to this dependence through the concept of ‘coloniality of knowledge’ (Quijano, Lander). What is your view on this problematic?” Rivera Cusicanqui answers:

“This formulation is nothing new, and if by ‘theoretical status’ you mean the installation of this idea in the hegemonic academic centers, I could tell you that this is a very forgetful academy. In several territories of Latin America, and also in the Bolivian Andes, the critique of the mental colonization of the elites has a long trajectory. In our case, together with Rossana Barragán, we attempted a synthesis of this genealogy in the book we published in La Paz on studies of subalternity in India. In the presentation of the text we interweave our reading of the Subaltern Studies group with a reflection on the contributions of Argentine social historiography, Peruvian ethnohistory and anthropology, and the vital Mexican and African contribution (1997) in the Bolivian social and historiographic production of the 1980s and 1990s” (Rivera Cusicanqui et al., 2016, p. 2).

Drawing parallels to the postcolonial condition between Abya Yala and India, Cusicanqui and Barragan (Rivera Cusicanqui & Barragan, 1997, p. 14) note: that the colonial hegemony in institutional construction is the result of the collaboration of two groups of elites: the colonial elites and the local elites who

initially worked with empires and later established their own power, “to stage a civilizing mission of Europe in another theater, that of the triumphant nationalism and its contradictory pretension of universality.” These elites were scrutinized in a context still signed by imperialism, neo-colonialism, and internal colonialism. In the 1970s, the argentinian school of economic history, exemplified by Tandeter, Assadourian, Garavaglia, and others, initiated a theoretical and methodological renewal of significant scope by focusing on Potosí and the indigenous labor population. The axis where capitalism and colonialism have found their lasting articulation through the *longue durée* of an internal market (Rivera Cusicanqui & Barragan, 1997, p. 14).

Rivera Cusicanqui and Barragan underscore, also, the work of members of the journal *Avances* and the *Taller de Historia Oral Andina*, as well as historian Alberto Flores Galindo and sociologist René Zavaleta, and how they have generated an intense debate on themes regarding peasant-indigenous insurgency, capitalism, and oligarchic oppression in the Andean area during the XIX and XX centuries. And, that already in the late 1960s, mexican sociologist Pablo Gonzáles Casanova proposed the hypothesis of *internal colonialism* to explain the profound heterogeneity of our societies and the existence of outdated structures of domination that were particularly functional to neo-colonial, oligarchic, and capitalist exploitation of the indigenous peasantry in vast rural areas (Rivera Cusicanqui & Barragan, 1997, pp. 11–14).

As Cristina González and Funie Hsu in *Education and Empire: Colonial Universities in Mexico, India and the United States*, reminds us: “if, as the saying goes, knowledge is power, the reverse is also true: power needs knowledge to establish and perpetuate itself. That is why every major transformation in the economy, from the development of agriculture to the information age, has resulted in educational changes. It is also why all empires have educational policies, whether implicit or explicit, concerning their colonial subjects” (González & Hsu, 2014, p. 1).

Machado Aráoz, argues that “generally speaking, sensibilities and sociabilities conform to the system's pattern of reproductive requirements. The multiple and increasingly sophisticated processes of education by which interest colonizes desires and emotions make a good part of the effectiveness of the task. The repressive devices that construct the environments of terror, complementary mechanisms of last resort. The mineralization of subjects thus alludes to the complex processes through which the territories intervened by mining modernization give rise to the remodeling of habitus and the simultaneous reconfiguration of subjectivities and sensibilities objectively required for the production and reproduction of such civilization” (Machado Aráoz, 2019, p. 43).

Neo-liberal uni-versity

According to Ani Pérez Rueda in *Las falsas alternativas: Pedagogía libertaria y nueva educación*, “neo-liberalism has colonized our lives, producing both structural changes and new subjectivities, and has been especially destructive with all those spheres of the collective from which struggle and resistance could be offered. Education has not been, of course, an exception and we have lived through years of commodification of education in the form of cutbacks, the discrediting of public schools and their teachers, the revaluation of innovative private schools and the dissemination of pedagogical discourses aligned with the interests of the market. Nico Hirtt (Hirtt, 2001) summarized this commercialization of schools along three lines. First, it is a matter of training workers in accordance with current market demands, which, we are told, no longer requires obedient workers, since to qualify for a managerial position in a modern company one must be entrepreneurial and creative, and have emotional intelligence, leadership and teamwork skills. Nor do we need workers specialized in a single task or highly trained in a single field: they will tell us that what is desirable is to be flexible, resilient and versatile, which in other words means ‘not knowing much of anything and being willing to move from one precarious and unskilled position to another.’ It is worth asking, [...] to what type of families these discourses are addressed and in what way they affect the others. The second axis mentioned by Hirtt is consumer education, one of the objectives of the intrusion of large telecommunications companies in public schools, which donate technological materials with the conviction that they will become consumer necessities in the long term and participate as legitimized agents in the design of public policies. Third and finally, public school systems have been opened to the market, allowing private companies to take advantage of them. In this way, they have become subject to what [Pérez Rueda calls] ‘the business of solutions:’ those who cause the drought are the same ones who come later, when thirst is unbearable, to sell us water, which in this case is also poisoned” (Pérez Rueda, 2022, pp. 23–24).

As has been mentioned, neo-liberalism is a rationality sustained by/for/through the economization of all spheres of life. Education is the prime medium for the modulation of homo oeconomicus. As Isaura Castelao-Huerta, underscores following Brown, despite its influence on economic, political, social, and cultural aspects of life, neo-liberalism is paradoxically both omnipresent and unstable, resulting in geographic and temporal variations. Therefore, it is important to situate its impact and unfolding on Abya Yala (Castelao-Huerta, 2021, p. 3).

The effects of neo-liberal reforms in Abya Yala have different interpretations. “In the first place, Leal Villegas (Leal Villegas, 2016) emphasizes that it is not possible to generalize about the impact of the application of neo-liberal policies, given that the productive structure and the way in which each country is inserted in the world economy must be considered, as well as its reactions to the international price of oil, US monetary policy,

and its internal political and financial instability. [...] Torres Gonzáles (Torres-Gonzáles, 2010) uses a historical approach to point out that in Colombia the right to education has been progressively privatized through direct charges to families and the contracting of private educational services through demand subsidies. This has caused, following Narodowski (Narodowski, 2010), that education is diversified, since, on the one hand, there is education monopolized by the State, with financial problems, impoverished in terms of educational capacity and aimed at the poorest population; and on the other hand, a private sector that, in terms of efficiency of public spending, becomes functional to the state sector, with greater margins of maneuver to educate and capacity to structure autonomous projects, and aimed at the socioeconomic sectors with greater resources.

In the case of Mexico, Ornelas Delgado (Ornelas Delgado, 2009) points out that there is a detriment to public universities because, although the Law of Science and Technology states that 1% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) should be invested in these areas, the State only grants 0.38%” (Castelao-Huerta, 2021, p. 4).

So-called Chile “was the continental laboratory in the application of educational reforms. In 1980, the first National System for Measuring the Quality of Education (SIMCE) was founded and, based on its results, the subsidy to public education was reduced in 1981 ((Núñez, 2004) cited in (Puiggrós, 1994)). The privatization mechanism in Chile was the Private Subsidized Education Program, so that between 1980 and 1990, 22% of public-school enrollment went to private schools and public resources went to private schools in the amount of 402.4 million dollars (Rojas, 1997)” (López Guerra & Flores Chávez, 2006, p. 4).

Castro-Gómez, following Foucault, argues that “the aim of neo-liberal rationality is to create the framework through which social spheres that are not strictly economic (such as science, culture and education) can function as markets and be linked to the mechanism of competition. To turn society as a whole into a set of economic players. Society understood as a set of companies competing with each other, and no longer as an object of intervention by the State through disciplinary mechanisms. From this point of view, the problem is no longer education as an instrument (‘apparatus’) of the State, but as an extension of the enterprise-form. Education as another commodity that individuals buy in the market (the same as health, information, entertainment, etc.) and serves as a means to increase their ‘intellectual assets’ and to broaden their labor competencies in a knowledge economy. Education, in short, as an investment that individuals make in themselves” (Castro-Gómez, 2010, p. 20). And, regarding the arguments we will see in the coming sections by Jorge Eliécer Martínez Posada on the *biopolitical production of subjectivity*, Castro-Gómez, adds, “it is not only that Colombian universities are becoming capitalist enterprises, but that the individuals who buy higher education services from them also appear as entrepreneurial machines” (Castro-Gómez, 2010, p. 21). As Martínez Posada underscores, *Escuela que es empresa y Empresa que es escuela*, School as enterprise and Enterprise as school (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 143).

Similar as *Economía Naranja* couples the creative and cultural industries with the real estate market, the uni-versity is also coupled with the real estate market, and as Nick Mitchell has shown, not only is it tied to real estate speculation but to the state management of “surplus population,” as was the case of the uni-versity in so-called usa and the I.G Bill introduced after the european war of 1914–1945. Mitchel shows how the uni-versity is imbricated not only to real estate speculation but largely to class, gender and race governance issues, through the military industrial complex, population, and labour market (Mitchell, 2023b).

Modulation by competences

Many studies on the neo-liberalization of education are focused on the institutional trans-formations rather than the individual/personal modulations, this thesis is focused on the neo-liberalization of values, methodologies, desires, aspirations, discourses, abilities and practices that are modulated through education, rather than only the macro institutional.

The current neo-liberal modulation of the subject circulates through the false promise of competency suited individual subjectivity. The whole educational apparatus, from kinder to uni-versity is organized for the “training in basic competencies, labor competencies, citizenship competencies and entrepreneurial competencies” (Ley 30 de 1992).

Pedagogy at the service of the market, as Castelao-Huerta refers, and as a consequence of constant performance evaluation, “is the consolidation of a dominant current of constructivist uni-versity pedagogy, whose interest is the effective learning results that form entrepreneurial professionals capable of solving problems (Silva Montes, 2011); under this new logic, where what is rewarded is performance and operational capacity, teaching staff becomes a mere assistant to the student body (Martínez Boom, 2000). With this, there is the imposition of a competency-based curriculum, characterized by labor know-how with a homogenization of knowledge, point out (de La Cruz, 2012) and (Espinoza, 2017)” (Castelao-Huerta, 2021, p. 12).

Competence-based curriculums are currently one of the main dispositif of the logistics of desires to modulate: values, methodologies, desires, aspirations, discourses, abilities and practices, through a straight forward vocational education. As we have seen a key principle of neo-liberalism and its relationship with higher education is the idea of competition. According to Martínez Posada Deleuze (Deleuze, 1999) explains how the constant development of human capital occurs through a societal focus on entrepreneurship, where different components compete with each other to drive progress. This notion of competition, which encompasses both competition and skill, is deeply ingrained in the knowledge system that sustains the production of subjects for capital. The colombian Ministry of National Education defines competence as *saber hacer en contexto*, the ability to perform tasks within a specific context, assuming that the context itself is self-evident and not

influenced by societal constructs, including economic production. The concept of “competence” encompasses both knowledge and practical application. In this regard, potency, or the ability to act, is channeled within the structured environment of educational training to shape subjects who are adept at building a self in terms of enterprise—such as life goals, business management, etc.—, including preparation for competition and skill development (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 100).

Under this context, education is not only an apparatus of the state, in terms of social reproduction, but also “an extension of the enterprise form, because education has become a commodity whose purpose is the increase of ‘intellectual assets’ and labour competence” (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 14).

In 2010, the colombian Ministry of Education sent a letter to all educations instances, stating: “We want competent students who learn what they have to learn as persons, as active members of society and as useful beings who successfully undertake their life projects. Developing competencies for life implies the formation of labor competencies, that is, competencies associated with productivity and competitiveness” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 141) This connection between life competencies and labor competencies is the axis of the biopolitical problematization proposed by Martínez Posada. “The moral subject that is constituted in this discourse, that is, the insistence that the life of the individual is a management of an entrepreneurial order called ‘life project.’ implies the capture of life itself for the production of capital. At the same time, immediately after this moral and economic certainty, there emerges the supposedly necessary interaction between these vital competences and the meaning of education, insisting on the equivocal notion of development” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 142).

The logistics of desires operates through multiple competencies through architecture schools. The modulation of ‘competent students’ is directed towards labour competence. Programs currently include competencies such as:

“Generates architectural solutions based on research methods that respond to the needs of users, with a systemic approach. Designs architectural spaces applying criteria of habitability, constructability and sustainability. Develops construction projects based on design premises, safety criteria, legality, technical-constructive rigor and sustainability. Manages architectural and real estate projects from the beginning to their operation, applying an integral vision of habitat” (Tec de Monterrey, 2023a).

“Projective thinking includes abilities such as: Creatively interpret the physical variables of the environment to define and transform the attributes of inhabitable space; contextual thinking includes abilities such as: Interact with communities and with the public and private sectors and involve learning in the conception, development and sustainability of the project; technical thinking includes abilities such as: Understand and define the production processes of technical systems; communicative thinking includes abilities

such as: Model ideas and concepts through diagrams; and last, computational thinking includes abilities such as: Identify, conceptualize and solve problems through creative processes” (Uniandes, 2021).

Other related competencies, are mobilized through the accelerating market of labour and life coaching, such as the site ARQcoaching, which recommends nine competencies in order to “exercise architecture in a profitable, effective, and impactful way”: 1. Moving fluently in the 2.0 environment, 2. Networking, 3. Selling, 4. Negotiating, 5. Languages, 6. Communicating, 7. Teamwork, 8 Computer skills, 9 Personal Effectiveness (ARQcoaching, 2018). Or the entrepreneurial recommendations by *Líderes para la arquitectura*—Leaders for architecture—, founded by Caterina De La Portilla, who conduct entrepreneurial virtual workshops through latin américa and spain, and has recently published the book *Cómo vivir de la arquitectura* a guide for *archipreneurs* (Lxarch, 2023), in order “to make your career a more profitable, stable and prosperous livelihood” and be part of the 1%. Fuck the 1%.

The CPNAA National Professional Council of Architecture and its Auxiliary Professions in so-called colombia, released in 2019 the 10 commandments of a good architect, according to Alfredo Reyes Rojas, secretary at that moment, and currently general director: 1. Creative thinking, ability to innovate; 2. Research: search for new knowledge; 3. Technology: development of solutions based on disruptive breakthroughs; 4. Innovation: ability to anticipate the future; 8. Social responsibility: commitment to the environment and to equity; 9. Planning: application of a calculated step-by-step approach and anticipation of consequences; 10. Skill development: making good decisions (Reyes Rojas, 2019).

Neo-liberal rhetorics regurgitated and recomposed in the most catholic form, through 10 commandments. Thou shall be neo-liberal.

These are just a few examples of how the neo-liberal rhetorics of creativity, innovation, sustainability and entrepreneurship at large are mobilized through architecture schools, professional associations and coaching marketing. A full study of how the logistics of desire operates also through social networks and the rising arch/influencer and media at large, falls beyond the scope of this research.

Uni-versity in so-called méxico

Since the 1980s, and especially in the 1990s, there has been a gradual dismantling of the mexican uni-versity, particularly public uni-versities, that has resulted in its alignment with neo-liberalization processes. The underlying discussion and the main issue concerning the public uni-versity and its social role revolves around two contrasting views of education. One view emphasizes the uni-versity as a supposedly public good and human right, catering to social needs, democratic principles, and providing mandatory and free education, such is the dream. Conversely, another perspective advocates for high-quality, excellency, pragmatic and focused on

principles of commodification, privatization, social exclusion, labor insecurity, and alignment with corporate needs. This approach views the uni-versity as a bureaucratic organization whose main purpose is to prepare human capital for the labour market (Guerrero Solís, 2020, p. 3).

Starting with the six-year term of Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994), various changes were initiated in the mexican educational system. These changes were evident in the *Programa Nacional de Modernización Educativa* of 1989-1994, which outlined five areas that needed reform. To achieve these objectives, the first step was taken with the *Acuerdo Nacional de Modernización de la Educación Básica* in 1992. This agreement was not an isolated event, but rather part of the broader context of the neo-liberal reform of the mexican state. It became one of the most significant political agreements of the XX century, as it addressed two crucial issues for the future development of the mexican educational system: the decentralization of the educational system and a reform in curriculum, pedagogy, and initial teacher training. The *Acuerdo Nacional de Modernización de la Educación Básica* exemplified the aspirations of the mexican educational system, aiming to meet labor market demands and ensure quality education that aligned with the needs of teaching and learning processes (Carpio Cortes et al., 2021, p. 7).

After the Salinas era, which brought about significant changes in education, a restructuring process occurred during Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de León's presidency. The Educational Development Program (1994-2000) was implemented during this period, focusing on meeting the market's needs and adopting a new philosophy in education. Although there were not many significant changes in education during this time, Alcántara (Alcantara, 2008) notes that the president considered education as a strategic factor for development, enabling individuals to achieve better lifestyles and take advantage of the opportunities presented by science, technology, and culture. Following this educational modernization, a reform to the General Law of Education was introduced in 1993. According to Barba (Barba, 2019), this reform emphasized the right to education for every individual and made secondary education compulsory. It also specified that the power over primary, secondary, and normal education plans and programs belonged to the Federal Executive, rather than the state. Additionally, this period saw the establishment of school councils for social participation, which played a significant role in national educational policies until 2013. The main principles guiding educational policies during this six-year term were equity, quality, and relevance in teaching and learning processes. The sectoral program aimed to expand educational services to reach all mexicans, regardless of their geographical location, economic status, or social standing (Carpio Cortes et al., 2021, p. 8).

During Vicente Fox's presidency, emphasis was placed on management autonomy, quality, and multicultural education, particularly in the impoverished areas of the country. Social participation councils played a significant role in decision-making processes and resource allocation within the educational centers. In the year 2000, a new political party came to power with President Vicente Fox, and the ideas of modernization

were introduced through the *Nueva Gerencia Pública*—New Public Management. This approach had already been successful in the United Kingdom in the 80s under Thatcher. With this new philosophy, public administration was conceived with a focus on citizens as customers, and new quality models were implemented to improve user service. The field of education also underwent changes during this time, with the creation of the *Programa de Escuelas de Calidad*—Quality Schools Program—, which was in place for three administrations. After President Fox's term, Felipe Calderón Hinojosa took office. His presidency also had a significant impact on the country's educational policies. A major negotiation took place with the *Sindicato de Trabajadores de la Educación* (SNTE)— Education Workers Union—, resulting in the signing of the *Alianza por la Calidad de la Educación*—Alliance for the Quality of Education in 2008. This agreement aimed to promote a transformation in educational quality by involving various stakeholders such as government authorities, parents, students, civil society, businesses, and academia. The *Alianza por la Calidad de la Educación* also emphasized the need for properly selected and trained teachers who receive incentives based on their educational achievements. The agreement aimed to provide a quality education that promotes citizenship, productivity, and competitiveness, allowing individuals to reach their full potential. Evaluation was also highlighted as a crucial element in raising educational quality, ensuring transparency, accountability, and informing the design of educational policies. (Carpio Cortes et al., 2021, p. 9).

Continuing the historical tour of educational policies in so-called México from 2012 to 2018, PRI the Institutional Revolutionary Party, led by Enrique Peña Nieto, regained power in 2013 with the reform in the General Law of Education. The concept of “quality” was defined as the alignment between the objectives, results, and processes of the educational system based on effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and equity (Reforma al Artículo Tercero, 2013, p. 25). Additionally, the new General Law of Professional Teaching Service specified that the General Framework for Quality Education would consist of profiles, parameters, and indicators that serve as references for competitive exams and mandatory evaluations for entry, promotion, recognition, and job security (Reforma al Artículo Tercero, 2013, p. 76). This recent educational reform emphasizes the crucial role of teachers in promoting the quality of education, emphasizing professionalization and academic preparation as agents of change (Carpio Cortes et al., 2021, p. 10).

This section highlights a series of public policies and reforms that have helped the Mexican educational system adapt to rapid changes. Neo-liberal policies have played a significant role, transforming the role of the state in teaching and learning processes. Key elements include decentralization, continuous improvement systems, management autonomy, plans tailored to labor needs, and teacher training (Carpio Cortes et al., 2021, p. 10).

Uni-versity in so-called colombia

As we have seen, in Abya Yala, the first uni-versity reform in the twentieth century, also known as autonomy and co-governance, was introduced in 1918 with the córdoba reform. It brought about a uni-versity model characterized by *independent* public institutions, shared decision-making, public education, free access, a management structure based on different groups, and government funding. The second uni-versity reform, called commodification and dual education, occurred in the 1980s and 1990s and led to significant changes in the traditional uni-versity model. This included the growth of private institutions, increased differentiation among uni-versities, higher enrollment numbers, and a reduced dominance of public higher education. As a result, Abya Yala and the Caribbean transitioned from a system with mostly public uni-versities to one with various forms of public and private education (Martínez Posada, 2010, pp. 29–30). Martínez Posada, argues that the “third reform of higher education in Latin America is due to internationalization and quality control; in this reform, higher education systems have been modified by the new communication technologies which have contributed to the transformation of the global panorama, making it possible to shorten distances, expand cross-border education, generate virtual education and make viable not only a new pedagogical practice and non-attendance education, but also the expansion of the knowledge society” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 30). The “third reform of education” in Abya Yala was “the result of a global technology of government. [...] What is most functional for global capital is not so much and not only that subjects work to satisfy basic needs (eating, sleeping, sheltering and resting), but that they ‘capitalize themselves,’ that is, that they manage to invest in immaterial areas such as beauty, information, health and knowledge, since such investments contribute to increase their possibilities of mobility in a changing and merciless economy” (Castro-Gómez, 2010, p. 22).

So-called colombia, as already mentioned, was neo-liberalized by constitution. “In 1991, within the framework of the Political Constitution of Colombia, the concept of ‘quality’ was highlighted as a guiding objective of educational processes. As a result of the regulation of the Constitution, *Ley 30* of 1992—Higher Education Law—appears and with it the formulation of elements and constituent organisms of a system in charge of promoting, inspecting and monitoring higher education institutions. Subsequently, the National Commission for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CONACES) was created, the Higher Education Quality Examinations (ECAES) and the guidelines for professions and disciplines were established” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 31).

Martínez Posada, has been studying the colombian uni-versity during the last three neo-liberal decades through a Foucauldian frame, and argues that “to consider educational processes from the perspective of discipline, is to characterize it as a dispositif of subjection and as a mode of production of subjectivity” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 32) Today, the productive model of global capital determines the control and

subjection of freedom. The production of subjectivity has been removed from disciplinary boundaries and now permeates all aspects of social life. Educational processes have transformed into spaces where subjectivity is produced, not only through discipline but also through the amplification of the deterritorialization resulting from the interaction between control methods and the globalization of capital. Martínez Posada's work seeks to make visible how neo-liberal governmental discourses function as mechanisms for the biopolitical production of subjectivity in colombia's higher education system (Martínez Posada, 2010, pp. 32–33).

“How to ensure that subjects obey and produce? In a combination of discipline and control, liberalism governs the population from its production as a society capable of overcoming the contingencies of life, constitutes a means in which the natural (the phenomena of population) is now part of calculation, and ensures, in the current sense of the notion of ‘life insurance,’ through mechanisms of regularization and anticipated calculation, productivity and obedience. Society of freedom: society of security. Each variable of the population phenomena now becomes a danger to be managed, a possibility that defies control and whose productive consequences put at risk the existence of society itself: a *Estado de Derecho*—State of law—is not possible without ‘security,’ without a ‘culture of danger,’ without a ‘culture of danger,’ without a ‘culture of security’” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 55).

As we have already seen, “homo oeconomicus is the subjectivity that is constituted in the advanced biopolitical forms of neo-liberalism. The production of this subjectivity from the governmental techniques of liberalism supposes then the emergence of a vital productive form that is not only regulated by the laws of the market, but now converts a whole social model captured by the ‘enterprise.’ Enterprise society whose main technique consists in generalizing itself, in taking over the entire social fabric, in managing the subject no longer as risky but as competitive” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 58).

Martínez Posada engages with the neo-liberalization of the uni-versity through an archaeological view of governmental discourses of higher education and draws a genealogy, starting with Law 30 of 1992. Which states in its first lines: “Article 1: Higher Education is a permanent process that enables the development of the potentialities of the human being in an integral manner, it is carried out after middle or secondary education and its purpose is the full development of the students and their academic or professional training” (Ley 30 de 1992).

The insistence on *development* makes “visible, if one carefully analyzes the article of Law 30 mentioned above, the neo-liberal economic discourse. The definition proposed by this governmental discursive dispositif is, visibly, a statement that depends on the neo-liberal statement of ‘human capital.’ And, in turn, it becomes evident how the homo oeconomicus, entrepreneur of itself underlies the subjective perception of the Law: the ‘full development of the students and their academic and professional training’ is the set of statements that prove the relationship that has been made visible” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 100).

Law 30 insists on the “need for ‘lifelong learning’ as a means for individual and social development. Creativity and knowledge ‘in all its forms’ are proposed as tools for the solution of social problems. This is, so far, a desirable ethical goal. However, what seems to be hidden in this discourse is the sense of production; that is, the way in which the knowledge produced by social experience and in the framework of the relations between society and the economic model of production, organizes social life itself to direct it completely towards capitalist monetary production. This governmental model of ‘education for the market’ or for capital can be seen in the statement of the objectives of Law 1014 of 2006 *Del fomento de la cultura del emprendimiento*, Of the promotion of the culture of entrepreneurship:

e) To create a link between the educational system and the national productive system through training in basic competencies, labor competencies, citizenship competencies and entrepreneurial competencies through a transversal entrepreneurship chair; understood as such, the formative action developed in the totality of the programs of an educational institution in the levels of preschool education, basic education, basic primary education, basic secondary education, and middle education, in order to develop the culture of entrepreneurship” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 108).

Martínez Posada insists that this discursive dispositif, “presents a supposedly transparent relationship with knowledge, which could be used for the generation and maintenance of enterprises. But the power relations it organizes do not appear to be transparent. First of all, it clarifies that it is possible to constitute a modality of entrepreneurial knowledge that accompanies the processes of education and knowledge production, which means that it is not about one more aspect of human knowledge, but about the meaning of knowledge: the generation of enterprises as a response to the development of individuality and society. The analyses of Foucault and Deleuze [...] are now more relevant than ever. First of all, an epistemological subject, that is, a subject of knowledge, a mind, which organizes its creativity and its participation in the ‘general intellect’ for capital. This subject is made visible in a striking way in the definitions established by this same Law

a) Culture: set of values, beliefs, ideologies, habits, customs and norms shared by individuals in the organization and arising from social interrelationships, which generate collective behavior patterns that establish an identity among its members and identify them from other organizations.

In this definition of culture it becomes clear how the general intellect ends up captured in the identity of the productive organization. The question of values has a direct relationship with the constitution of a moral subject, the beliefs and ideological frameworks of a society are part of its identity beyond its productive possibility. The subjectivity produced in this discursive device is enunciated with all its force and articulates the deployment of power relations that give meaning to education:

b) Entrepreneur: is a person with the capacity to innovate, understood as the capacity to generate goods and services in a creative, methodical, ethical, responsible and effective manner.

The notion of 'innovation' emerges here as the capture of knowledge and creativity to constitute a subjectivity that is the capacity to generate goods and services. This epistemological subject ends up being, as is evident, a productive force captured in its function of producer, from its knowledge and its creative possibility, of enterprise. In this sense, the notion of development proposed by these governmental discourses could be seriously questioned. Such a development model is evident in the following definition:

c) Entrepreneurship: a way of thinking and acting oriented towards the creation of wealth. It is a way of thinking, reasoning and acting focused on opportunities, approached with a global vision and carried out through a balanced leadership and the management of a calculated risk, its result is the creation of value that benefits the company, the economy and society.

This is the neo-liberal framework in its entirety. Capitalism made possible through the capture of life itself" (Martínez Posada, 2010, pp. 109–110) (Ley 1014 de 2006).

By 2002, in so-called Colombia, there were over thirty thousand licensed architects and in just twenty years the number exceeded eighty-five thousand in 2022 (Reyes Rojas, 2022, p. 123). As Jorge Pérez Jaramillo predicted, the number significantly increased in this period, "due to the establishment of numerous new educational institutions in the 1990s (as a result of Law 30) and neo-liberal economic policies" (Pérez Jaramillo, 2002, p. 29).

Regarding the regulatory framework, particularly concerning the teaching of architectural education, it is important to consider: "Law 30 of 1992, Law 115 of 1994 and Decree 1295 of 2010, which organize and standardize the public service of higher education. Specifically for the teaching of architecture in Colombia, there is Resolution 2770 of 2003, as well as that established by the National Council of Architecture and its Auxiliary Professions (CPNAA), the Colombian Association of Faculties of Architecture (ACFA) and the Colombian Society of Architects (SCA). At the international level, the guidelines of the UNESCO / UIA charter and the provisions of the [...] international accreditation agency, the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), whose objectives seek to standardize the quality of architectural education worldwide" (Martínez Osorio, 2012, p. 122). Such is the national institutional frame of architectural education under territorial coloniality.

Neo-liberal educational spatialities

The rhetoric of flexibility and creativity have had also effects on the production of space directly as both Spencer and Schwartzberg argue. Both educational and labouring spheres have been converted into spaces for the practicing and refinement of entrepreneurial and creative competencies. If universities produce two fundamental commodities for neo-liberal capitalism: knowledge and workers, universities are then, more and

more factories of knowledge, industries of the self. But, as Spencer highlights, the neo-liberal uni-versity more than a factory is re-produced as a corporation, the spatial archetype of the neo-liberal uni-versity is the open office, a flexible “free” space epitomized in the “organizational campuses” of global corporations such as google, facebook etc. Also, as Spencer underscores “the university is remade into a space for the practising of new entrepreneurial skills, dispositions and forms of conduct: the so-called ‘learning landscape’” (Spencer, 2016, p. 10).

“The rhetoric of creativity certainly has its effects at the level of ideology, but some of the specific cultural techniques associated with architectural creativity constitute, in themselves, processes of economo-subjectivization. This means that when we are being most ‘creative’ in certain architectural environments, we are also working at greater rates toward the actualization and dissemination of neoliberal space and logics.

The relationship between architectural creativity and neoliberal environmental power appears through two interrelated planes: on one hand, the material-formal configurations of neoliberal space itself, which has transformed all spaces into workspaces—this is one of its typological achievements, architecturally speaking; and on the other, the modes of living and working that these neoliberal spaces presuppose and engender. These are two sides of the same coin that come together in the physical tools the contemporary designer employs (surfaces, typically) that collapse the distinctions between work-space, work-mode, and work-purpose altogether and which make up the techno-cultural substrate of contemporary architecture: computer screens, parametric software and visualization tools, open-plan-and-play production spaces, Google researchology and infotainment, etcetera.

We tend to think creativity is what animates these surfaces. In fact, it is precisely the opposite: creativity is an effect of these tools and technologies. Creativity is the animation these environments and interfaces produce in ourselves. This is not a metaphoric reflection, but a material condition, and can be found as much in the products and spaces of the giant technological corporations as in the most ‘creative’ global architecture studios.

The creativity of environmental power is animated by way of at least three main channels: (1) through managerial logics and products; (2) through the use of particular parametric tools of governmentality; and (3) through the proliferation of media and project-driven modes of labor. Each of these interconnected channels is large and complex, and related to many others; their main qualities can only be introduced here but they point to a modulation of ‘creativity’ in the neoliberal workspace” (Schvartzberg, 2015, pp. 186–187).

But as Lucas Ospina keenly remarks, “the real business of the university today is NOT education: it is real estate, payment for services and thousands of contracts around the university campus. Education and academia are the playground of a larger business complex” (Ospina, 2023). Mitchell points to a similar argument, and notes through the case of UC Santa Cruz, how even before the uni-versity opened, newspapers

were promoting the real estate market that would develop with the opening of the new campus. To the point that real estate speculation in the surroundings has made almost impossible for people that work and study at the uni-versity to find an affordable living place (Mitchell, 2023a, 2023b). Mitchell, together with Abigail Boggs, Eli Meyerhoff, and Zach Schwartz-Weinstein in *Abolitionist University Studies: An Invitation*, follow this argument and denounce how, uni-versities through the *campus form*, were “foundational tools for the dispossession of Native American peoples’ land, many universities have continued these processes of dispossession by accumulating land to expand their campuses in urban areas, contributing to gentrification and ‘studentification.’ This is made possible, in part, by the fact that non-profit institutions, such as universities and many hospitals, are exempt from property taxes” (Boggs et al., 2019, p. 20). Uni-versities hide behind a non-profit mask and their income is used to pay obscene salaries to high-ranked employees, provide loans and speculate in the real estate market. This is why uni-versities are real estate companies that teach classes (Boggs et al., 2019, p. 20).

Architectural pedagogy(s) | Pedagogies of the new

“...we limit ourselves to confer the character of a premise to the assertion that, since the dominant regime of production in this social formation is neocolonial and capitalist, the corresponding school has the same character” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973)

“The teaching of architecture is not wrong, but completely wrong” Carlos Niño Murcia

We could not agree more with Carlos Niño Murcia. But for different reasons. Niño Murcia constantly repeats his condemnation of architectural education in conversations and lectures, always followed by his well repeated statement of pedophile Adolf Loos, that “an architect is a bricklayer who has learned Latin” (Loos, 1998, p. 53), he argues that what is completely wrong about architectural education is the continuous undervaluation of history and the overvaluation of design and studio pedagogy. Instead, we argue, that architectural education, the teaching of architecture, is completely wrong, because it produces architects and sustains architectural authority. In other words, we argue against architectural education for what it does, for the re/production and schooling of whiteness, for producing architects through its *pedagogy of cruelty*, and not for what it does not do and quality.

The conventional lament of architects is that uni-versities do not properly prepare students to work in the “real world”— as if academia was some kind of imaginary land, the imaginary land of *pedagogías de la crueldad*. We could not agree less, with this lament. We are not interested here in the quality of architectural

education, if uni-versities properly educate future architectural labourers. Fuck education. We are here compelled to problematize the modulation that runs through the uni-versity, the education of social roles, the discipline of bodies, the logistics of desires. Newly graduated architects might be terrible at drawing a 1:1 detail, or incapable of formulating spatial relations. We do not care. Because, still these architects are required, and the uni-versity adequately educates them, to fulfill a social role for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, in order to properly re-produce this world, the *architectural world*, with or without the proper professional formation and knowledge, still professional authority is exerted.

The territories occupied by both the mexican and colombian nation-states are not comparable. This is not a comparative study but rather two case studies that we happen to inhabit. And yet, we cannot resist comparisons. As of 2022, méxico counts with 485 architecture schools, whereas colombia has 62. Nevertheless, the neo-liberalization of architecture, both of the architectural education and the profession, have striking similarities. Both coincide with the extreme commodification of housing, the retreat of the state in the production of housing and the transfer to private companies. As many other countries.

The eurocentric construct of architecture—the architect and its relation to a discipline and profession—has historically answered, constructed and sustained power: political and economic. Upper class architects designing upper class whims. Petty bourgeois entrepreneurial architects innovating for real estate speculation. Middle class architects employed and following orders from bourgeois architects. It falls beyond the scope of this research, but it would be important to draw a trans-versal study of the differences between the logistics of desires at public and private uni-versities. In a gross reduction, private uni-versities are more focused in mobilizing either entrepreneurial or private employee aspirations, whereas public uni-versities are more focused in mobilizing institutional aspirations. In all cases, good capitalist workers.

The end of the european war of 1914–1918 marked the beginning of the end of the Beaux-Arts model, and a full reformulation of architectural pedagogy with schools such as the Bauhaus in Germany or the Soviet Vkhutemas. This turning point reformulated architecture as an *a-historical* discipline—as a way to resist and end the world that had produced the horrors of the war and re-make a new world—and unleashed at the same time an individualist creative imperative. Walter Gropius in the 1919 *Bauhaus Manifesto and Program* states: “The manner of teaching arises from the nature of the workshop: organic form developed from mechanical knowledge; elimination of all rigidity; emphasis on creativity; freedom of individuality, but strict scholarship” (Gropius, 1919).

How is this post-european war of 1914–1918 release of creative freedom related to the post-european war of 1914–1945 individualist imperative of innovation? How does the disciplinary and pedagogical transformation from the XVII century *Académie* to the contemporary architecture faculty in the uni-versity concretizes in the contemporary neo-liberal architect?

As we will see, the UIA-International Union of Architects, as a global apparatus of coloniality, will play an important role since its foundation in 1948, on the reproduction of architecture as a violent eurocentric spatial technology with uni-versal claims that sustains/constructs the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, reproducing constantly asymmetric powers of class, race and gender. Architecture is not an a-historical nor uni-versal practice, the discipline and profession we know today has just a few centuries and hopefully will not last many more.

Professionalization

“As the sociologist of professions Magali Sarfatti Larson has argued, professionalism, a construct of liberal capitalism, had three simultaneous goals: to ensure a guiding, elite knowledge sector; to—ironically, at the same time—hark back to pre-capitalist ideals of craftsmanship, universal protection of the social fabric, and noblesse oblige; and to offer conventions of standardization, scientific and cognitive rationality, and a progressive division of labor” ((Sarfatti Larson, 2013, p. xiii) in (Deamer, 2020a, p. 103)). “Specialization of function and the creation of special bodies of practical or theoretical knowledge are a function of the accumulation of resources” (Sarfatti Larson, 2013, p. 2)

Igea Troiani notes that, neo-liberal rationality in architecture faculties operates through: “the short-term vocational goal of making students instantly employable, efficient ‘factory workers—who can maximize the money they can make for their employers” (Troiani, 2017, p. 172). The neo-liberal uni-versity produces: entrepreneurial, competitive, adaptable, flexible, resilient, original, innovative and creative architects. Such qualities are taught, learnt and put to work through architectural pedagogy. According to Daniel Jacobs and Brittany Utting architecture has a twofold “pedagogical orientation between professional practice and cultural criticism, the design of its curriculum is especially implicated in the equivalency between knowledge and power, culture and capital, labour and value” (Daniel Jacobs & Utting, 2019, p. 261). This twofold orientation is reproduced and normalized through architecture’s main pedagogical technique and space: the studio, as a “competitive ecosystem of production,” that nurtures competitive-gender-biased marketplace tactics, advocating normative macho aggressions (Troiani, 2017, p. 178). The studio often “functions as a proxy practice, reproducing the power structures of owner and worker in an aggressive labour market. The traditional atelier-studio reifies and reinforces a cult of over-productivity, perpetuating the myth of individual authorship to accelerate expectations of work, heroic exhaustion, and self-exploitation. Students are encouraged to engage in their education on the market’s competitive terms, as ‘student-entrepreneurs,’ which schools highlight to reinforce the image of a hyper-productive and hyper-creative studio culture to market themselves. These dominant models of labour and expectations of productivity without compensation transition seamlessly into

professional architectural practice, perpetuating the cycle of precarity and overwork” (Daniel Jacobs & Utting, 2019, p. 261).

According to Fernando Viviescas, the studio successfully recreates all the office apparatus, hierarchy, vices, and practices. Excluding discussion, disagreement, controversy, and even reading. “The studio is assimilated to the ‘office’ and there lies the guarantee of the reproduction of the scheme that has achieved as a tangible result the perpetuation of the conception of architecture as a (liberal) profession.” Unfortunately, this tendency to replicate the office environment in the faculty or even worse, to prepare the office in the faculty, has created a subculture that hinders any serious and critical approach to architecture. This subculture significantly obstructs the possibility of modifying the way we think about the discipline and addressing the actual pressing spatial and cultural issues (Viviescas, 1994, pp. 20–22).

Design studio pedagogy, relies on what Martínez Posada calls, the institutionalization of habits. By way of Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, Martínez Posada argues that such institutionalization occurs when habits or repetitive actions, which stem from behavioral patterns, particularly when the existence of processes of institutionalization of the bodies of the forms of coexistence and of the social order is reflected in the technologies of the self. When the typification of habitualized actions are shared by others, it leads to the institutionalization of habits, which involves considering historical context, authority, and control (Martínez Posada, 2014, pp. 64–65).

The studio model places all the necessary conditions for students to rehearse as if performing at an office, 24/7 work is encouraged in order to re-produce the false notion that architecture is a suffered, complex and time-consuming, original act. This, concretizes on the inability of architects to identify themselves as workers, as Peggy Deamer insists, architecture has become so unaware to the labour discourse that it subscribes to the honor of labour exploitation, falling into the same ideology that christianity used to make the poor feel blessed for their poverty, and declares: Architecture isn’t a career, it is a calling! (Deamer, 2015a, p. xxxiii). Architects are willing slaves ready to respond the vocational calling, the calling of creative governmentality under the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

Form and value is what matters

“The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as ‘an immense accumulation of *buildings*,’ its unit being a single *building*. Our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of a *building*” (Marx, 2004, p. 125)

The previous epigraph is a dis/appropriation of the first line of, *Chapter 1: The Commodity* of Marx’s Vol 1 of *Capital*, in which commodity is replaced by building. Marx starts *Capital* by defining and questioning what is a commodity. The notes that follow attempt to frame a brief critique of architectural economy through three fundamental conditions of the architectural object: form, fetishization and commodification.

In architecture “the dominance of form over social relations governs” (Filipe Narciso, 2022, p. 163). This will not be a phenomenological account of architectural form. Fuck phenomenology! Form and space are the prime dispositifs of architectural production. Carlos Jiménez and Hugo García in *Del espacio arquitectónico a la arquitectura como mercancía*, From architectural space to architecture as a commodity, underscore that “architectural space belongs to the world of evidence, to the space of representation that is ideology, a domain in which the social system, that structure of structures that makes up a set of abstract relationships, is expressed through certain forms” (Jiménez & García, 1972, p. 58). And as cuadernos de NEGACIÓN argue, “the bourgeoisie is the class of the form” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 25). If the dictum a few decades back was form follows function, now form follows finance has taken over (Deamer, 2014, p. 25). Composition and disposition, or the design of space and form are the main disciplinary and professional competences architects are taught. The obsession with form and space coupled with the imperative of the new, has driven architecture to a sustained formalism that drives both education and the profession, under the innovation regime and ever increasing re/production of value by the building industry as part of real estate speculation, and the commodification and more recently the financialization of space.

As Felipe Aravena, Joaquín Díez Canedo and Alessandro Toti argue in *Commodifying Architectural Education*, “architecture itself was born as a commodification of the building activity—some theories place this moment in the 15th century, others suggest far earlier” (Aravena et al., 2016, p. 137). Today there seems no outside of the world of value and commodities. Pier Vittorio Aureli following Piero Sraffa’s economic theory and the production of commodities by means of commodities, argues that architectural form is ultimately a commodity—a commodity as theorized by Sraffa—is radically abstract given its material reality, its instrumentalization and capacity to generate a productive cycle. Hence, economic form signifies the process of

production and redistribution through commodities, considering form through its performative and constructive qualities, rather than its symbolic or informative meaning (Aureli, 2004, pp. 29–36).

Commodity fetishism, argues Jean Robert through Marx, “has its origin in the very peculiar social character of the labour that produces them” (Robert, 2011, p. 12), reducing the production and exchange of commodities to relations between things, hence obscuring all socio-ecological relations involved in the production process. As Fredy Perlman notes, “the commodity produced by the worker is exchanged by the capitalist for a specific quantity of money; the commodity is a value which is exchanged for an equivalent *value*. In other words, the living and past labor materialized in the product can exist in two distinct yet equivalent forms, in commodities and in money, or in what is common to both, *value*. This does not mean that *value* is labor. *Value* is the social form of reified (materialized) labor in capitalist society. Under capitalism, social relations are not established directly; they are established through *value*. Everyday activity is not exchanged directly; it is exchanged in the form of *value*. Consequently, what happens to living activity under capitalism cannot be traced by observing the activity itself, but only by following the metamorphoses of *value*. When the living activity of people takes the form of labor (alienated activity), it acquires the property of exchangeability; it acquires the form of *value*. In other words, the labor can be exchanged for an ‘equivalent’ quantity of money (wages)” (Perlman, 2018, p. 90). Anselm Jappe underscores that “value, as a social form, does not recognise the actual usefulness of commodities. It only considers the quantity of ‘abstract labour’ that they contain, that is, the quantity of pure expenditure of human energy measured in time” (Jappe, 2014b, p. 26).

The fetishization of the territory is such, that buildings, or inhabitable commodities, are constructed by concealing diverse modes of exploitation and alienation. In *Fetichización de la arquitectura: el objeto por encima del sujeto y los procesos*, *Fetishization of architecture: the object over the subject and processes*, Mariana Ordoñez and Jesica Amescua, underscore that “understanding a building, project or architectural object is not understanding what is visible and intelligible [formal, functional, structural and aesthetic qualities], but to know its production processes and the social relations that were generated during those processes. However, in professional practice, architectural production processes is kept hidden, thus feeding the illusion of transparency.” And, argue that, “the fetishization of architecture entails a series of social, ethical, political, economic and environmental conflicts” such as: individualization and technocracy, invisibilization and exploitation, fetishization of materials and production of nature, power relations through class and denial of participation, and hegemony in architectural production and representation (Ordoñez & Amescua, 2021).

In a similar line, Spencer, argues through Adorno and Marx, that “conditions of labour are concealed so that the products of these can appear in the commodity form, as fetishized objects of consumption. As stages for the mass consumption of cultural production, the contemporary architecture of stadiums, concert halls and museums is obedient to the same formal laws. Today's architectural phantasmagoria is similarly invested in the

‘occultation of production.’ The work of building is of no concern to architects because the real work of architecture, as a commodity, is to positively express the abstract structures and concepts of neoliberal capitalism while mystifying its actual conditions of production. This work acquires a special sense in those forms of architecture most closely aligned with the ontology of neoliberalism. The formal tropes of an architecture of flexibility and adaptability advertise accommodation to the spontaneous order that stands as the truth of the neo-liberal way of the world” (Spencer, 2016, p. 74).

The occultation of production is imbricated with the *class-sexual-racial* division of labour, Mabel O. Wilson, Jordan Carver, and Kadambari Baxi, comment on the “disconnection between architects and construction workers” through the remarks by architect Zaha Hadid, who was “questioned by the Guardian newspaper in March 2014 about ongoing human rights violations associated with the construction of FIFA projects in Qatar, where her firm has been commissioned to design the premier al-Wakrah stadium, Hadid stated, ‘I have nothing to do with the workers.’ Asked to comment on the more than 800 migrant deaths connected to World Cup projects already under way, Hadid—the Pritzker Prize-winning architect, whose office has designed and built hundreds of projects for transnational corporations, cultural institutions, and governments in Europe, Asia, and North and South America—stated that it was the governments commissioning these buildings who were in the best position to address the problem. As she put it: ‘I cannot do anything about it because I have no power to do anything about it. I think it’s a problem anywhere in the world” (Wilson et al., 2015, p. 147). This is just an example of the disposability of migrant and racialized bodies by the building industry, and how the architectural “conditions of labour are concealed so that the products of these can appear in the commodity form, as fetishized objects of consumption. As stages for the mass consumption of cultural production.”

Overall this strategies are part of architectural alienation, in other words, how architecture estranges our collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world.

Cultural colonialism and education as imperialism

Architecture is fundamentally structured and re/produced through epistemic coloniality and cultural imperialism. As previously noted, *la hacienda académica*, continues to be a violent site where the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is sustained, a site of re/production and modulation of workers and citizens for the proper functioning of the nation-state. To repeat Mariátegui, “national education [...] has a colonial and colonizing spirit” (Mariátegui, 1958, p. 91).

But, it is not only nation-states that have such spirit, also the global apparatuses of coloniality. Such is the case of the UIA-International Union of Architects, founded in 1948 in Switzerland, as a regularization and

certification machine, a planetary *collective equipment* to finally standardize the discipline and profession of architecture and normalize the uni-versal architect. The UNESCO-UIA Charter for the Training of Architects was first formulated and approved in 1996, during the UIA Assembly in barcelona. In its latest revision in 2017 (UIA, 2017), the charter states that the fundamental objective of architectural education is the training of the architect as a generalist. And, they clarify that “this is particularly true for [those] working in the context of developing countries, where architects might accept the role of 'facilitator,' rather than 'provider,' and where the profession may encounter new challenges.” The charter defines in the first training objective, in addition to training generalists, capable of “designing constructive volumes,” that the architect, “by virtue of the training *he* receives, is a privileged interlocutor with the various constituent elements of society, the State, local authorities, decision-makers, developers, contractors, users and the general public.” The first objective continues: architects, “should be considered as intellectual service providers, whose training will enable them to synthesize controversial issues and contradictory forces.” Architecture as a discipline is obsessed with teaching modes of producing architecture, it is torn between a homogenizing globalization and a reductionist locality, a globalization led by the UIA that seeks to normalize and certify, and a locality led by faculties and associations of national scale that respond largely to the labour market that produces generalist subjectivities.

As Pedro Martínez Osorio in *La enseñanza en arquitectura y las visiones normativas hegemónicas, desde el contexto global al local*, Architectural education and hegemonic normative visions, from the global to the local context, argues, a critical perspective of education, regarding the discourse promoted by the charter, points to the hegemonic and eurocentric vision promoted by the UIA, which would be generating a series of relationships distant from the territorial reality in Abya Yala. “One of the first aspects that appear from its analysis is that the application of this discourse is especially or particularly directed to ‘architects working in the context of developing countries,’ opening beforehand the discussion on the definition of the concept of development and the theoretical and practical implications that this definition implies,” as we have seen in previous sections, on the problematization of the development project (Martínez Osorio, 2012, pp. 123–125).

Martínez Osorio, through Wallerstein and Quijano, problematizes the eurocentric uni-versalist perspective of the charter, particularly how the UIA disregards situated modes of inhabiting and the imposition of notions of development and civilization. Hence promoting and in some cases imposing a one-world view, through territorial coloniality and architecture as a uni-versal practice (Martínez Osorio, 2012, p. 126).

It is fairly evident the incapacity—or should we say unwillingness—of the United Nations and all its various institutions and instances to address systemic problems caused by the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. Mainly because the UN is destined to safeguard the interests of nations-states. “But what is the state? It is a political abstraction (really a socio-political corporation), a hierarchical institution by which a privileged elite strives to dominate the vast majority of people” (Kom’boa Ervin, 2021, p. 58). “We

understand by nation-states the peculiar modern form of articulation of public and private interests to guarantee the reproduction of capital within territories delimited by national borders” (Gutiérrez Aguilar, 2011, p. 41). Then, when the UN publishes something as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the first reaction is distrust as a worthless effort.

Nevertheless, some of these institutions and documents, proper to apparatuses of global coloniality, as we have seen through the neo-liberalization of housing, have broad impact. The UIA has been able, not to address systemic spatio-territorial inequality, but to homogenize and control the professionalization of the architect in vast territories. This has been mainly achieved through RIBA as the certification apparatus of UIA. If as we have mentioned, metrics and indicators of performance are modes of measuring and tracking accountability and responsibility, both exerted as internal responsibility and external control, the certificatory regime of education, monopolizes the authority to designate which architecture programs are valid and which are not, adjusting to a uni-versal model, typical of epistemic coloniality.

The movement between a homogenizing globalization and a reductionist locality, has led architecture schools to engage with certain rhetoric—no more than that—of inter-culturality. But, no matter how much the uni-versity dresses up as inter-cultural or multi-cultural, it is still the plantation school. Even if the critiques of intellectual imperialism and epistemic coloniality reform the uni-versity into an institution better grounded on the territories it occupies, it is still sustained by/for vocational education and abstract labour. As Esteva, by way of Illich, underscore, we do not need alternative educations, but alternatives to education. We repeat, under the regime of ethico-onto-epistemic diglossia we do not need alternative architectures, but alternatives to architecture.

No matter how much architecture dresses up as vernacular, critical regionalism, participatory, feminist, de-colonial, sustainable, or any other mask, still a mask it will be. The *soft police of power*, hides *behind the white-mask of amiable leadership willing to use force, to kill and be killed* (Said, 2003, p. 226).

So-called México

In 1933 Juan O’Gorman, Álvaro Aburto, Juan Legarreta and Enrique Yáñez, along with others, tore up a copy of *La Victoria Samotracia*, and exclaimed: ¡*Muera Miguel Ángel!* Death to Michelangelo! And thus, with this action, they buried the pedagogical model of the *Escuela de Bellas Artes de Ciudad de México*, to pave the way for a new mode of teaching architecture. “Every way of doing architecture has a way of teaching,” argues Ernesto Alva Martínez (Alva Martínez, 1998, p. 57).

By the 1960s, architecture in so-called México, in addition to the crises caused by educational reforms, was going through a prolonged educational, professional and identity crisis. However, as Víctor Arias Montes

argues, “its precedents are anchored in the early 1950s with various efforts led by some architects to distance themselves from the dominance of the International Style. [...] In 1953, Mathías Goeritz released his Manifesto for an Emotional Architecture. [...] And also, in the same year, Enrique del Moral, gave a lecture at the *Casa del Arquitecto* on the quarrel of tradition versus modernity.” But, as Arias Montes, accurately asks, “wasn't the architecture that was being produced beautiful and exciting? Was that the main problem of that architecture? Ciudad Universitaria was inaugurated in those years and international architecture became dominant, although with some splashes of artistic integration that tried to redirect the course” (Arias Montes, 2019, pp. 11–13).

The tensions and struggles “in the practice and teaching of architecture, exemplified in the conflict at the *Escuela Nacional de Arquitectura*-ENA at UNAM in the early 1970s, revealed the need for major changes. Although there was some analytical activity, it became evident that both practice and teaching had serious problems that no attempt had been able to define, let alone resolve. The profession showed serious limitations, and it was not customary to reflect; the urgency to build delayed the possibility of knowing how, why and for whom one worked. Schools were repeating teaching schemes that were evidently anachronistic; and the ability to think and propose had become numb in the face of the priority of building. [...] The need to analyze and transform practice and teaching led several architects to try to make progress in research and evaluation, in order to be in a position to make proposals for the desired change; but they did not know how to define it adequately. For the first time, work clearly focused on the critical analysis of architecture emerged” (Toca Fernández, 2017, p. 11).

José Villagrán García, was among the first to raise an alarm about the crisis at the ENA. Widely recognized “as one of the most outstanding promoters of rationalist architecture and the consequent training of architects under those principles, suggested, to challenge the crisis, scientific knowledge of local, regional and national architectural problems, as well as greater technical preparation in the field of construction and to penetrate the Mexican aspect of the works built in the country in order to reevaluate their meaning beyond the passing of time. Together with an extensive dissemination of the reasons why Mexican architecture was in crisis, he proposed the need to ‘found a research institute to systematically study *our* problems and *our* construction techniques and to undertake the comprehension of the possible formal contents of *our* historical art’ (Villagrán García, 2011, p. 623)” (Arias Montes, 2019, p. 14).

In 1962 the University Student Council was formed, and in 1966, with the appointment of Javier Barros Sierra to the rectorship, a profound reform was undertaken, which, for the first time, summoned the entire uni-versity community. “The reform proposed, as an essential point, the participation of the student body in the transformation of the study plans, an issue that opened the way for students to participate widely in

the discussions and for others, linked to some groups of professors and authorities, to block or oppose any attempt at reform in their schools.

The ENA was no exception. The student body showed great interest, organizing talks and seminars where the radical nature of the proposals quickly overcame the ideas of the authorities. The *Seminarios de Revolución Académica*—Academic Revolution Seminars—were organized for this purpose, where the relationship between the ENA and the needs of the country, the academic curriculum, the pedagogical systems used and, above all, the prevailing authoritarianism in the teacher-student relationship began to be questioned. And within the ENA, organized groups of teachers and students began to openly question the capacity of the authorities to move forward a school which was beginning to openly show the contradictions of a long and deep crisis” (Arias Montes, 2019, p. 19).

That same year, a survey was conducted regarding entry into the labour market and in the introduction structural questions were posed: “How could we know if the professions of architect, engineer and engineer-architect are adapted to the needs of Mexico's national development? That is to say, if they fulfill the social or technical function that corresponds to them to participate or contribute to the constructive activities of the country and the technical progress of the world, or if they only graduate from the educational institutions—for example—professionals at the service of the high economic strata of the population” (Cevallos Osorio, 1967). The architect has been always already the *lava-perros* of power. The watchdog of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

The generalized crisis of the profession was not particular to the mexican context, let us recall the famous words by Ernesto Che Guevara during the closing ceremony of the VII Congress of the UIA, September 27 to October 4, 1963, in so-called cuba, in la habana:

“Technique can be used to domesticate the peoples, and it can be put at the service of the peoples to liberate them (...) And whoever pretends to say that only a technician, an architect, a doctor, an engineer, a scientist of any kind is to work with his instruments, only in his specific branch, while his people die of hunger, or kill themselves in struggle, has in fact taken the other side. It is not apolitical, it is political but contrary to liberation movements” (Guevara, 1977, p. 116).

The cuban architect Fernando Salinas, presented both the final report of the UIA Congress, and wrote, according to Arias Montes, “one of the most accurate essays on architectural and urban reality of latino américa,” titled *La arquitectura revolucionaria del tercer mundo*, The revolutionary architecture of the third world. The opening paragraph of this essay, without a doubt, fueled the revolutionary fervor of that era, encapsulating the spirit of those years (Arias Montes, 2019, p. 29):

“A specter is haunting the paths of modern architecture, transforming it from its roots; the ghost of the needs of the Third World” (Salinas, 1972) the forgotten and dominated worlds, the colonized worlds of Abya Yala.

This context would lead to one of the most potent experiences of struggle within and against architecture schools and the uni-versity in so-called México, *Arquitectura y Autogobierno*, Architecture and Self-government—which in the early days showed a glimpse of the potency of the intra-actions between anarchism and learning—, would radically transform the faculty of architecture in 1972, concretizing the political movement that started in the mid 60s. Yet, the coming decades would see the ever-increasing neo-liberalization of the uni-versity and architectural education.

Colonial to republican

With the conquest and colonization of Abya Yala, the transformation of the territory and the construction of places were radically altered. Faced with the pluri-versal possibility of understanding, constructing and inhabiting multiple worlds, the uni-versal craft of architecture was imposed. The architect in so-called México—one of the many centers where colonial power was wielded and modes of inhabitation was professionalized according to European parameters—is a figure crossed by diverse tensions generated by a brutal acculturation, local traditions that were supplanted by foreign methodologies and customs, and contradictions due to the reactions arising from the syncretism produced by the phases of conquest, colony and national independence.

At the time of the conquest, in Spain, the training of the architect was given in three successive methods: the first “a master, within the system put into practice by the guilds of medieval origin;” the second method was “from [the] mastery of figurative drawing;” the third method or group “was formed by Juan de Herrera [who] was a military man and humanist, so he represents the clearest Spanish example of the Albertian architect, trained in the meditation of his humanistic and mathematical knowledge” (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 17).

In colonial México most of the early architects were associated with a guild, as Manuel Carrera observes, at some point “the guild economically considered was an anti-capitalist institution, in that the spirit of enterprise and individual initiative was almost null” (Carrera Stampa, 1954, p. 47). Within this structure they educated and employed younger people, and it was composed of various figures depending on their knowledge and skills, the senior master, was the owner of the means of production and directed the training processes and construction commissions. The guild is one of the first collective work organizations, a way of grouping and watching over collective interests and needs, “it was a corporation of workers [...] that grouped together to

protect themselves in the performance of the same trade; [they] established the rules on the way of working, guaranteeing the quality of the materials, the manufacturing techniques, the characteristics of the product and the defense of the interests of their members” (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 49). The first great change in the formation, and consequently, in the figure of the architect, occurred with the dissolution and prohibition of the guilds, between 1770 and 1814, with the disposition elaborated by José María Morelos in the *Constitución de Apatzingán*. Since the XVI century, in Europe, Academies had been established as a “formal” and professionalizing educational paradigm. The main academic model of architecture, as we have seen, was the *Académie royale d'architecture* in Paris. Related to this genealogy is the establishment of the *Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Carlos* in 1781 in Ciudad de México, later to become the faculty of architecture at *Universidad Nacional de México*, UNAM (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 86).

Modern to neo-liberal

With the consolidation of the Mexican Republic and the issuance of the Organic Law of Public Instruction, engineering was separated from architecture. Article 37 provided for the issuance of degrees for architects and master builders by the *Escuela de Bellas Artes*, School of Fine Arts. (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 136). Under the direction of Román Lascuráin, between 1877 and 1902, the figure of the architect was redefined from a triple mission: as an artist, as a philosopher and as a civilian. As an artist, its mission was: to realize beauty, to obtain the expression of the ideal. As a philosopher, to satisfy the feeling of beauty, through perfection in the cultivation of form. As a civilian, its mission was to satisfy the many needs that affect through various spheres (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 149).

In 1922 another great transformation began, the *Escuela Técnica Nacional de Constructores*, National Technical School of Builders was founded, which became the *Escuela Superior de Ingeniería y Arquitectura* (ESIA), School of Engineering and Architecture, part of the *Politécnico Nacional*, National Polytechnic. This transformation is part of the tireless debate between art and technique that has crossed architecture. In so-called México, this dispute at that moment was divided into two tendencies led by O'Gorman and Villagrán García. The tendency led by O'Gorman advocated the death of Michelangelo: “to turn architecture into a solely and exclusively functional object, where beauty was left aside. O'Gorman said that 'beauty was a superficiality that what it did was to charge cost and that it made things much more expensive.’” Villagrán, on the other hand, “elaborated the theory where he sought a balance of the Vitruvian concept of the three factors of architecture: 'utility'; the constructive technical part: 'solidity' and 'beauty'; and he added a fourth one that he called ‘values’ which is the social value” (Alva Martínez, 1998, p. 62).

These two tendencies, as Alva Martínez argues, followed the same architectural movement, that of rationalism, but produced two different modes of teaching and practicing architecture. One tendency remained at UNAM, which continued the tradition of the *Escuela de Bellas Artes de San Carlos*. The other formed the *Instituto Politécnico Nacional*—IPN— and invited Hannes Meyer to be a part of the movement. Hannes Meyer, who served as the Bauhaus Director after Gropius, immigrated to so-called México to contribute to the establishment of the IPN and the creation of the Popular Graphics workshop. These two institutions developed and ultimately led UNAM to the construction of *Ciudad Universitaria* in 1954. The campus encompassed all the elements of the rationalist movement, such as Mies van der Rohe's architecture and Rietveld's flexible design. In contrast, the National Polytechnic Institute represented a different form of rationalism. They focused less on muralism and the interlocking of communication elements, instead opting to design a prototype and replicate it for various schools (Alva Martínez, 1998, p. 62).

A brief excursus, the presence of Hannes Meyer is important because from all the Bauhaus directors, he was the most radical and politically committed as a marxist. Meyer committed his life to the cooperative movement, and rehearsed his Co-op principle “I newer work alone,” through various formats: Co-op Housing, Co-op Theater, Co-op Vitrine, Co-op Interior, Co-op Photography, amongst other. But most importantly for the current argument, if we follow Mitchell’s argument that the uni-versity is “a social institution in which the majority of the work produced is by workers who receive no wages in order to work, and conversely are expected to pay in order to work” (Mitchell, 2023a). Then students are wageless workers. As Amir Djalali notes in *The Architect as Producer: Hannes Meyer and the Proletarianisation of the Western Architect*, “Meyer saw the end of the division between the intellectual labour of the architect and the manual labour of the builder” (Djalali, 2015, p. 36). Meyer notes in *El arquitecto en la lucha de clases y otros escritos*—The architect in class struggle and other writings— that “the increasing exacerbation of the crisis will suffocate the class-conscious architect, but from a political point of view, *he* will become more and more emancipated from *his* waiting state. *He* knows that, as an intellectual worker at the drafting table, *he* is a slave like *his* comrade—the construction worker” (Meyer, 1972). “It is for this reason that Meyer transformed the Bauhaus into a factory and its workshops into research and development departments for the most advanced industries of the day; it was his attempt to accelerate the historical tendency and unleash its unsettling potential. The salary paid to the students was a central part of this strategy. By transforming students into workers, Meyer achieved a twofold result. On the one hand, he allowed students from proletarian backgrounds to access the school, prefiguring a higher education for the masses; and on the other hand, Meyer proletarianised the students coming from bourgeois families, introducing them to salaried work, leveling the class differences within the workshops and promoting cooperation between students” (Djalali, 2015, p. 36).¹²

Let's continue. Luis Manuel Franco Cárdenas argues that, the “boom” of architecture schools in so-called México began in the 1940s, coinciding with the consolidation of the building industry due to the effects of the European wars. Mexican architecture experienced great economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s, with a balance between the demand for professionals and the number of graduates. The demand for architecture professors was high, reinforcing the idea that progress was unstoppable. However, imbalances between labour demand and the number of graduates soon emerged. Despite the numerous schools that have emerged since then, most of them did not offer significant alternatives, most schools lacked a clear and distinct direction, which led to a continuous and underlying crisis. The situation worsened when schools deceive students by making false promises based on flawed premises. Many of these schools, particularly private ones, adopted foreign models. Same as today driven by neo-liberal principles. This highlights the capitalist discourse of education and trade (Franco Cárdenas, 2007, p. 65).

As we have seen previously, the case of so-called México is representative of how neo-liberalization operates at a national scale through capitalist accumulation by dispossession, how communities have been displaced and dispossessed through the violent pressure of: the privatization of the territory, energy and extractive projects, infrastructure mega-projects, the “conservation of nature” and real estate speculation and financialization (de Ita, 2019, p. 95). Although this violent dispossession projects took its actual form during the 1980s and 90s, it is important to underscore that, there are not only direct influences of global apparatus of territorial coloniality, as the WB, IMF, UN, OECD, but this neo-liberalization is part of the push away of communal ownership towards private individualized ownership, promoted, as we have seen, by figures such as von Mises already since 1943 in *Problemas económicos de México*.

Neo-liberal discourse and housing public policy have been promoted by global apparatuses of territorial coloniality. In 1993 the WB published a document titled *Housing Enabling Markets to Work*. In the initial pages, they outline the evolution of WB housing policy during the 1980s and early 1990s and propose significant changes in policy orientation for both the Bank and its borrowers. The document advocates for reforms in government policies, institutions, and regulations to ensure efficient functioning of housing markets. The main argument put forward by the WB is for governments to move away from their previous role of intervening in housing production and instead become facilitators and guarantors of free property rights. The WB argued that by limiting state intervention and leaving the real estate market to function on their own, housing needs can be better addressed. Claudia Puebla Cadena, further explains that housing policies have shifted from a “provision” approach to a neo-liberal “facilitating” approach since the 1980s. The objective of the WB and state bureaucracy is to pave the way for investments through privatization of public assets under their custody. This leads to the sale of these assets and a subsequent devaluation of their value, such as land reserves. The government grants facilities to real estate capital to appropriate and urbanize these spaces, aiming

to initiate a new cycle of capital through the sale of devalued assets and the development of housing projects. This process reproduces capital and expands the market for developable land. Despite seeming contradictory, the need for real estate capital to conquer new spaces makes the role of the state essential in safeguarding such investments (Merchand Rojas, 2017, p. 8) (Puebla Cadena, 2002).

“The urban and housing policies that emerged from the Washington Consensus cancelled housing production under direct public sector promotion by replacing the State's provider role with a facilitating function that has generally been limited to supporting private sector initiatives” (Ortiz Flores, 2006, p. 6). Also, the UN-Habitat conferences have been important in the promotion of the neo-liberalization of housing. As Maria de los Angeles B. Garcia Peralta N. argues, “due to the relevance of the problem of homelessness and the deterioration of human settlements, the United Nations promoted the discussion and orientation of general policies on this issue with the Habitat I World Conference, held in Vancouver (1976), the celebration of the International Year of the Homeless (1986), the formulation of the Global Housing Strategy to the Year 2000 (1988), the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro (1992), the Social Development Summit in Copenhagen (1995) and Habitat II in Istanbul (1996). The Vancouver Conference was notable for the weight of the proposals made for planning at all levels and their rethinking in the context of the first crises of the welfare state. The Global Housing Strategy put forward the initial ideas on ‘facilitation,’ based on the neo-liberal approach and defined as the provision of the legislative, institutional and financial structure to enable private agents to develop the housing sector. The Rio Agenda 21, in 1992, incorporated the concern for sustainable development into global environmental policies. The Copenhagen Summit highlighted the problems of development, poverty and deterioration of minimum welfare conditions caused by the globalizing economic model. And finally, the Istanbul Conference assumes ‘housing for all’ and the ‘sustainable development of human settlements in an urbanized world’ as the axes of its declaration, proposing market mechanisms and the ‘facilitating strategies’ of the State as instruments of solution. It should be noted that these facilitating strategies allude to a set of measures based on neo-liberal policies, with a constant reorientation of the powers of the State to put them at the service of capitalist enterprises” (Garcia Peralta Nieto, 2016, p. 174).

These neo-liberal housing policies have had a significant influence in both education and the profession. Schools focus many studios on the so-called “housing problem,” hence preparing future architects to work for the continuous growing sector of real estate speculation as part of architectural alienation, estranging people off the collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world. As Illich would say, disabling professionals re/producing disabled clients. And as Robert notes, “when talking about housing deficit, architecture, ‘*empresa pueblo*,’ ‘housing question’ or human settlements, social facts of different shades are constructed. In each of these nuances [Robert] recognizes the professional coloration of a peculiar construction of reality. Each of these realities successively constructed by architecture, *barriadología*—neighborhoodology—

or economics suffocates the *art of inhabiting* under layers of descriptions of the services available to women and men [deliberately] disabled” (Robert, 2021, p. 209) by architects.

The “apogee of developers” as Garcia Peralta N., refers to, and argues that both the financial deregulation and the change to the *Ley del Infonavit* had a significant impact on housing policy. In 1988, Fovi's production of housing units was 104,903, but it drastically decreased to 17,121 the following year. However, this decrease was partially compensated by the 35,883 units financed by banks, which may have been constructed through Fovi credits. It is worth noting that these credits depended on loans granted by the WB starting from 1989. During the six-year administration of Salinas, the number of houses built continued to decrease and did not recover. At the beginning of his term, public agencies promoted the construction of 217,744 housing units, but by 1991, this number dropped to 133,190. The situation only slightly improved in the last year of that administration, with 220,521 units built. Mortgage loans granted by banks, which began in 1989, reached around 36,000 and peaked at almost 130,000 in 1992. However, this number significantly declined due to the 1994 crisis. As for Infonavit, its investment did not grow after the crisis and only saw an increase of more than 50% in 1999. This led to a higher number of loans granted, reaching 250,000 in 2000. However, it is important to note that this number of loans does not necessarily correspond to the construction of the same number of houses, considering that the credit granted per unit in 2000 was just over 173,000 pesos. The neo-liberal model allowed only a few companies, such as Geo, to significantly increase their production. Geo was the neo-liberal dream of Luis Orvañanos, an architect who graduated from Universidad Iberoamericana. During 40 years from 1973 to 2103, Geo monopolized the violent real estate market. For example, Geo built close to 20,000 units in 1997 and maintained a constant production level, reaching almost 30,000 units in 2000 (Garcia Peralta Nieto, 2016, p. 290). In 2018 the public trade company was dissolved after: colluding with and financing electoral campaigns, selling houses at an overprice of 40% and obtained illicit resources from mortgage funds. Which enabled the owners of Geo *darse vidas millonarias* with the money of those in need of housing and from the labour of Geo workers, as stated by former workers (El Financiero, 2015; Alfredo Méndez, 2015).

Luis Orvañanos might have been one of the first neo-liberal patriarchitects, graduating in 1969. By 1999, as the study by Alma Herrera Márquez, Germán Gómez Pérez and Margarita Cruz revealed, not only the state was at war with public education, which led to the previously mentioned strike and student movement, but uni-versities as UNAM were also already inhabited by some of the “first offsprings of neo-liberalism” (Aviles, 2003). The process of neo-liberalization of education meant putting in motion, through the logistics of desire, a set of values and aspirations mainly articulated by/for individual success, in order to produce a professional modality of being that aspires and desires to constant accumulation of success in the form of authorship, innovation, capital, fame awards/recognition, power and built projects.

Situating the research in so-called ciudad de México, as of 2023 the city counts with twenty-two undergraduate programs of architecture, of which five are public universities and seventeen are private. A closer look at the curriculum of three schools in ciudad de México might elucidate the neo-liberalization of architectural education.

First, UNAM as the first school of architecture, to open both at the national and local scale. “The training of the architect at UNAM involves constant updating and innovation” (FA-UNAM, 2017, p. 26). UNAM today is committed to “train professionals in the Undergraduate of Architecture, who with their preparation and social conscience meet the requirements of the society in which we live and transform it to raise its quality of life. To guarantee in the graduates a professional solidity and to increase the quality of the teaching of the Faculty, contributing to the enhancement and teaching and cultural prestige of UNAM, maintaining a spirit of commitment and responsibility to society” (UNAM, 2023a). “Taking into account the social meaning of education with an emphasis on gender equality, the main mission of the Faculty of Architecture (FA)-UNAM is to train professionals in Architecture, Urban Planning, Landscape Architecture and Industrial Design capable of developing design projects, management, construction, research and communication that correspond to its natural, urban, social and cultural context” (UNAM, 2023b) Oh... such is the dream of the inclusive eco-humanitarian architect!

UNAM’s current architecture undergraduate curriculum was approved in 2017. The social needs addressed by the curriculum, respond to “mexican architecture [which is] produced in a context of social inequality, geographically differentiated from its latitudes, densities and distribution in the national territory. This implies rethinking the profession based on the basic needs of society in its habitat in all its dimensions and scales, where architecture professionals must respond to the conditions that society requires, professionals with capacities for active, creative and self-managing intervention to assimilate the changes aimed at improving the quality of life, with intervention in all its genres and scales, in new projects, already built works and any form of habitat production. This curriculum focuses on a perspective of professional development in which the architect responds to *his* professional role of service to society” (FA-UNAM, 2017, p. 15).

“The educational vision with a systemic approach that is promoted in the structure and contents of this new curriculum is linked to four transversal themes, relevant to architectural work and production, which must be addressed in all areas and levels of the degree, which are: habitability, sustainability, feasibility and inclusion.

The transversal themes are incorporated into the systemic perspective by emphasizing the sense of attitudes and values so that:

[...] Collaboration is allowed between social actors involved in the improvement of communities and groups of professionals who take part in the processes of planning, synthesis, design, construction and maintenance of the professional activity of service, with social legitimacy. The result should reflect actions that

preserve the local character in a global world with the meeting of social agendas to address the quality of life and social welfare in the face of problems such as urban growth and its relationship with the real estate market, which modifies the rural-urban dynamics. It seeks to encourage knowledge of concepts such as resilience, the right to housing, the need for decent public spaces, health and mobility, among others” (FA-UNAM, 2017, p. 49).

During the Deepening Stage which “comprises the fifth and sixth semesters. This stage is focused on developing the student's identity as a future professional,” for which they “participate creatively and entrepreneurially in urban architectural projects, collaborating with professionals from other disciplines” (FA-UNAM, 2017, p. 61).

The architect graduated from UNAM should possess some of “the following knowledge, skills and attitudes: Interest in the issues of the current local and global architectural debate with a committed, self-managed and sensitive entrepreneurial stance” (FA-UNAM, 2017, p. 44). “Some situations that mark the professional development are the following: The development and management of projects and works in the social sectors formulated in urban areas and projects of self-production of housing and services that link professional practice with the demands of the low-income population and the development of projects and works that allow innovation and creativity in the local, national and international spheres” (FA-UNAM, 2017, p. 24).

Architecture at UNAM might have one the most conscious curriculums directed to resolve popular habitat problematics and needs, yet neo-liberal rhetoric and modulation are even engrained in the re/production of *barriadólogos*—hoodologists—, as Jean Robert would call them. *Barriadología*—hoodology—, was understood by Robert, as a “set of linguistic devices through which people” are “‘educated’ to talk about ‘their own’” in popular *barrios*—neighborhoods. It postulates “that people would talk about their ability to inhabit in terms that would transform this into a demand for professional assistance” (Robert, 2021, p. 208). Architecture can wear all the progressive masks of inclusion, participation, and environmental and social conscience and yet a mask will be. The school of architecture at UNAM is organized by *talleres*—studios—, some which still even follow the *Autogobierno* experience and some other courses *Producción y Gestión Social del Hábitat*—Production and Social Management of Habitat—, and some follow conventional formalism, but yet, all studios are still committed to the re/production of the need for architecture and the architect, the *demand for professional assistance*. And hence, sustain the professional *white-mask of amiable leadership* (Said, 2003, p. 226).

Second, *Escuela de Arquitectura* in Monterrey at Instituto *Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey* (ITESM), *Tec de Monterrey*, the first private undergraduate architecture program to open in so-called México. Founded in 1946, is now the epitome of the neo-liberalization of education. It has since become a national corporation with twenty-five campuses throughout so-called México, including two campuses in

ciudad de México and one in estado de México, these three count with the same architecture program under a single direction. Tec de Monterrey is the neo-liberal model for a national educational corporation, a factory of whiteness, spread all through so-called México.

As stated in their landing page, “At Tec de Monterrey we continually innovate our academic offerings so that they always respond to social, economic, labor, scientific and technological changes” (Tec de Monterrey, 2023c). The new general *Tec21* pedagogical model is based on *retos*, challenges. The “new educational model, unique in the world, activates and empowers your innovation capabilities and allows you not only to stay current, but to be an agent of change in unprecedented times, when education is undergoing a complete transformation” (Tec de Monterrey, 2023d). The architecture program states: “Our challenge-based educational model develops the competencies that will allow you to creatively and strategically face the opportunities and challenges of the 21st century” (Tec de Monterrey, 2021a). You know that we cannot miss the challenge and opportunities of any crisis. After all capitalism is crisis. Or as Don Durito de la Lacandona would say, “it turns out that ‘neoliberalism’ is not a theory to confront or explain the crisis. It is the crisis itself made theory and economic doctrine! (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 53).

Students may enter the undergraduate program of architecture from two “areas of study:” Built Environment or Creative Studies. The architecture program “aims to train professionals who plan, design, build and manage architectural and urban spaces that human beings need to develop integrally. Its graduates are designers of sustainable spaces, promoters of real estate opportunities, with a solid urban and environmental awareness and a mastery of technologies for design, representation and construction. They possess a critical attitude, a humanistic conscience and a social and ethical commitment through environmental preservation and the improvement of their community economically and socially” (Tec de Monterrey, 2023a). “As an architect, you bring together art and technique to design and build spaces that impact everything from the mood of people to the attractiveness and productivity of cities” (Tec de Monterrey, 2023b).

Upon entering a shared program for creative studies or the built environment, students on the second year are able to start with architecture. Innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship are mobilized since the first year until the end. On the first semester students start with a course on “Methodologies of creative thinking,” during second and third year all architecture studios, or challenges as Tec likes to call them, count with a course on management, where students have to deliver a business plan for their projects. At the end of the third year, students can choose a disciplinary concentration between: Entrepreneurial family, sustainability and transcendence, Financial vision for decision making, Advanced architecture, Theory, history and criticism of art and architecture, Design and technology-based futures, Art, object, fashion and jewelry, Visual arts and technology incubator, Entrepreneurship in the creative industries, Building information modeling and management (BIM), Start-up city, Regenerative design, Specialized journalism, Efficiency and digitalization in

construction, Open innovation and technology transfer, Engineering and real estate intelligence. And lastly, on the last semester of the fourth year, students can choose between Multidisciplinary professional elective, Entrepreneurship in the field of architecture or Architectural management (Tec de Monterrey, 2021a) (Tec de Monterrey, 2021b).

The program also wears fully the sustainable development mask, calling for a resilient future of innovative-sustainable entrepreneurship. All the program is structured through the UN 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015 with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which provides supposedly—imposes—a “shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and into the future” (UN, 2015) (UN, 2023).

Third, Universidad Iberoamericana as one of the biggest and most “prestigious” private uni-versities in so-called ciudad de México. The undergraduate is focused in “Designing habitable spaces for human beings. To build habitable spaces for human beings. [*Emprender*] Undertake projects related to human habitation” (Ibero, 2021, p. 1). Some of the competences, the curriculum is based are: “To conceive and promote creative solutions that improve the current conditions of urban and architectural space, to anticipate the needs of the society in which it collaborates” (Ibero, 2023, p. 1).

Graduating as an “Ibero architect you will be able to design adequate and sensitive spatial solutions to the socio-environmental context, through a creative and analytical process of conception, design and entrepreneurship of architectural and urban projects that contribute to the quality of life of individuals and communities” (Ibero, 2023, p. 2).

Full in line with the white authority complex, Ibero “forms leaders who understand the architectural project from its multiple perspectives [...] trains creative, critical architects with national and international projection” (Ibero, 2023, p. 1).

And you might ask yourself, why study at Ibero? Because, “The Ibero architect has always been characterized by having a broad vision of reality and a high critical and reflective capacity, which allows him/her to make pertinent proposals for solutions to complex problems with creativity and innovation [...] Ibero's Bachelor's degree in Architecture has a solid reputation and tradition, training creative and critical architects with national and international projection. The education at Ibero stands out from other universities for its teaching and learning practices, in addition to the exercise of tolerance, the promotion of critical creativity and respect for diversity” (Ibero, 2023, p. 2). Or you might also ask yourself, what is the labour field of an Ibero architect? Fear not! “Entrepreneurship in the private sector - Form your own professional services company in the field of architecture, urban planning and other areas that require physical or virtual spatial solutions” (Ibero, 2023, p. 2).

Such is the neo-liberal frame for the re/production of the architect in so-called ciudad de México. These are just three examples of neo-liberal architectural education. But you can see where we are going. There is no need to comment and problematize every single statement from the neo-liberal rhetoric of these three schools. These are not just rhetorics. These are not just semantic dispositifs, because as Barad reminds us dispositifs are not merely semantic, dispositifs produce *material-discursive practices* (Barad, 2007, pp. 132, 149). These schools deliver what they promise: mass production of neo-liberal architects through the uni-versity. Through the schooling of *blanquitud*. Uni-versities are more and more *factories of whiteness, industries of subjectivity, factories of knowledge, industries of the self*.

So-called colombia

“...the teaching of architecture in Colombian universities has taken on a very particular resemblance to national industry. In some parts there are imported pieces that are assembled by national technicians, in others there is only national raw material handled without quality criteria. The product, the professional, can have serious flaws in its cultural and intellectual constitution and, as a result of all this, there is still, for some universities, some profit. For the country in general, the gain is difficult to estimate” (Saldarriaga Roa, 1985)

By the time architecture students were breaking the Samotracia in so-called ciudad de México, there was no architecture school yet, as an independent faculty, in so-called colombia.

During colonial domination, so-called colombia, being a minor colony, did not have the attention nor the resources as so-called México. An example of this is the absence of an Arts Academy, which so-called México had since 1781, whereas colombia had to wait almost a century, until 1886, and the *independence* to have an academy.

The conventional tale dates the beginning of architectural education in 1936 with the foundation of *Escuela de Arquitectura* at *Universidad Nacional de Colombia* in so-called Bogotá, as an independent school. Before that, it was adscript to Engineering and Maths. But as Luis Fernando González Escobar in his doctoral research, later published as a book, *Del alarife al arquitecto: el saber hacer y el pensar la arquitectura en Colombia, 1847-1936*, argues, since 1847 there were multiple efforts to educate and professionalize architects (González Escobar, 2013).

In so-called colombia the profession was institutionalized and organized first than the discipline, by 1934 SCA *Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos* was created, a professional organization that looks out for the

class interests of white-mestizo bourgeoisie, and two years later the first school of architecture at UNAL was founded. This is a clear example that shows how education was a means of regulation of labour, since architects needed a professional degree in order to practice.

Territorial coloniality through architecture demanded the modulation of “good” architectural taste. People in so-called colombia had to be civilized, exposed to the canons, educated out of their “architectural infancy.” This was done, as González Escobar shows, through several means as, pamphlets, press, and exhibitions, (González Escobar, 2013, p. 213), and particularly through the establishment of a “proper” architecture school.

By 2022 colombia had sixty-two faculties of architecture, with a disproportionate relation of only 25% being public and 75% private educational companies, or uni-versities (Reyes Rojas, 2022, p. 142).

Architecture schools have not been, historically, the site of radical political movements, but as already mentioned—and we will see further with more detail—with *Arquitectura y Autogobierno*, the 60s and 70s social discontent articulated diverse groups and ideologies. In so-called colombia, Fernando Viviescas in *La Enseñanza de la Arquitectura en Colombia: el pensamiento ignorado...*, argues that, the critical postures and the student movement within public universities during the 60s and 70s that “carried out the radical critique of the 'design ideology' and the schools of architecture that promote its reproduction” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 10), “led traditional architects and *businessmen* to opt for opening new schools in which they could re-edit the teaching of architecture, away from a context in which they constantly felt pressured. Faced with the ineffectiveness of internal academic repression in the existing faculties—because of the strength and cohesion that the student movement reached—and in order to avoid a broad and open debate with the new approaches, it was decided to strengthen private education and open new scenarios to provide an outlet for the market that appeared to be growing stronger” (Viviescas, 1994, p. 14). The strengthening of private education, then, was a capitalists strategy of taking educational matters into their own hands, and training architects for the specific demands of capital and real estate speculation in so-called colombia.

This coincides with another important process we reviewed in chapter 1, the beginning of the neo-liberalization of the building industry, with the violent commodification of housing through the transfer of housing construction from the state to the private sector with the creation of *Sistema Colombiano de Ahorro y Vivienda*, and the UPAC - UVR system. As Pradilla and Jiménez, show, the state was focused on the building industry as an important economic and development apparatus, evidence of this was the emphasis in the national *Plan de Desarrollo* of 1972, to urban development that concentrated the building industry as a growing sector (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 11).

The student movement of 1971 is one of the most potent moments of struggle within and against architecture schools and the uni-versity in colombia. We could also speak of the strike of 2021, fifty years later,

that began to organize in 2019, just as the strike of 1971 began years before through the 1968 experience. However, the strike of 2021, which included even private uni-versities, did not mobilize a critique to architectural education at the service of capital, as that of 1971.

Colonial to republican

The arrival of Thomas Reed, an architect born in the island so-called tórtola, now british virgin islands, in 1846 to oversee the design and construction of the National Capitol and teach the *Lecciones de Arquitectura teórica y práctica*, at *Universidad del Primer Distrito* (Saldarriaga Roa et al., 2017, p. 41), marks the beginning of various entangled attempts at the professionalization and education of the architect in the recent *independent* republic of colombia, as González Escobar shows in *Del alarife al arquitecto*, (González Escobar, 2013) through a historical research of the modulation architecture from craft to profession:

“In the search for formalization, not all efforts had continuity or were related to each other. In spite of some isolated cases, very specific and with limited effects, it is possible to observe others that had permanence and were reflected in the development of the colombia’s architecture. This process was not linear, it had ups and downs and changes that can be located in five crucial historical periods: a first period goes from 1847 to 1849, during which the first efforts were made to introduce the teaching of architecture in a theoretical and practical way in the government of Tomás Cipriano de Mosquera; a second moment occurred between 1850 and 1867, when the freedom of professions decreed by the government of José Hilario López generated a vacuum in the official teaching that was filled by private institutions, some of which projected the study of architecture, as an exceptional fact; the third period goes from 1868 to 1879, when the rudiments of architectural training were incorporated into both the schools of arts and crafts and the engineering program at the *Universidad Nacional de los Estados Unidos de Colombia*, which was founded in 1867 under the government of Eustorgio Salgar; The fourth period, between 1880 and 1903, corresponds to the period of the *Regeneración*, in which the schools of fine arts participated in the teaching of architecture, which was disputed with the schools of arts and crafts and the *Escuela de Ingeniería*; the fifth period goes from 1904 to 1936, in which the discussion took place within the *Facultad de Matemáticas e Ingeniería* of the *Universidad Nacional*, without excluding what happened in the *Escuela de Minas de Medellín*, which relegated the *Escuela de Bellas Artes* and the institutions dedicated to the teaching of artisans to a second plane, while the teaching by correspondence experienced an important reception but ended up being relegated by the authority imposed from the formal academy” (González Escobar, 2013, p. 413).

In 1847, Reed was appointed *Arquitecto Director de Obras Públicas* and assigned to teach a theorico-practical architecture course, and also receive apprentices from governmental projects for practical teaching, in

an institution that was called *Escuela Práctica de Arquitectura* (Saldarriaga Roa et al., 2017, p. 40). The title of architect was first recognized with the issuance of the *Decreto orgánico de instrucción universitaria*, Organic Decree of University Instruction, on September 14, 1847. This decree allowed for the possibility of obtaining an “architect's diploma” from the *Escuela de Ciencias Naturales, Física y Matemáticas*, one of the three schools of the *Universidad del Primer Distrito*. The teaching of architecture would be separate from the *Colegio Militar*, where Reed, also the teacher, would oversee the theoretical course for civil engineers. The establishment of this institution took place in April 1847 and started functioning in January 1848 (González Escobar, 2013, p. 32).

Good taste, morality and progress were the main semantic dispositifs mobilized by the new nation-state, press and the rising local bourgeoisie in order to establish a market for architectural services and deprive people of their constructive and inhabiting capacities. Ever since the initial proposal of teaching architecture in 1847, the press started publishing texts that discussed concerns about architecture—considered an art at that moment—and initiated the first discussions regarding it (González Escobar, 2013, p. 203). The process that led to the creation of the *Escuela de Bellas Artes* between 1880 and 1886 largely responded to the political implementation of the statements regarding the impact of fine arts on civilization and the establishment of a new social order. This implementation began with the promotion of good taste and eventually led to forms of social control and moralization of the population (González Escobar, 2013, p. 223). These civilizatory and modern tropes as: good taste, moralization, new social order, were all part of the need to control and keep as white as possible the new colonial republic.

Modern to neo-liberal

Architecture remained subordinated to engineering and art until 1936 with the opening of the first Faculty of Architecture at *Universidad Nacional* de Bogotá UNAL. Beatriz García Moreno in *Apuntes sobre la enseñanza de la arquitectura*, outlines that the first faculty at UNAL, “adopted in its time of initiation the teaching scheme of the French Academy propagated in Europe, and the European Urbanism developed at the time of the emergence of the industrial city in different countries, but by the late forties its teaching, introduced the principles and lessons of the Modern Movement and adopted pedagogies from the Bauhaus or American universities. These new paradigms were brought by foreign architects residing in Colombia and linked to teaching, by architects trained abroad, or by traveling architects who came loaded with images of the new architecture, and, of course, by architectural magazines and books that disseminated the new practices” (García Moreno, 2002, p. 12).

The urban phenomenon of the first decades of the twentieth century brought about the formalization of education, resulting in the establishment of the first faculty of architecture. This also led to the recognition

and professional appreciation of architects, leading to the formation of the *Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos*—SCA in 1934, after several unsuccessful attempts. The first attempt at organization was made in so-called bogotá in 1904, known as the *Sociedad Central de Arquitectos y Constructores*. Subsequent attempts were made in so-called medellín in 1919 and 1931, resulting in the formation of the *Sociedad de Arquitectos de Medellín*. Additionally, in July 1934, the first exhibition dedicated solely to architectural projects was inaugurated in so-called bogotá, organized by the newly established SCA. This exhibition was an attempt to claim independence, as architecture was still subordinated to engineering and art (González Escobar, 2013, p. 39).

As mentioned, good taste, morality and progress were the main semantic dispositifs mobilized by the state, press and the bourgeoisie in order to establish a market for architectural services and deprive people of their constructive and inhabiting capacities. Efforts were aimed at changing the prevailing culture of regarding architects as a luxury only necessary for large or representative projects, and unnecessary for small conventional buildings. Architects themselves were called upon to introduce the public to the *beauty* of architecture. This was important because supposedly developing good architectural taste allowed individuals to see their own ideals reflected in buildings, which meant that people had a responsibility to appreciate the beauty of these structures (González Escobar, 2013, p. 319).

These efforts mainly mobilized through the press, would be one of the main objectives of SCA. The profession was organized first that the discipline, in order to procure a market for architects and to look after the interests of architects. As of 1936 through the first architecture faculty, professionalizing education would be the main mean of regulation of architectural labour. SCA remains an important cog between the discipline and the profession, particularly through CESCA—*Colectivo de Estudiantes de la Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos*, Colombian Society of Architects Student Collective—, which mobilizes all the precariousness, violence, privileges and desires of the neo-liberal architect. But, above all, as an institution that ensures class privileges of the white-mestizo bourgeoisie.

Architectural education remained—and still is—subordinated to epistemic coloniality mainly through european and north american architecture theory and practice. Colombian architecture was heavily influenced by the modern movement, in 1947 Le Corbusier made his first visit by invitation of the UN delegate Eduardo Zuleta Ángel. “The programs that began in the forties and fifties, the *Pontificia Bolivariana de Medellín*, *Nacional* of Medellín, *la del Valle*, *Los Andes*, *La Javeriana*, *América* and *Gran Colombia*, were quickly identified, for the most part, with the conception of architecture transmitted by the Modern Movement, and by the conception of the architect that it propagated. For the teaching of architecture in Colombia, Le Corbusier's visit in 1947 was decisive for the orientation adopted in the fifties and sixties” (García Moreno, 2002, p. 12).

An excursus. What is the conception of the architect that the modern movement propagated? Or as, Jeffrey T. Schnapp asks in *The Face of the Modern Architect*: who is the modern architect? “The twentieth century provides two contradictory but convergent responses to this question, responses that coexist and commingle during architecture’s century-long march toward professionalization and the achievement of an unprecedented degree of social visibility.

The first answer is that articulated in Ayn Rand’s monument to objectivism, *The Fountainhead* (1943), in the voice of her rationalist architect-hero Howard Roark, subsequently embodied by Gary Cooper in a film bearing the same title:

Every creative job is achieved under the guidance of a single individual thought. An architect requires a great many *men* to erect *his* building. But *he* does not ask them to vote on *his* design. They work together by free agreement and each is free in *his* proper function. An architect uses steel, glass, concrete, produced by others. But the materials remain just so much steel, glass and concrete until *he* touches them. What *he* does with them is *his* individual product and *his* individual property.

An individualistic descendant of the divine *arkitekton* with his cosmic compass and thaumaturgic touch, this modernist demiurge is possessed with the secular counterpart to spirit: a transcendent thought, a vision, a plan, a logos for the earthly city that, in seeking its realization, necessarily collides with and overcomes a real world of obstacles—bureaucracies, philistine clients, small-minded interests. For *him*:

A building is alive, like a *man*. Its integrity is to follow its own truth, its one single theme, and to serve its own single purpose. A *man* doesn’t borrow pieces of his body. A building doesn’t borrow hunks of its soul. Its maker gives it the soul and every wall, window and stairway to express it.

The architect is, accordingly, the antithesis of the mere technician, that master of modern machinery: the engineer. Rather *he* is the poet and philosopher who writes in aluminum and steel, the artist who places the giant leverage of industrial machinery under the mastery of spirit, the genius who transforms the built landscape into a self-portrait: a body that is his own but that endures for tens of centuries.

The second answer to the question ‘Who is the modern architect?’ is articulated by Massimo Bontempelli in his writings on architecture from the 1930s: the modern architect is he who manages to achieve what Bontempelli deems the highest ideal of art—*anonymity*, the absolute detachment of work from author and fusion with the world. Success means that the work of architecture manages to achieve such a high degree of ‘necessity’—whether the word is understood in a social, historical, organic, formal, or aesthetic sense matters little—that it merges with the earth’s crust and quickly becomes the natural identity of a place that is itself both the summing up of a historical epoch and the portrait of a collectivity at a given historical moment” (Schnapp, 2008, p. 7).

Back to so-called colombia. The role of the architect and its education were not fundamentally problematized between 1936 and 1970, as Viviescas highlights, asking for political commitment or at least a stance, was considered too burdensome for a guild that had successfully navigated the challenging decades of the forties, fifties, and sixties without expressing any commitment or involvement in cultural and political matters. Instead, their sole priority was to promote and benefit from economic gains (Viviescas, 1994, p. 13).

Alberto Saldarriaga Roa and Lorenzo Fonseca in *La Arquitectura Moderna en Colombia*, argue that, during the 1930s, several official institutions were established that required the work of architects. As a result, the beliefs and principles of the architect's social role was supported without much awareness. The period between 1950 and 1960, paradoxically witnessed the rise of modern architecture in so-called colombia. This can be attributed to two significant factors: the stabilization of the demand for architectural services and the strong influence of Le Corbusier. The architectural profession, detached from itself, refined its language before entering a phase of internal divisions and the diversification of influences (Saldarriaga Roa & Fonseca, 1984).

As mentioned, Viviescas, considering these precedents, argues that the critical postures and the student movement within public universities during the 60s and 70s that “carried out the radical critique of the 'design ideology' and the schools of architecture that promote its reproduction” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 10), “led traditional architects and businessmen to opt for opening new schools in which they could re-edit the teaching of architecture, away from a context in which they constantly felt pressured” (Viviescas, 1994, p. 14).

As a response, critical postures were articulated both by students and faculty, such was the case of the joint work of Emilio Pradilla and Carlos Jiménez, who wrote in 1973 *Arquitectura: urbanismo y dependencia neocolonial*, Jiménez and Hugo García also wrote in 1972, following Jiménez thesis project, *Del espacio arquitectónico a la arquitectura como una mercancía*, and Pradilla with some others founded the magazine *Ideología, Diseño y Sociedad* in 1970, later *Ideología y Sociedad* (García, 2008, p. 131) (Duque Daza, 2015, p. 2).

In *Arquitectura: urbanismo y dependencia neocolonial*, Pradilla and Jiménez, explain that the book was motivated by the profound process of critique of architectural education and the crisis faculties were navigating, and argue that, the debates during 1971 and 1972 at the architecture faculties of *Universidad del Valle* in Cali and *Universidad Nacional de Bogotá*, were a critical response from the students, who were future actors in the architectural field, to the deteriorating crisis in architectural and urban social practice. The students were detached from the commitments that come with assuming their role but were also aware of the limited opportunities available. The debates also addressed the disintegration of architecture and urban planning training programs, as well as the lack of alignment with professional practice and the needs of people in so-called colombia (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 13).

Although this critique reached architectural education and profession, this efforts were neutralized and isolated by not responding to the debate, and, as we have already mentioned, the opening of private

architecture schools, as Viviescas, highlights the “road was paved for the market of businessmen and promoters of faculties dedicated—‘without political problems’—to manufacture designers and small businessmen, rather than architects, since to the ideological prurience could be added the argument of the poor quality of the professionals graduated from those ‘problematized faculties’” (Viviescas, 1994, p. 16).

A closer look at the curriculum of three schools in so-called bogotá might elucidate the neo-liberalization of architectural education. First, the architecture program at Universidad Nacional de Colombia, UNAL, as the first school of architecture in so-called colombia. This program must be analyzed through the overall nationalist project of public education, which as we have seen by way of the archaeological view of governmental discourses of higher education that Martínez Posada draws, must consider several laws, such as Law 30 of 1992. Which states in its first lines: “Article 1: Higher Education is a permanent process that enables the development of the potentialities of the human being in an integral manner, it is carried out after middle or secondary education and its purpose is the full development of the students and their academic or professional training” (Ley 30 de 1992).

The insistence on *development* makes “visible, if one carefully analyzes the article of Law 30 mentioned above, the neo-liberal economic discourse. The definition proposed by this governmental discursive dispositif is, visibly, a statement that depends on the neo-liberal statement of ‘human capital.’ And, in turn, it becomes evident how the homo oeconomicus, entrepreneur of itself underlies the subjective perception of the Law: the ‘full development of the students and their academic and professional training’ is the set of statements that prove the relationship that has been made visible” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 100).

Law 30, as Martínez Posada points out, emphasizes the importance of lifelong learning for individual and societal development, with creativity and knowledge being proposed as tools to solve social problems. While this is a desirable ethical goal, the discourse seems to overlook the aspect of production. In other words, it fails to acknowledge how the knowledge generated through social experience and within the framework of societal and economic relations ultimately shapes social life to prioritize capitalist monetary production. This approach to education, referred to as “education for the market” or “education for capital,” can be observed in the objectives stated in Law 1014 of 2006, *Del fomento de la cultura del emprendimiento*, which aims to foster a culture of entrepreneurship. This includes fostering a connection between the education system and the national productive system through training in essential skills, labour skills, citizenship skills, and entrepreneurial skills, implemented across all levels of education to cultivate an entrepreneurial mindset (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 108).

Martínez Posada notes that this discursive dispositif claims to have a transparent relationship with knowledge, which can be utilized for the generation and maintenance of enterprises. However, the power relations it organizes are not transparent. It highlights that entrepreneurial knowledge can be formed alongside

education and knowledge production, indicating that it is not just another aspect of human knowledge but rather about the significance of knowledge, such as the creation of businesses in response to individual and societal development. The Law's definitions make an epistemological subject, a subject of knowledge, a mind that organizes its creativity and contribution to capital's "general intellect," visible. This subject is clearly evident in the definitions established by the Law. Entrepreneurship, in turn, is defined as a way of thinking and acting focused on creating wealth. It involves thinking, reasoning, and acting with a global perspective, balanced leadership, and calculated risk management. Its result is the creation of value that benefits the company, the economy, and society. This definition encompasses the entirety of the neo-liberal framework, which allows capitalism to capture life itself (Martínez Posada, 2010, pp. 109–110).

Architecture at UNAL has a very conventional structure distributed in six areas of instruction: Project; Representation; History and Theory of Architecture; Technology; City and Territory; Context of the Arts. The program is framed by the national overall mission to "promote equitable access to the Colombian educational system, provides the widest range of academic programs, trains competent and socially responsible professionals, contributes to the development and redefinition of the national project, and studies and enriches the country's cultural, natural and environmental heritage [...] The architecture program, on the meanwhile, seeks to provide a comprehensive education that will result in professionals of excellence in the area of architecture, equipped with the best ethical attitude that will allow them to face the construction of the country and the development of the same discipline. The main objectives of the curricular program are:

- To train professionals of excellence in the field of architecture.
- Contribute to the improvement of the quality of life, while its action is focused on the creation of cultural assets that rescue the memory, history, raise new symbols and present the need to protect the heritage and integrate it into the present life.
- To act on the territory at the urban and regional level, defending its specialty and quality through languages and technology that delimit and modulate the relationship between public and private spaces and environments.
- Interpret in terms of Colombian needs the state of the art at the national and international level, and be aware of the controversies and trends that occur in the world with respect to the profession of the architect to translate them into local terms.
- Maintain a critical spirit and permanent inquiry about the conditions and needs of our environment, orienting studies towards research and increasing interest in general culture" (UNAL, 2015, p. 8).

"Agreement No. 033 of 2007, which establishes the guidelines for the education of students at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, is based on the principles of academic excellence, comprehensive education, contextualization, internationalization, research training, interdisciplinarity and flexibility; it adopts

the Academic Credits regime to measure the time required by the student to meet the objectives of the subjects and to facilitate the homologation of subjects and the mobility of students between national and international programs. Agreement No. 033 organizes the curriculum into training components, understood as a set of subjects with a particular training objective. Thus, the curricular plans have a Foundation Component, which deals mainly with the contextualization of knowledge; a Disciplinary or Professional Component, characteristic of the essence of the career, including the Degree Project; and a Free Choice Component that, as a tool for comprehensive training, includes scenarios of context, entrepreneurship, social responsibility, and research” (UNAL, 2015, p. 11). Making direct link with Law 1014 of 2006 *Del fomento de la cultura del emprendimiento*, Of the promotion of the culture of entrepreneurship.

Second, Universidad de los Andes, as one of the biggest and most “prestigious” schools in so-called Bogotá. Los Andes is one of the prime factories of *blanquitud* in so-called Colombia, and we had the unfortunate privilege of graduating from its architecture school. The faculty of architecture and design ARQDIS at Uniandes, through its “architecture program trains professionals with a solid ethical commitment to society, culture and the environment; excellent disciplinary training; a firm conceptual base; mastery of architecture skills and a transformative vision that allows them to understand the spatial needs of society in order to influence them with creativity and relevance. [S]tudents have the possibility of building a specialized profile, derived from the deepening of knowledge fields associated with: the technological, creative and social fields” (ArqDis, 2023b).

The competences ARQDIS uses to modulate the neo-liberal architect are divided in five categories: projective, contextual, technical, communicative and computational thinking. Some of the specific competences are: “Creatively interpret the physical variables of the environment to define and transform the attributes of living space. [...] Identify, conceptualize and solve problems through creative processes. Associate technical, contextual and projective thinking” (Uniandes, 2021)

Since 2018, the architecture school, through its *Master in strategic management of architectural projects*, has been organizing *EMPRENDE*, a yearly open conference on architecture and entrepreneurship. “EMPRENDE is a series of events of the Master in Strategic Management of Architectural Projects that was born with the objective of creating and consolidating a supportive community around the idea of entrepreneurship within the architectural industry that influences the development of the built environment. In EMPRENDE you will find the training and support necessary to develop a meaningful and rewarding professional practice that will allow you to boost your business. A space open to dialogue, construction and knowledge transfer, where you can connect with suppliers, learn about marketing and the experience of others. In addition, EMPRENDE is also a space where graduates of the Master's program share their experience as

entrepreneurs, their business innovations and their creative strategies within the architectural industry” (ArqDis, 2023a) (ArqDis, 2018b, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023d).

Also since 2018, Uniandes has been promoting the neo-liberal notion of resilience through several courses and workshops as the 2018 32^o *Taller Internacional de Arquitectura de Cartagena de Indias, Resiliencia Costera*. “The 32nd International Architecture Workshop of Cartagena de Indias organized by the Universidad de Los Andes focused on coastal resilience as a strategy to respond to projected crisis scenarios in the next thirty years as a result of population growth and climate change. The workshop proposed future scenarios for the development and protection of the city of Cartagena from architecture, landscape, urban design and planning, giving Cartagena a set of ideas that will help the city become aware of its natural heritage as a major part of a system of protection and resilience” (ArqDis, 2018a). Or the 2023 Resilience and planning workshop between Columbia University and ARQDIS (ArqDis, 2023c).

A full account of the neo-liberal pedagogy at work in Uniandes falls beyond the scope of this research, we would need to dedicate an entire thesis, as it would be the case with any of the schools here briefly studied. More and more, the neo-liberal rhetoric of innovation, entrepreneurship, resilience, creativity, design thinking, amongst other, and any form of post-it design are at work through the ARQDIS faculty. “In the midst of the innovation *boom*, different disciplines have created a large number of tools that facilitate their creative processes. These tools are usually linked together according to the type of process involved, and are known as *Toolkits*. Nowadays they are very popular, and almost necessary in creative areas. For this reason, in our first post we wanted to tell you about the toolkits we know and use, to propose an open guide of how, when and what to use them for” (de Francisco Vela & Latorre, 2020). Such is the boom of the neo-liberalization of architectural education. The boom of the re/production of the neo-liberal architect.

And, last but not least, the latest architecture undergraduate program to open in so-called Bogotá, *Facultad de Creación FaCrea* at Universidad del Rosario, which started in 2020. Until now, the epitome of the neo-liberalization of architectural education, responding directly to Duque’s creative farce of *Economía Naranja*.

The faculty is organized through the neo-liberal rhetoric of the creative industries such as: creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, the program states that: “*Facultad de Creación - FaCrea* offers professional training for an interdisciplinary future, which requires comprehensive, creative and innovative approaches” (FaCrea, 2021, p. 3). In order to better compete in the innovative market of educational factories, the opening of FaCrea was the “result of an in-depth study of more than four years of avant-garde international offerings in training areas associated with creativity. [...] Based on the conclusions of the study, transdisciplinary faculty was proposed, with the vision of Universidad del Rosario, which differentiates itself within the national offer and, in

turn, is in tune with international avant-garde programs” (FaCrea, 2021, p. 3). Inferiority complex enters the room...

Architecture as stated by FaCrea, “is oriented towards an interdisciplinary future that requires comprehensive and creative approaches. Our program prepares professionals who create innovative architectures, in accordance with the needs and challenges of our country, and who lead environmentally and socially responsible projects, associated with a better quality of life in urban and territorial spaces. In FaCrea Architecture you learn by doing and experimenting with materials, techniques and avant-garde technologies” (FaCrea, 2021, p. 5). The architect FaCrea produces is “prepared to design and intervene in space with a mixed creative, recursive and innovative knowledge. Leaders in architectural, spatial, urban and territorial projects that integrate the environmental, social and economic sustainability of our country and region by applying avant-garde material, technical and technological knowledge” (FaCrea, 2021, p. 6). The delusion of orange avant-garde architecture.

All students from the different programs begin together with a basic cycle, emphasizing the interdisciplinary approach and have since first year till fourth year, history of culture and creativity. Creativity is schooled from day one (Aschner, 2021). In their last year they can choose a minor and a course on entrepreneurship and practice in creative industries.

After just three years of production, FaCrea, or should we say the *Factory of Creativity*, has won the Babson Collaborative prize for Entrepreneurship Education of the Babson Academy for *El Arte de Empezar* “The Art of Entrepreneurship: Awakening Your Creative Energy, a global virtual summer course that teaches entrepreneurial skills and mindset through the lens of artists” (Babson Academy, 2023).

Most architecture schools remain attached to a mixed system between remnants of the modern movement, bauhaus, and the recently turn to research, eco-social approach and sustainability rhetoric. This means that still most schools heavily rely on the pedagogy of the studio as its main modulation apparatus. These are just three examples of the neo-liberalization of architectural education for the re/production of the neo-liberal architect in so-called bogotá. You can see where we are going. There is no need to comment and problematize every single statement from the neo-liberal rhetoric of these three schools. As we’ve said, these are not just rhetorics. These are not just semantic dispositifs. Dispositifs produce *material-discursive practices* (Barad, 2007, pp. 132, 149). Architectural education delivers what they promise: mass production of neo-liberal architects through the uni-versity. Through the schooling of *blanquitud*. Uni-versities are more and more *factories of whiteness, industries of subjectivity, factories of knowledge, industries of the self*. Neo-liberal subjectivation through architecture schools, re/produce a professional modality of being that aspires and desires to constant accumulation of success in the form of authorship, innovation, capital, fame awards/recognition, power and built projects.

Neo-liberal dispositifs

Territorial coloniality, through the ideology of design at large and particularly architecture, is sustained through the logistics of desires. As previously mentioned, neo-liberal interests, desires, and aspirations circulate through distinct logistics and semantic dispositifs. As a material-discursive practice it articulates diverse and at times contradictory values. Neo-liberalization, and particularly neo-liberal architectural subjectivation, operates through a non-exhaustive assemblage of desires and aspirations, dispositifs as: success / self-realization, the new, innovation, creativity, flexibility, competition, metrics and accountability, risk and resilience, amongst other.

The logistics of such dispositifs must be studied through the asymmetric power relations that persist through coloniality. As Maldonado-Torres argues, coloniality “is kept alive in literacy and learning manuals, in the criteria for determining what is good academic work, in the patriarchal and eurocentric definition of culture, in the common sense of the universal citizen, in the image that peoples project of themselves—a strange mimetic reminiscence of coloniality and of that superior european other—, in the aspirations of subjects” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007b, p. 131).

Neo-liberal dispositifs are then deployed particularly by way of schooling and abstract labour, and the logistics of creative governmentality. The circulation of such dispositifs comprises from: curriculums, methodologies, theories, lexicons, habits, professional associations, social networks, manuals, guides, mentoring schemes, TV series, coaching to other forms of modulation.

The age of the entrepreneur

The logistics of desires are mainly managed through the paradigm of entrepreneurship, both voluntary and forced entrepreneurship. In so-called colombia, as Serge Durand argues, “if one looks at the situation of the architect as a professional, *he* must be a *businessman*, *he* must know construction, *he* must have a very clear vision of what historical tradition is; *his* essential function is to intervene in many other things in the design process, which is not simply the fact of organizing spaces but must make the community aware of *his* action, without essentially ceasing to be the organizer of life in space” (Durand, 1989, p. 32).

This organizer of life in space is, of course, constructed in the image of white-cis-hetero-male homo œconomicus. In the neo-liberal uni-versity or as Troiani calls it, the entrepreneurial uni-versity, students are rendered as consumers/clients and academics as service providers. Under this relation, both students and academics are constantly “evaluated, graded and measured through: examinational power” (Troiani, 2017, p. 174). In a similar line, Castro-Gómez, following Foucault’s elaborations on the subject as a self-entrepreneur, in the introduction to Jorge Martínez’s book *La universidad productora de productores: entre biopolítica y subjetividad*, The university producer of producers: between biopolitics and subjectivity, regarding the

“biopolitical production of subjectivity,” notes that “it is not only that universities are becoming capitalist enterprises, but also that the individuals who buy services from them in higher education also appear as entrepreneurial machines.” This entrepreneurial machines are produced through the neo-liberal rationality, which, as has been noted, is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life and the *conduct of conduct* through the governance of freedom. Such rationality produces a specific subject—rendered as human capital— modulated through financial metrics and entrepreneurial logics, the *homo œconomicus-architectonicus* is produced.

Although *homo œconomicus* might not be assumed not to be gender specific, “entrepreneur meaning ‘to do something,’ comes from the 13th century French masculine verb *entreprendre*.” (Troiani, 2017, p. 176) This, coupled with the hetero-normative figure of the *arkhi* (chief) + *téktōn* (builder) as a male leader, has gendered *homo œconomicus-architectonicus* as a patriarchal figure, the *patriarchitect*, and architecture as a male-dominated practice.

A recent example of how the rhetoric of entrepreneurialism are circulated in architecture schools, is the newly open research group MINGA at *Universidad Javeriana* in so-called bogotá. Cynically, the group abuses and appropriates the indigenous term *minga* to name a research and entrepreneurship *semillero*—seedbed—of the faculty of architecture and design. And so begins the modulation of the *archipreneur*. From the *semillero* of entrepreneurship at school, to better perform in the “real world” of real estate speculation, taking any crisis as a possibility to innovate.

Pedagogies of the new

Achilles Mbembe referring to innovation highlights, that it operates in all senses, as *putting together again*. “People are forced to innovate, both in ways of being, ways of thinking and in ways of making things. As putting together again, repairing what has been broken up, bodies, tools, institutions, symbolic systems have become the very condition of survival.” And asks: “Whether this apparently inexhaustible capacity for creativity [...] can be harnessed to propel our planet into a future worth its name?” (Mbembe, 2017).

This apparently inexhaustible capacity is managed mainly through entrepreneurial and competitive education, because later at work, “the siren of ‘entrepreneurialism’ implies that competing as individual freelancers is the source of ‘innovation’” (Deamer, 2020a, p. 92). And as Castro-Gómez, underscores “if someone wants to be competitive in a risk economy, then must be able to innovate, to become a creator of new knowledge that is profitable for the company. In this way, entrepreneurship is not only the domain of the great uni-versities, but becomes a *mode of individual existence*. The biopolitics of neo-liberalism no longer has anything to do with the government of *biological* variables—as Foucault affirmed before 1978—but emerges

hand in hand with the techniques of entrepreneurial self-direction. It is the *molecularity* of life that is now the object of government” (Castro-Gómez, 2010, p. 21).

Creativity and innovation are constitutional qualities and abilities—amongst others—that *homo educandus*, *homo æconomicus* and *homo architectonicus* should learn and perform. The notion of the new at large, is a fundamental governmental apparatus managed through the *logistics of desires* and modulated through neo-liberal pedagogies and creative governmentality.

The entrepreneurial uni-versity is modulated more and more through the pedagogy of creativity. Through *creativization*, a modality of governance that makes creativity an imperative in all spheres of life. Such regime emerges when creativity is not limited to creative practices, or aesthetics practices, but pervades contemporary life and asks to be creative in all spheres. At a professional, social and domestic milieu, people are constantly asked to perform creatively, to innovate. In design practices, such as architecture, this regime is even more brutal. Students arrive on day one already with the *desire of the new*. The creative impulse is captured by the neo-liberal rationality and set to work by/for capital, in other words, how the creative desire is modulated and circulated. New forms to sustain the same world. One world, the *architectural world*.

Architecture is obsessed with the new. As any other modern-colonial creative discipline. Architecture has been obsessively producing new forms—buildings—and reflecting on their modes of composition and production. In other words, through the schooling of the creative capacities novelty rules the market. Both form and discourse are captive. As Spencer notes that, according to Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello in *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, those who work in artistic and intellectual fields feel a strong pressure to stand out and differentiate themselves in their profession due to the self-promotional nature of post-fordism. Having unique ideas and being recognized is important to acquire projects and secure positions in academia or publishing. However, some people see the type of theory used by certain figures in the architectural culture as problematic for the discipline as a whole. Architecture has tried to eliminate the “madness of theory” and rid itself of its theoretical problems. Theory has been altered to fit into neo-liberalism. Architecture has become a tool for the implementation of neo-liberal managerialism, serving the market and its spatial articulation (Spencer, 2016, pp. 50–72). And as a neo-liberal architect posing as critical theorist notes: “‘No longer exclusively an homogenizing force,’ writes Farshid Moussavi in *The Function of Form* (2009), ‘capitalism now contributes to the production of difference and novelty’” (Spencer, 2016, p. 67).

“The rhetoric of creativity certainly has its effects at the level of ideology, but some of the specific cultural techniques associated with architectural creativity constitute, in themselves, processes of *econo-subjectivization*. This means that when we are being most ‘creative’ in certain architectural environments, we are also working at greater rates toward the actualization and dissemination of neoliberal space and logics” (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 186).

We have already seen various architecture curriculums and their obnoxious obsession with the rhetoric of creativity and innovation. Although, much of this is a response to better compete in the innovative market of educational factories, as FaCrea, “which differentiates itself within the national offer and, in turn, is in tune with international avant-garde programs.” Public policy has had also a very important impact. For example, between 1988 and 1999, the *Asociación Colombiana de Facultades de Arquitectura*, Colombian Association of Faculties of Architecture, ACFA, in collaboration with, *Instituto Colombiano para la Evaluación de la Educación*, Colombian Institute for the Evaluation of Education, ICFES, and with the assistance of *Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos*, Colombian Society of Architects, SCA and the Corona Foundation, undertook the project “requirements for architecture programs in Colombia.” This initiative served as the foundation for Decree 936 by the Ministry of Education, which temporarily established the quality standards for undergraduate architecture programs (García Moreno, 2002, p. 103). The point 1.5 of article 4 “Basic curricular aspects” of the decree, states that: “Every professional training program in architecture will aim for: Scientific training to innovate in the fields of knowledge related to constructive, aesthetic, planned and humanistic systems and approaches” (Decreto 0936 de Mayo 10 de 2002).

As Schwartzberg, accurately remarks, “we have become neoliberal by design, through the pervasiveness of its modes of economization” (Schwartzberg, 2015, p. 181).

The problem is not innovation and creativity per se, or a war against novelty but how does the creative imperative works under and for capitalism, how is creativity modulated and put to work by and for capital. The reduction, Rolnik underscores, “of the ‘power of creation’ proper to life to reduce it to ‘creativity.’ And “of the drive's power to ‘create’ new modes of existence in response to the demands of life, to the mere exercise of its ‘creative’ capacity, which will then be invested in the composition of new scenarios for the accumulation of capital” (Suely Rolnik, 2019, p. 68,104).

Within and against *las pedagogías de la crueldad*

“I call pedagogies of cruelty all the acts and practices that teach, habituate and program subjects to transmute the living and its vitality into things. In this sense, this pedagogy teaches something that goes far beyond killing, it teaches to kill with a de-ritualized death, a death that leaves only residues in the place of the deceased [...] The pedagogy of cruelty is, then, the one that habituates us to this dissection of the living and the vital, and seems to be the inescapable path of modernity, its ultimate destiny” (Rita Segato, 2018, pp. 11–12)

“Cruelty educates, forms subjects, teaches practices and manners. It writes on bodies and territories the messages of impossibility and helplessness; it not only marks triumph, it reminds us how excessive a power can be. It not only eliminates life, it marks death”
(Inclán, 2016, p. 94)

Yes, we know. We acknowledge we have experienced liberatory spaces and moments in the uni-versity. Yet, these are counted and move through the undercommons. They do not define the uni-versity, but rather struggle within.

It is extremely difficult, not to say impossible, to reform a deeply hierarchical, capitalist, patriarchal and colonial institution such as the uni-versity. la paperson argues there are three uni-versities, a first one that reproduces the same system and ideological structure, a second one that problematizes the system and ideological structure but does not act and a third one that problematizes the system and ideological structure, imagines how to transform it and experiences it (paperson, 2017). This third uni-versity could be viewed in the polemic raised by Harney, when notes that “Matteo Mandarini gave us this very interesting phrase. Tronti has this phrase where he says, ‘I work within and against the institution.’ So, the Queen Mary project was this within and against the institution project. But it’s also been elaborated in Precarious Ring stuff and other places as something that would also be known through co-research, something like ‘within and for.’ So, the within and against gets cut with a kind of within and for. When you move further out into an autonomous setting, where you get some free space and free time a little more easily, then, what you have to attend to is the shift, for me, between the within and against—which when you’re deep in the institution you spend a lot of time on it—and the with and for. And that changes a lot of shit. All those things are always in play. When I say ‘with and for,’ I mean studying with people rather than teaching them, and when I say ‘for,’ I mean studying with people in service of a project, which in this case I think we could just say is more study. So, that with and for, the reason we move into more autonomous situations is that it grows, and we spend less time in the antagonism of within and against” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 154)

The following are some brief notes of these third uni-versity, or *within and for*. We would like to recognize some important experiences of the struggle within the uni-versity and architecture schools. This is not an exhaustive list, just some cases that help elucidate and situate struggles: Cali architecture faculty at the beginning of the 1970s, UNAM architecture faculty with *Arquitectura y Autogobierno* between 1964 and 1992, and the UNAM architecture feminist strike during 2021.

The first experience, as narrated by Emilio Pradilla and Carlos Jiménez in *Arquitectura: urbanismo y dependencia neocolonial*, gathers the profound process of critique of architectural education and the crisis faculties were navigating, and argue that “the debates took place in 1971 and 1972 in the faculties of

Architecture of the *Universidad del Valle*, in Cali, and the *Universidad Nacional* de Bogotá, a process of criticism that is none other than the inevitable and necessary response given by the students—future actors of the architectural ‘comedy,’ but still detached from the commitments implied in assuming their role in it and aware, at the same time, of the scarcity of places in the cast—to the worsening ‘crisis’ of architectural and urban social practice and to the disarticulation of the training programs in architecture and urban planning, at the same time, of how scarce are the positions in the cast—to the worsening of the ‘crisis’ of the architectural and urban social practice and to the disarticulation of the training programs for student-architects, both internally and in relation to the demands of professional practice and to the evident requirements of the Colombian population.

It would be idealistic if we believed that this process of criticism is generated by the clairvoyance of some students who, in isolation and within their school, manage to recognize the existence of the ‘crisis,’ and thanks to their personal intellectual capacity or agitation, they set in motion and maintain the questioning of the school. This fact is inexplicable apart from the social processes taking place in this period in Colombia.

The Colombian University was convulsed for years by the insurgence of theoretical currents that criticize and oppose the ideological knowledge transmitted by it and by the appearance of political tendencies that dispute the hegemony of those that represent the interests of the dominant classes and that control it by means of the instruments of the political power of the State.

The University began its work in 1971, in the midst of a panorama of acute social conflicts: radicalization of the *campesino* movement in struggle for land, and generalization—on a national scale—of the occupations of large properties; workers’ mobilizations in demand of better living and working conditions and against the labor legislation that restricts their right to organize and strike, national strike of teachers to obtain the payment of back wages and against the educational legislation in force; movements of demands that acquire a political character to the extent that the only response given by the State is repression.

The action of the student and professional university movement—and the financial and academic demands it makes—are marked by the political character assumed by the social mobilization of which it is a part, and by the repression exercised against it.

Obviously, the level of politicization reached by the student movement and the permanent debate about the character of Colombian society, its particular contradictions and the political way to resolve them, does not only affect it in general; it also affects each and every one of the scientific or technical areas that make up the university apparatus. And architecture is no exception: architectural practice—and therefore the teaching that reproduces it—finds its objective in the transformation of nature to respond to social needs and therefore refers in one way or another to its knowledge. The process of critique thus reaches the school of architecture” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, pp. 13–14).

The second case of experiences on the critique of architectural education, as briefly mentioned earlier, refers to *Arquitectura y Autogobierno*,¹³ Architecture and Self-government at UNAM. It began to unfold in the 1960s, reached an important point during 1968 and concretized in April 1972 when students and faculty dismissed the dean and took control of the faculty, after a massive vote at a general assembly. This led to the existence of two parallel architecture programs under one faculty between 1972-1985, one coordinated by Autogobierno and another expelled outside the campus coordinated by the same white bourgeoisie that had ruled from the beginning of ENA. On this brief notes, we would like to focus particularly on the anarchist influence of the movement, and a first period between 1972 and 1976, referred as the *anarchist autogobierno*, by de-professionalized architect and anarchist Braulio Hornedo Rocha.

¡La escuela es nuestra! ¡Las clases no se suspenden! The school is ours! Classes are not suspended! Those were the screams heard through the architecture school in April 1972. It took nearly eight years, from 1964 to 1972 to take control of the direction of the faculty of architecture and to self-organize the learning process among students and professors. A process of radical politicization in a school that historically has been the site of extreme traditionalism and complicity with political and economic elites. Various students and political ideologies were part of the struggles since 1964, passing through the potency of 1968 until 1972. By mid-XX century, many architecture faculties were in opposition to the eurocentric modern movement, or international style, and most importantly to the detachment of architectural education with the most pressing popular problems, and instead still focused on formalist whims for the bourgeoisie under the “aesthetic orgy” of architectural design (Arias Montes, 2019). “Autogobierno was a real, honest response to an archaic, obsolete, outdated, out-of-touch, anachronistic academic system” (AMADOR, 1977, p. 6).

“The *Escuela Nacional de Arquitectura* prepared professionals who consider the title of architect as a noble title that gives them guarantees to exercise their career with the greatest possible dishonesty and voracity. Authentic speculators of the profession, voracious vultures, builders of condominiums and houses in series of French-Provençal style. Construction merchants, builders of criminal housing units” (AMADOR, 1977, p. 6). 46 years later, this still happens today...

Under this context three groups started coordinating with the horizon of joint struggle efforts: *Grupo Arquitectónico Linterna* (GAL), the main promoters of the *Colegio de Profesores*, and the *Comité de Arquitectura en Lucha*, CAL (Arias Montes, 2019, p. 79). Although, there were many ideological influences, and marxism was the mayor political current for anti-systemic struggles during this period, such was the case of José Revueltas and his proposal of *Autogestión Académica*, there was a significant influence of anarchists not only in architecture but in UNAM at large. An important figure in *Autogobierno* and the architecture school was that of Germinal Pérez Plaja, from a family of anarchist tradition, grandson of spanish exiles. His grandparents,

Carmen Paredes Sans and Hermoso Plaja Saló ran the anarchist publisher *Editorial Vértice* first in barcelona between 1925-1939 and then in ciudad de méxico between 1946-1972 (Soriano Jiménez, 2017b, 2017a).

In conversations with Fraterna Pérez Plaja—sister of Germinal—, Braulio Hornedo Rocha, Eduardo Benavides Abril and Víctor Arias Montes, they sustained the importance of anarchism ideas at large both in the 1968 movement and the early days of *Autogobierno*. Pérez Plaja had contact with the student movement since the early sixties, along with Carlos González Lobo and Jesús Barba (Fraterna Pérez Plaja, personal communication, 21 2021). During 1968 the student representatives were Pérez Plaja, Alfonso González and Héctor Barrena, González was also an anarchist, but with different views from Pérez Plaja regarding the seizure of power (Eduardo Benavides Abril, personal communication, 28 2021). The anarchist current inside the movement started promoting the vision of not abandoning classes, self-organizing education, holding sessions of criticism and self-criticism, analysis, and spontaneous assemblies (José Victor Arias Montes, personal communication, 01 2021). These influences coupled with Revueltas notion of *autogestión académica*—academic self-organization—led to the seizure of control of the faculty and its self-organization by students and teachers.

As Arias Montes narrates in *Una experiencia en la enseñanza-aprendizaje de la arquitectura. el caso del Autogobierno en Arquitectura de la UNAM*, “the assembly of April 11 arrived, and amidst a great agitation of teachers, students and workers of the ENA, the historic session began. The auditorium was completely crowded. First point: appointment of the Board; nobody doubted that an inclusive board, representing various positions, was the most correct thing to do. This was done, and the proposal was ratified by consensus. [...]

—Let the director present himself! Yes, let him present himself...! -The audience immediately cried out. [...]

—The director is not here at the moment... but he will be found... [...] The response, undoubtedly charged with great irritation, was unanimous: —The director should resign! Overflowing the table, the assembly went further: —Not only the director is responsible... also in professional examinations there is corruption, favoritism and the material is sold...! —Some of them pointed out. —Yes, also in Social Service PRI are the ones who really coordinate the activities...! —One more added. —The studio leaders are authoritarians...!

—They should all resign! Let them all resign! [...] —Let there be a vote! Yes, let there be a vote! — They all demanded in unison. While the Table finished drafting the agreements, suggesting that more time be given to elaborate a flyer and inform the whole base, the proposals were read, including some objectives that those present had committed to achieve, being accepted and approved by absolute majority and urging the attendees to take the leadership.

—Let's take the direction! —was the cry that sealed the beginning of the end of an administration that was lost in its own labyrinth without knowing, until that moment, which path to take to get out of it. [...]

But from among the crowd gathered, someone [Germinal Pérez Plaja], as if illuminated by a spirit, shouted: ‘Don’t close the studios! That would paralyze the school and that is not in our interest! It would be better for the studios to continue working, but now with our supervision!’

Bam! There was silence for a few seconds, as if to give time to reason, and then, also deafeningly, they shouted: —Yes, studios should remain open! No one will take us out! The school is ours! Classes are not suspended!

It seemed as if someone had revived José Revueltas, with that pamphlet of July 1968 where he pointed out: ‘Do not leave the university campus for any reason!’

Do not leave the university premises under any circumstances.

To respond to the suspension of classes with *academic self-organization*.

What is *academic self-organization*?

To continue the courses within the plans and outside of them with the help of teachers in solidarity with the students.

Debate, question, refute, in round tables, seminars, assemblies, the problems and ideas of our time and our society...” (Arias Montes, 2019, pp. 83–84).

Arquitectura y Autogobierno was a radical experiment of direct democracy, self-organization, cooperation and confederalism towards the resignification of architectural practice in the context of extreme inequalities and pressing territorial issues, taking as its main purpose an architecture towards, with and for the people, *vinculación popular*, popular bonding. The six main objectives of Autogobierno were: 1. Totalization of knowledge, 2. Praxis, 3. Critical dialogue, 4. Self-organization, 5. Criticism-Self-criticism, and 6. Knowledge of the national reality (Arias Montes, 2009, p. 11).

Yet, as Guattari underscores in *Self-Management and Narcissism*, “the self-management of a school or a university is limited by its objective dependence on the state, the means of financing, the political commitment of its users, etc. If it is not articulated with a coherent revolutionary perspective, it can only be an order word for transitory action that risks being passably confusing” (Guattari, 2015, p. 283).

The third, and last experience—of this selection of case studies—, is the feminist strike of 2021, also, at the architecture faculty of UNAM. Organized through the anti-patriarchal coordination of various collectives, such as MOFA (Mujeres Organizadas Facultad de Arquitectura), FemisFA, CIDIFems, Consejerxs Alumnxs FA and Estudiantes Organizadxs de la FA, and sustained by female students, the faculty went to indefinite strike on March 22nd. MOFA reminds that, “University pride? we don’t know it, the institution has done nothing but ignore us, abuse us and label us as crazy [...] upon entering architecture school, we women are faced with a teacher asking us on our first day of classes ‘if we are studying architecture to get a husband.’ A construction

teacher may say ‘but after all, the rules are like my cousins, they only serve to violate them.’ Or that even in our families, those who study architecture are questioned ‘why do you want to study a career for men?’ It should be clarified that for some years we women have represented half of the student body of the faculty, yet many professors make us less, they ignore us, they think that the only thing we can say is how to design a kitchen” (MOFA, 2021).

The *Pliego petitorio con motivo de la Asamblea Resolutiva Estudiantil del día 22 de marzo del 2021 por la Violencia de Género en la Facultad de Arquitectura*, Statement of Petition on the occasion of the Student Resolutive Assembly on March 22, 2021 for Gender Violence in the Faculty of Architecture, demanded the Faculty and UNAM to respond and take action on several issues. These include reviewing the actions of Guillermo Isaac Campos Cruz and Emma Vázquez Ortiz, who repeatedly obstructed complaints of gender violence. It also called for the immediate dismissal of Israel Hernández Zamora for various offenses, including blackmail, manipulation, psychological violence, physical abuse, sexual abuse, threatening the complainant at her home, as well as repeated incidences of abuse of power, as well as the dismissal of Efraín López Ortega based on the unjustified resolution of his legal complaint. The dismissal of brothers Miguel Soto Valencia and Jorge Javier Soto Valencia for harassment, cover-up and violent behavior, and also the dismissal of Mariana Ramírez Rosas and Yetlanetzi Alicia Martínez Barajas for their complicity in covering up complaints of gender violence (MOFA et al., 2021, pp. 2–3).

These are just three examples of the struggles of the third uni-versity or with and for, that as Harney notes, “move into more autonomous situations [...] and spend less time in the antagonism of within and against” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 154). It is important to recognize also the singular struggles mobilized by many students and teachers—many of them under the precarious conditions as adjunct professors, working by hours—with their courses that cultivate critical thinking against the conventional and hegemonic discourse advanced by the programs they are part of. It is beyond the scope of this research to do a comprehensive study of all these experiences, but certainly a genealogy of these singular struggles would be important to draw. We are here focusing with experiences at the scale of programs and faculties.

Coda

Following the three ecologies proposed by Guattari, it could be said, that architects are modulated at the level of; great environmental challenges—extracting resources / transforming/devastating; great social challenges—rising and ongoing inequality / speculating on private and public property / aka real estate; and it struggles at the mental level—subjected to neo-liberal capitalism / social subjection / machinic enslavement (Guattari, 2005).

We have seen how neo-liberalism as a rationality, a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life, has become a ubiquitous regime of existence, that is, a mode of reproducing materially and symbolically a specific existence, centered on an economic/market-based life. How through several meanderings of historical and discursive compos(*t*)ing we draw a situated cartography of the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject. That in turn, such false promise, sustains the *patriarchitect's* narcissistic and authority complex, as Fanon would say. A cartography that might draw an ontological field from the colonial *fact* to neo-liberalization. How the neo-liberal architect, overrepresented, in so-called colombia and méxico, by the white-male-cis-hetero-petty-bourgeois-mestizo modality of existence, is re/produced by/for the uni-versity—vocational education through architecture schools—, as a fabric of whiteness.

Through this chapter we have seen how neo-liberalism as a mode of existence, through a situated account of the neo-liberalization of architectural education particularly through the fields and forces of coloniality in so-called colombia and méxico, has modulated by way of the false promise of the individual subject such thing as the neo-liberal architect. Or still the neo-liberal architecture student? The willing students of capitalism. The unwaged workers of the neo-liberal uni-versity ((Mitchell, 2023a, 2023b)).

Fuck education. Fuck the uni-versity. Architecture schools are fundamental in the re/production of the problems and needs of inhabitation, and innovatively design solutions. As we will see in further detail in the next chapter, following Illich, professions and professionals create the problems for which they and only them have the solutions. Architecture creates the need for architects. Architects create the need for architecture. And is not only architecture's fault that we are deprived of the capacity to imagine and construct modes of inhabitation. No. Capital at large needs us to be useless and dependent; first, to sustain abstract work and produce, to consume from a useless object to a place to live; and second, because the time needed to even learn how to sustain life on our own—always collectively—, not even to do it, should be destined to work or to improve our labour skills as human capital. Ultimately, architecture schools re/produce architectural alienation, in other words, how architecture estranges our collective potency of inhabiting autonomously other worlds. Architecture deprives people of their constructive and inhabiting capacities.

Such is the neo-liberal frame for the re/production of the architect in so-called méxico and colombia. The schooling of desire, of architectural desire. The uni-versity as a site for the modulation of desire. The logistics of desire. The desire to be architect. Neo-liberal subjectivation through architectural education, and the schooling of the desire for success re/produce a professional modality of being that aspires and desires to constant accumulation of success in the form of authorship, innovation, capital, fame awards/recognition, power and built projects. And, architecture schools deliver what they promise: mass re/production of neo-liberal architects through the uni-versity. Through the schooling of *blanquitud*. Uni-versities are more and more *factories of whiteness, industries of subjectivity, factories of knowledge, industries of the self*.

Let's reiterate we are not co-moving towards alternative architectural educations, but alternatives to architecture and education. Towards imaging and rehearsing the possibility of *as many worlds as possible*. Worlds through which we can imagine and rehearse other modalities of inhabitation, beyond the *pedagogías de la crueldad*, beyond architectural education. Beyond architectural alienation, and rehearse the collective potency of inhabiting autonomously other worlds.

Chapter 4

Exodus, or the Voluntary Workers of Architecture: On the neo-liberalization of the architect

Exodus, or voluntary workers?

“Stranger: Wouldn’t we be proceeding in order if we should next determine the gnostic (science)

Socrates: Certainly.

Stranger: Pay attention. Are we to understand that there’s after all a kind of natural joint in it?

Socrates: What sort is it? Point it out.

Stranger: The following sort. We agreed surely that there was an art of logistics.

Socrates: Yes.

Stranger: I suspect that it altogether belongs just to the gnostic arts.

Socrates: Of course.

Stranger: Shall we grant, then, no more extensive work to logistics, with its cognition (*gnōsin*) of the difference among numbers, than to discriminate the things cognized?

Socrates: Why certainly.

Stranger: The reason is that every master-builder (*architektōn*) too is not himself engaged in work but is a ruler (*archōn*) of workmen (*ergatōn*)?

Socrates: Yes.

Stranger: And it’s surely because he furnishes cognition and not manual work (*cheiourgian*)?

Socrates: That’s so.

Stranger: Then he would justly be said to participate in the gnostic Science.

Socrates: Certainly.

Stranger: Yes, but it’s appropriate for him, I suspect, once he’s made (Statesman 259e)” (Plato, 2007, p. 429)

“The architects (*architektonas*) in each *technē* are more honourable and know in a truer sense and are wiser (*sophōteros*) than the manual artisans (*cheirotechnōn*), because they know the causes of the things that are done” (Metaphysics 981a30-b2) (Aristotle, 1984, p. 446)

“If cultural identity ceases to be conceived as a substance and is seen rather as a ‘state of code’—as a peculiar transitory configuration of the subcoding that makes the code usable,

‘speaking’—then this ‘identity’ can also be shown as an evanescent reality, as a historical entity that, while determining the behavior of the subjects that use or ‘speak’ it, is simultaneously being made, transformed, modified by them” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 75)

Hopelessness seems to dominate all sides of the wall. Individualism, success, innovation, creativity, authorship, flexibility, risk, resilience, intellectual property, competition, real estate speculation, hierarchies, among other, are the ingredients for the production of the uni-versal neo-liberal architect. Architecture students, those strong enough to love it, will become its voluntary workers, ecstatic in the apparent white freedom of their architectural confines. Soon, the first workers beg for admission. Their number rapidly swells into an unstoppable flow of voluntary workers. We witness the re/production of the neo-liberal architect. The physical structure of the old world might not be able to stand the continuing competition of this new architectural presence. The world as we know it will become a pack of ruins (Koolhaas et al., 1972).

“Helpless, they face reality alone, without options, mired in a stupid morality and imposed ideals that they cannot escape. They are made fragile, vulnerable, ready to grab hold of any institutional garbage prepared to accommodate them: school, hierarchy, army, learning fidelity, submission, modesty, the taste for work, family, nation, union, and many more... Their entire life is now poisoned to one degree or another by the uncertainty of their conditions with regard to the processes of production, distribution and consumption, by the concern over their place in society and the place of their companions” (Guattari, 2015, p. 363).

The architect as most professional identities, are racist, sexist and classist categorizations, modes to comply, modes to secure the authority complex proper of whiteness. If we are committed to a trans-versal and imbricated critique, then professional identities must be questioned through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

Fuck the *arkhê*! Not much has changed since Plato regarding the white *patiarchitecto*. Still a figure of authority, the *architektōn*, is a hierarchical figure in the building industry, commanding people how to live, other architects how to design, and also construction workers how to build, since architects only design, and arrogantly reproduce the manual-intellectual labour division. Following Wynter and Fanon, we could say that professional identities in Abya Yala, which is to say white-bourgeois-men professionals, are crossed by a double movement: first, that through labour and professional identities a mono-humanist modality of existence is imposed, that of the white-bourgeois architect; and second, that the colonial imbrication of oppressions and the complex of inferiority are always against the possibilities of escaping or becoming fully.

For a profession so obsessed with individual authorial geniuses, architecture has written very little about the history of the architect and its professionalization, even if there are volumes and volumes on the work of an individual architect, still the focus lies on the architectural product, on space and form. For a profession

so obsessed with designing space and form, architecture has written very little on the form of the architect itself. This work, does not contribute to such shortage. It rather works through that shortage, in order to argue that such obsession with space and form leaves behind a fundamental project, the production of forms of being architects, the modulation of architectural subjectivity. Nevertheless, we are not arguing that architecture should then open and include other forms of being architects, alternative modalities of architectural practice. No. No laments for architecture. No laments. If we had to commit to one single argument on this work, it would be to urgently imagine-experiment with alternative modes of inhabiting and becoming, beyond-against and beyond architectural labour, architectural subjectivity, to make the need of architecture and the architect, obsolete. Useless. Not wanted. Not needed. Why? A few arguments have been mentioned already. We will draw some more in the coming pages.

First of all, the same as Holloway argues, that “the creation of labour is the creation of the labourer. It cannot be otherwise: labour cannot be performed if there is no labourer to perform it” (Holloway, 2010, p. 114). The creation of architecture is the creation of the architect, architecture cannot be performed if there is no architect to perform it. Again, there is no *architecture without architects*. No vernacular architecture. No anonymous architecture. Not to be arrogant, and reproduce the distinction between high and low culture, but as a scream against the uni-versal homogenization of territorial coloniality. Architects can keep their architecture! We are not claiming, yet another “death of architecture,” we are co-moving towards the possibility of other modalities of inhabiting, not dominated by white-spatiality and the western-authority of architectural profession, possibilities that the architectural world violently denies, imposing and pushing towards the white totality of inhabiting. In other words, we won’t kill nor is architecture dead. You can keep your architecture. Our modes of inhabitation do not fit into architecture. And yet, white colonial-modernity violently imposes architecture constantly.

Moten and Harney argue that, “there is no point in trying to hold out the university against its professionalization. They are the same. Yet the maroons refuse to refuse professionalization, that is, to be against the university. The university will not recognize this indecision, and thus professionalization is shaped precisely by what it cannot acknowledge, its internal antagonism, its wayward labor, its surplus. Against this wayward labor it sends the critical, sends its claim that what is left beyond the critical is waste” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 38). We agree that there is no point in holding out the uni-versity against its professionalization. They are the same thing. Bondage machines. Yet we refuse to not refuse professionalization, to co-move beyond-against and beyond the uni-versity and abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. Not because we look for the recognition of the uni-versity of such struggle, but exactly the opposite because we expect nothing from the uni-versity. *We demand nothing* from the uni-versity! We refuse professionalization as the urgency of un-doing ourselves beyond our labour identities. Because as Moten and Harney also argue, “the

Universitas is always a state/State strategy. Perhaps it's surprising to say professionalization—that which reproduces the professions—is a state strategy” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 39).

The following chapter focuses on the production of architectural subjectivity, through professionalization. It moves through the impossibility, incompleteness of such modulation and its violent constant effort to pursue completion through the re/production of architectural authority. Under/by/for neo-liberalism as a mode of existence, such authority is currently sustained by/for: the leadership complex, professionalization, manual-intellectual division of labour, *sexual-racialized* division of labour, whiteness, hierarchization, individual authorship, creative genius, mono-functional modern space, and colonial impositions of progress at large.

As Spencer, underscores, “the labour of design occurs under conditions in which workers are required to acquire not only disciplinary knowledge and skills—becoming subject to indebtedness in the process—but the dispositions, mentalities and tolerances requisite to rendering themselves employable. The architecture produced from this labour, in turn, goes to work on its users, contributing to the means through which subjectivity is produced. Architecture is distinctive, if not unique, in this regard. Its sites of production are everywhere, producing its own producers, producing the imaginary of capital, producing conduct, habits and perceptions, producing affects and meanings. The production and reproduction of capital through architecture is not so much confined to a hidden abode as it is hiding in plain sight. Fashioning the analytic tools capable of grasping the significance of these multiple sites of production, and their interrelatedness—itsself an ongoing work—will better equip us to recognize, and contribute to, the struggles occurring through and within these” (Spencer, 2020, p. 204).

Some of the usual contemporary architectural laments, go something like this: “architecture is a technology that has not yet discovered its agency” (Diller & Vidler, 2013) cited by (Adler, 2016, p. 180) (laments in *arquitecto*), but maybe it is not that architecture has not yet “discovered” its agency, but rather that it is unwilling to commit against the brutality of its agency. Another usual lament is that architects have lost their role and competence to other professionals (laments in *arquitecto*). And, just a final lament—amongst many—that, architects are now driven by individualistic desires and capitalist profit, following the orders of real estate speculation and financial capitalism, (laments in *arquitecto*). So what? Architects have always followed the orders of power, before the market, managed jointly by financial capitalism and nation-states, architects followed direct orders from kings, clergy, and the bourgeoisie. The history of the architect, is that of a lackey. This has not changed. Architects are one of the many “watchdogs of colonialism” (Césaire, 2001, p. 55). Architecture has always flirted with power, as Helen Runtig and Hélène Frichot note “it is in the seductive space of real estate that finance and architecture can flirt, collaborating on the shaping of brains, minds and

bodies through biopolitical and noological processes of subject formation, of *assujettissement*” (Frichot & Runting, 2016, p. 231).

We could dedicate pages and pages to the history of the architect and its laments. But for the sake of the argument, and because it falls beyond the scope and interest of this study, we will focus on the coupling of architecture as a profession and the advent of architectural education through the case of the architectural colonization of Abya Yala, particularly the territories now called México and Colombia.

Coloniality of labour

Genealogy of colonial labour

“Freedom through work was never the slave’s cry but we hear it all around us today”
(Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 41)

Under the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, labour is sexual-racialized forced compulsory production. Problematizing the architect today involves studying its role in the building industry that sustains real estate speculation under financial capitalism, and the infrastructure necessary for the sustenance of racist nation-states—i.e. borders, schools, prisons, roads, parks, amongst other.

More and more, architects are not just passive designers under the command of developers, but are becoming—again, as was the case of Colombia during the mid-XX century—real estate speculators themselves. We have seen how schools are including increasingly courses on entrepreneurialism, construction management and other related topics to “real estate intelligence.”

The various roles and changes that the architect has assumed are entangled through the *longue durée* of the coloniality of labour. Not only architecture as an eurocentric spatial technology was imposed, but it was violently imposed through abstract labour.

Machado, notes by way of Césaire that, “coloniality is the total inversion of colonization as civilization. It speaks of a civilization that has legitimized the means of violence as a pattern of stratification and regulation of life and the species; it is violence that has become naturalized in racism, classism and sexism” (Machado Aráoz, 2019, p. 34) (Césaire, 2001).

Coloniality, Escobar argues, refers to the “categorization and hierarchical classification of differences, leading to the suppression, devaluing, subordination, or even destruction of forms of knowledge and being that do not conform to the dominant form of modernity. Coloniality cemented the dichotomy between the human/civilized (European) world, further classified in terms of gender, and the nonhuman/uncivilized (the

nonmodern, racialized dark peoples of the world, described, like animals were, in terms of their biological sex) (Lugones, 2016), (Maria Lugones, 2010))” (Escobar, 2018, p. 94). As we have seen, the “suppression, devaluing, subordination, or even destruction of forms of knowledge and being” meant also the suppression, devaluing, subordination, or even destruction of modes of inhabiting, of modes of symbolically and materially trans-forming the territory. Coloniality and particularly territorial coloniality meant the continuation of these dominations, and the ongoing re/production of one-world, the architectural world, the violent imposition and incomplete uni-versal project of inhabiting the planet towards white eurocentric modernity. In the last centuries, this was mainly advanced through the ideology of design at large, and particularly through architecture.

Quijano defines four axis of the global pattern of power, the coloniality of power that started with the constitution of both américa and europe in 1492. The first two are fundamental for our current discussion, since according to Quijano the first axis imposed “a new system of social domination, founded on the basic and universal social classification of the world population on the basis of, and around, the idea of ‘race.’ This idea and its effects on power relations produced a racist episteme in the process of globalization of European colonialism since the 18th century. Imposed on the entire population of the world, this system constitutes the first global form of social domination.” The second axis, associated with the first, established “the formation of a structure of control of labour, its resources and products, which articulated all historically known forms (slavery, serfdom, small independent mercantile production, reciprocity and capital), around and under the predominance of the capital-wage relation (hereinafter, capital) and of the world market. Because of the central and dominant place of capital in this structure, this structure admitted, fundamentally, a capitalist character and was imposed on the whole world. In this way, a new pattern of exploitation was constituted: world capitalism. And since it is a structure of control over all forms of labour and thus affects the entire world population, it is also the first global form of social exploitation” (Quijano, 2013, p. 145).

According to Quijano, “slavery in América was not an extension of classical slavery, but a historically and sociologically new phenomenon: it was deliberately established and developed as a commodity, to supply the world market. The same happened with personal servitude” (Quijano, 2013, p. 152).

Colonial capitalism, or just capitalism is sustained by/through abstract labour. And architectural labour designs and arrogantly supervises the construction of this capitalist world. The architectural world.

Architectural authority from craft to profession

How are architects produced through neo-liberal *games of truth* and *practices of power* (Foucault, 1998, p. 290)? What/who is the neo-liberal architect? Is there such a thing as *homo œconomicus-architectonicus*? And if

so, where, when and how is such a subject produced? What are the core values and abilities that the neo-liberal architect must cultivate in order to best perform at work? What are the professional techniques, spaces and discourses used for such production?

Any elaboration on the architect today, in so-called colombia and méxico, must situate through the current state of the building industry, considering real estate speculation under financialization, neo-liberalization processes and the imbrication of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, particularly territorial coloniality. In order to problematize the ideology of design at large—composed by various disciplines and professions of technocrats as: architecture, urbanism, urban design, urban planning, landscape urbanism, engineering, industrial design, amongst other—as an instrument by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

The following, draws a brief genealogy of the transition of architecture from craft to profession, considering the fields and forces of coloniality in order to expand in the next section on a situated account of the architect in so-called colombia and méxico. The architect is a eurocentric modulated labouring-subjectivity, educated and disciplined through specific western-modern values, desires, and specific methods, as: drawing and analysis of images, modeling of form and space, reading theory, building design, construction supervision, obtaining a license depending on the context (Deamer, 2016a, p. 107).

The first sections focus on the figure of the architect as an eurocentric construct from the greek *architektōn* until the spanish colonial *architecto*. The following sections focus on the main—non exhaustive—features of the architect and how it sustains its authority, through notions as: leadership, manual-intellectual division of labour, *sexual-racialized* division of labour, individual authorship, creative genius, and patriarchy.

Ancient builders

The conventional tale of the architect, the space “conceiver,” the genius spatial-design author in the west, usually starts with Imhotep in Egypt and Daedalus in Greece. A full study from them to Koolhaas falls beyond the scope and interest of this study. Let us say, in a gross reductionist way, that most of them were: cis-hetero authoritarian men with leadership complex—the tale would say leaders—, narcissist architects—the tale would say genius—at the service of power, be it political or economical, which are rarely separate.

The history of the architect and its professionalization, is sustained mainly by/for: the divisions of manual-intellectual and sexual-racialized labour, whiteness, patriarchy, hierarchization, individual authorship and the notion of the genius artist, amongst other.

Leon Battista Alberti elaborated, one of the first definitions of the eurocentric construct of architecture and the architect in his 1452 *De re aedificatoria*. He defined the architect as: “who by sure and wonderful

reason and method, knows both how to devise through *his* own mind and energy, and to realize by construction, whatever can be most beautifully fitted out for the noble needs of *man*, by the movement of weights and the joining and massing of bodies. To do this *he* must have an understanding and knowledge of all the highest and most noble disciplines. This then is the architect” (Alberti, 1988, p. 3). The discipline is still to a large extent, attached to this definition or to Adolf Loos’ definition, who said “an architect is a bricklayer who has learned Latin” (Loos, 1998, p. 53). In 1977 Spiro Kostof edited *The Architect, Chapters in the History of the Profession*, a compilation of texts that drew a genealogy of the architect as modelled by the profession, in the introduction he defines architects as “conceivers of buildings. What they do is to design, that is, supply concrete images for a new structure so that it can be put up. The primary task of the architect, then as now, is to communicate what proposed buildings should be and look like. The architect does not initiate buildings, nor necessarily take part in the physical act of construction. The architect’s role is that of mediator between the client or patron” (Kostof, 1986, p. 6).

Lisa Landrum remind us that “philosophical thinking about architectural practice was prefigured by dramatizations of architectural acts, as shown by the inclusion of ‘architects’ and ‘architecting’ (*αρχιτεκτόνειν*) in select scripts of Athenian drama” (Landrum, 2015, p. 6).

Landrum argues, that “the earliest extant references to architects in ancient Greek philosophy, as found in select works of Plato and Aristotle” surprisingly, these passages have had little treatment. “Aside from isolated citations, the question of how and why Plato and Aristotle chose to integrate ‘architects’ (*architekton/αρχιτέκτων*) and ‘architectonics’ (*architektonikē/αρχιτεκτονική*) into their discursive inquires has not been asked. Thus, one of [Landrum’s] basic aims [has been] to disclose what these philosophical passages contribute to a critical and speculative discourse on architecture. Although the Greeks had no word for architecture per se (*architectura* being a Latin word first found in Cicero), Plato and Aristotle—in the midst of examining political, ethical and epistemological problems and potentialities (in the 4th c. BCE)—began loosely to define principled ‘architectonic’ practices involving the knowing direction of individuals, arts and materials toward comprehensively beneficial aims. Whereas the earliest extant inscriptions naming ‘architects’ (from the 440s and 430s BCE) yield only a few meaningful but largely techno-bureaucratic details, and Herodotus’ *Histories* (from the same decades) merely credit select ‘architects’ with a disparate assortment of ‘wonders’ (*thaumata*)” (Landrum, 2015, p. 5). “Philosophical thinking about architectural practice was prefigured by dramatizations of architectural acts, as shown by the inclusion of ‘architects’ and ‘architecting’ (*αρχιτεκτόνειν*) in select scripts of Athenian drama. Indeed, the earliest extant *architekton* in Greek literature is found neither in inscriptions nor historical prose, but (arguably) in a fragmentary etiological drama by Aeschylus (staged in 476 BCE), wherein a personified Justice (daughter of Zeus) is presumed ‘to architect’ proportionate order. About fifty years later, in the wake of Pericles’ ambitious building program and while Herodotus’ *Histories* were

circulating in Athens, Euripides and Aristophanes featured more medial (and mortal) architect-protagonists. Amid grave dangers, these agents—called ‘architects’ and called upon ‘to architect’—dared to initiate and lead collaborative schemes aimed at restoring social order, regional peace, levity, and even *theōria*. These dramatizations, together with the philosophical passages following them, represent substantial yet largely overlooked contributions to the beginnings of architectural theory” (Landrum, 2015, p. 6)

“For Aristotle, ‘causes’ (*aitia*) and “principles” (*archai*)—better translated as ‘beginnings’—account for how and why actions and things come into being and become knowable. Book delta (5) of *Metaphysics* reviews the many senses of these key terms, including the material, formal, efficient and final causes, or *teloi* (1013a24-b3); and the varieties of *archai*, ranging from tangible starting points and foundations, to elemental matter from which life originates, to basic premises and best hypotheses from which topics become comprehensible (1012b33-1013a23). *Archai* also encompass willful ‘choices’ that initiate change, including the decisive directives and advice of civic authorities, as well as those ‘arts’ (*technai*) that bring about transformation. In this regard, Aristotle emphasizes that ‘the arts, and of these especially the architectonic arts (*architektonikai*),’ are called *archai* (1013a13-14). He also clarifies that ‘all causes are *archai*’ (1013a16), and *archai* include ends: for, as he explains elsewhere, ‘the end aimed at is the starting-point of our thought, the end of our thought the starting-point of action.’ Aristotle culminates his definition of beginnings with reference to ultimate ethical ends: “the good and the beautiful are the *archē* both of the knowledge and the movement of many things” (1013a22-3). So, to summarize, for Aristotle, architects and architectonic arts ought to have knowledge of *archai*, and these material, cultural and intellectual *archai* appear to include all manner of pertinent beginnings, means and ends. As we shall see, this philosophy of *archai* outlined in *Metaphysics* helps us comprehend the manifold and reciprocal agencies embedded in the ‘architect of the end’ in *Nicomachean Ethics*. But, what are we to make of Aristotle’s surprising plurality of architects and architectonic arts?” (Landrum, 2015, p. 12).

Plato and Aristotle “consistently present architectonic agents as exemplary civic and intellectual leaders acting in awareness of their own (and others’) limits, with knowledge of the most appropriate *archē*, and with a view to the most comprehensive aims—the common good. This discloses an alternative and more accurate etymology of architects: not as master-builders but as leaders and makers of beginnings (*archai*)” (Landrum, 2015, p. 20).

The obsession of architects for leadership and archetypes could be explained through the double meaning of *arkhé*, that as Malabou notes by way of Agamben, means both origin and principle / command and order (Malabou, 2024, p. 154). These two conditions seem to be inscribed in architectural labour since the greek, and therefore in the production of the architect, who, situated through the colonial fact, always seeks his white origin and the impulse to command and create.

See paris and die! Professionalization in Italy and France

“If you meet him again when he has returned from Paris, and especially if you do not know the capital, he will never run out of its praises: Paris-city-of-light, the Seine, the little garden restaurants, know Paris and die...” (Fanon, 2008, p. 9)

The architect “as a specialist or professional” began to emerge during the XVI century in Europe, “so that by 1550, when Giorgio Vasari published the first edition of his history of Italian artists, he could call it *The Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors and Architects*” (Ettlinger, 1986, p. 96). Until then, architecture was a craft carried out by master-masons and master builders. “Besides the amateur architect and the artist architect, one also finds a third variety of architect: the specialist who considers himself both a gentleman like the amateur and a designer like the artist but who insists upon his independent status as a professional in his field” (Wilkinson, 1986, p. 137).

According to Catherine Wilkinson, if the emergence of a new conception of architecture occurred in the fifteenth century, it took another century for the architect to establish their place in the constantly changing social structures of the Renaissance. Alberti believed that architecture was a vocation for a well-educated gentleman with knowledge of mathematics and geometry, but his understanding of it as a profession was unclear. In *De re aedificatoria* written around 1450, Alberti expressed the modern view of an architect as a complete designer, capable of planning cities and designing various structures. However, he provided little information about architect training or building practices. A century later, Philibert de L'Orme (1510-70), a writer like Alberti, was able to envision a self-governing profession of specialists with defined standards of training and responsibilities. In his book *Premier tome de l'architecture* in 1567, he delineated the appropriate roles of the patron, the architect, and the workman, and established guidelines for their working relationship. His second book began with a summary of the aims that guided his treatise:

“In the preceding book we have sufficiently advised the architect and the *Seigneur*, or whoever would like to build, of their positions and duties as the two principal heads of the building enterprise. It remains in this second book to turn our pen to the third class of persons, without whom no building can be perfect. These are the master masons, the stone cutters, and the workmen (*whom the architect must always control*) who as well must not be deprived of our labor and instruction here, since it has pleased God for us to give it” (de L'Orme, 1568, p. Bk. II, Fol. 31).

Wilkinson, continues and argues that, what sets de L'Orme's perspective on the profession apart from previous views is his explicit comparison between the architect and those who designed buildings but were not considered architects in his opinion. According to him, patrons should hire architects instead of relying on

“master masons or master carpenters, as is customary, or painters, notaries, or other supposedly qualified individuals who often have no better judgment than the patrons themselves” (de L’Orme, 1568, p. Bk. I, Fol. 6). Many of these supposed architects were actually trained for manual labor and lacked knowledge of architectural principles. Others had only studied theory and were unable to apply it practically. Their work amounted to nothing more than “a shadow of a real building” (de L’Orme, 1568, p. Bk. I, fol. iv) (paraphrasing Vitruvius). The true architect, on the other hand, was different, combined the practical experience of a master mason with the knowledge of an amateur. As de L’Orme stated, they were educated not only through books but also through extensive experience. What defined the architect as a professional was their relationships, both professional and social, with the patron, the *workmen*, and the administrators and officials overseeing the building project. However, de L’Orme’s perspective was partly shaped by his conflicts with the building professionals who believed they were capable of devising a building and whose habits and privileges were threatened by the architect (Wilkinson, 1986, pp. 124–126).

By separating himself from the mason and carpenter, de L’Orme was making a distinction in society. The architect aimed to present himself as a practitioner of a Liberal Art, which was a relatively new concept in France but well-established in Italy. In Italy, during the Renaissance, the architect rose to the level of an intellectual, similar to the painter and sculptor. In 1436, Alberti emphasized the renewal of sculpture, painting, and architecture in Florence, particularly highlighting the architect Brunelleschi’s invention of perspective construction. Alberti viewed the architect as both an artist and an intellectual, distinguishing their work from that of a *craftsman*. Among the three arts, architecture was the most easily separated from *craftsmanship*. Rooted in geometry and mathematics, architecture was considered almost a Liberal Art. In Tuscany, the architect, not being a part of a guild, was more easily differentiated from the craftsman compared to the painter or sculptor. Alberti’s, *De re aedificatoria*, did not mention guilds and provided the first modern portrayal of the architect as an intellectual artist (Wilkinson, 1986, pp. 124–126).

If Italy was the site for the formation of the architect as an intellectual-artist, it was later in France where the architect as a technocrat was greatly advanced. In this respect, Myra Nan Rosenfeld underscores that, “the history of the Royal Building Administration in France is a topic of utmost importance, since this institution influenced the organization of the modern architectural office. Its delegation of the tasks of business administration, drafting, planning, site inspection, and engineering contributed to the way in which architects work today in large offices. Furthermore, the curriculum of the Royal Academy and of its successor, the *Ecole des Beaux-Arts*, was the basis for the method of instruction used in architectural schools until the advent of the Bauhaus in the twentieth century. Finally, the Royal Building Administration provided the means for the modernization of medieval architectural practice in France through the introduction of the new methods from Italy” (Rosenfeld, 1986, p. 161).

The *l'Administration des batiments royaux*, Royal Building Administration, was established after a long period. Its origins can be traced back to the reign of Charles V (1364-80). Initially, it had a simple structure with masons, notaries, and the Master Mason as its administrator. The introduction of the Inspector General position during the reign of Louis XI (1461-83) elevated the role of a business administrator above the Master Mason. Inspired by practices in Italy, Charles VIII (1483-93) introduced the position of Royal Architectural Adviser, who had authority over the Master Mason. Francis I (1515-47) brought about significant changes by appointing Sebastiano Serlio as the Royal Architect. He was the first French monarch to prioritize the quality of architectural education provided by the Royal Building Administration and commissioned Serlio to write multiple books on architecture for its members. Under the reign of Louis XIV (1643-1715), the administration expanded its staff and personnel, resulting in a more hierarchical and specialized organization. The responsibilities of the head architect no longer included financial administration or on-site work. Instead, the king, along with the Inspector General and Finance Minister Jean-Baptiste Colbert, took on a more authoritative role in the development of the Royal Building Administration, as evidenced by the construction of the East Colonnade of the Louvre. Additionally, during Louis XIV's reign, as we have already seen, the Royal Academy of Architecture was established as the first official school of architecture in France, greatly influencing architectural practice. In Paris, architects had been organized into stone-mason and carpenter corporations since the XIII century, with their training requirements, apprenticeship durations, and certification exams recorded in Etienne Boileau's *Livre des metiers* (Book of Professions), which was registered with the parliament of paris. These corporations had obtained their charters from the king. During the Middle Ages in France, there was no distinction between planning and manual labor. Medieval architects acquired proficiency in all aspects of their profession, including stonecutting, business administration, planning, mathematics, and engineering. Most masons received training within their own family workshops. In France, the term "architect" did not refer to a "planner" until Guillaume Bude bestowed the title Royal Architect, *architectus regius*, upon Fra Giocondo in 1495, an Italian consultant to Charles VIII (Rosenfeld, 1986, pp. 161–163).

Professionalization in Spain

In order to trace the genealogy of the architect in Abya Yala, through the fields and forces of coloniality, it is important to move to Spain. In Spain, the construction trade seemed to rely more on large building projects and had less strict organization compared to France. Unlike in France, master-builders in Spain were not part of a guild and instead received training on the job. They would work their way up in the hierarchy of workers, often starting as stone-cutters or masons if they wanted to become a master, until they reached the position of supervisor or *aparejador*. In this role, they would organize the workers, estimate costs,

and sometimes provide funds for building materials. They would then become a master-builder after completing their training. As the master of the works, they would be responsible for the design and proper execution of the building. Prestigious positions like the *maestro mayor* in cathedrals were important for establishing a solid reputation, and usually, a person held only one such position at a time. However, by the early XVI century, masters were frequently absent on other projects, leaving their supervisor in charge. This indicated a weakening of the system and a more varied approach. During this time, the master of the works began to distance themselves from the rest of the trade and took on the role of a full-fledged architect. The patron overseeing the project would have their own separate structure, led by an administrator at the building site and including notaries and a paymaster (for larger projects). These officials would handle contracts for each major stage of construction or for expensive tasks like decorative carving, and they would pay semi-skilled workers on a daily or weekly basis. They were also responsible for paying themselves, the master, and the contractor who worked on salary. These officials kept detailed records of expenses, including the cost of building materials and even the price of renting a mule for the master's travel to meet with the patron. In both Spain and France, this system worked well as long as the designer remained the leader of the workers. However, it had difficulty accommodating outsiders, and the transition to a new system was met with some open conflict (Wilkinson, 1986, p. 131).

According to Antonio Fernández Alba, “any analysis, no matter how brief, that is intended to be made about the history of architects in Spain, must reference the work of Eugenio Llaguno and Amirola: *Noticias de los Arquitectos y Arquitectura de España desde su Restauración* illustrated and expanded with notes, additions, and documents. by Juan Agustín Ceán-Bermúdez, censor of the *Real Academia de la Historia*, and consiliary of the *Real Academia de San Fernando*. This work, compiled in 4 volumes, offers valuable historical documentation, where the development of events surrounding the architecture that is established on the Peninsula, and the work of architects when this institution is formed as such, is evident” (Fernández Alba, 1984, p. 297). To do so with order and clarity, Llaguno divides the “history of architecture in Spain into ten periods, because in them its forms were established and its alterations were committed, sometimes caused by the customs and traditions of the different nations that took over the kingdom, and other times by the ignorance and whims of the artists” (Llaguno y Amirola, 1829).

The term architect appears for the first time printed in Spanish in the treatise *Medidas del Romano*. It argues that, “you should also know that *architetto* is a Greek word; it means main manufacturer. There, the building designers are properly called *architeto*s. Those who, according to Vitruvius, are obliged to be trained in the sciences of philosophy and liberal arts. Otherwise they cannot be perfect architects whose tools are the hands of mechanics. And note that the good architect must first of all provide himself with the science of geometry” (Irisarri Martínez, 2015, p. 43). The word architect was gradually introduced into the field of

construction from this point forward. The increasing popularity of this “new” term was undoubtedly a result of Felipe II officially recognizing it as an official position and appointing Juan Bautista de Toledo as *arquitecto real*. The term architect also began to be popularized in seville in part due to the influence of italian artists (Irisarri Martínez, 2015, p. 43).

As already mentioned, at the time of the conquest of Abya Yala, in Spain, the training of the architect was given in three successive methods: through a master in a guild, through the mastery of figurative drawing and through figures as Juan de Herrera (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 17).

At this time master-masons, *alarifes*, and clergy would participate actively in the colonization of Abya Yala through the violent spatialization of military infrastructure, cities, and religious missions.

“The cultural exchange in both the sciences and the arts, established by the Borbón dynasty with Italy and France, made necessary a more efficient regulation, in terms of systems and ways of designing and building, than the polemics between guilds and workshops. An attempt was made to organize these demands in an institution of solvency that could grant, through aptitude and capacity exams, the title of architect or master builder.” This led to the creation of the *Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando* in Madrid in 1751 (Fernández Alba, 1984, p. 302).

The rise of the bourgeoisie to power in Spain, accompanied by early industrial development, necessitated a specialization in scientific and technical knowledge for the efficient management and growth of modern businesses. However, the conservative academic standards were unable to withstand the pressure from industrial organizations. The professional qualifications required for the new class of bourgeoisie were based on knowledge and expertise, in contrast to the qualifications derived from nobility. These qualifications guaranteed a scientific and technical capacity that was essential for organizing the state and providing crucial support for the industrial enterprise. They also played a crucial role in legitimizing and controlling the political, social, and economic aspects of society. The granting of these qualifications through competitive examinations gave rise to new classes within society, who were assigned specific managerial roles, with their interests aligned with those of the new society. It is not surprising that the first professional schools emerged in the centers of industrial development. Architects and engineers in various fields became prominent professionals in the establishment of new companies and in capital investment activities supported by the merchant bourgeoisie. For instance, in Madrid, the first School of Architecture was established in 1884 (Fernández Alba, 1984, p. 304).

The Academy of San Fernando played a significant role in shaping the school, as it controlled the architect's degree, distinguishing the academic nature of the institution from the technical knowledge and skills emphasized by European polytechnic foundations. To address this distinction, the title of *maestro de obras* was introduced, eventually evolving into the university degree of *aparejador*. This division of labour assigned the architect the responsibility of designing and envisioning projects, while the *aparejador* ensured proper

execution. However, over time, this hierarchy did not necessarily benefit the quality or execution of projects, as aesthetic criteria and quality control became subordinate to market demands. Architecture had to adapt to the emerging pre-industrial modes of production in the late XV century. These models evolved and faced challenges throughout the XIX century, ultimately leading to a model in the mid-XX century where architects were constrained by the law of value and focused more on their professional interests rather than socially meaningful projects. In 1816, the Academy of San Fernando established four categories: academician or professor, architect proper, master builder (now known as the quantity surveyor), and quantity surveyor (now known as the foreman). The social realities of the 19th century brought about a less classist view of the architectural profession, changing the system of commissions, protection, and sponsorship of architectural work (Fernández Alba, 1984, p. 304).

Colonial architects in Abya Yala

With the conquest and colonization of Abya Yala, the trans-formation of the territory and the construction of places were radically altered. Faced with the pluri-versal possibility of understanding, constructing and inhabiting multiple worlds, the uni-versal craft of architecture was imposed. The architect in Abya Yala—one of the many centers where colonial power was exercised and architecture was professionalized according to european parameters—is a figure crossed by diverse tensions generated by a brutal acculturation, local traditions that were supplanted by foreign methodologies and customs, and contradictions due to the reactions arising from the syncretism produced by the phases of conquest, colony and national *in*dependence. Ultimately leading to architectural alienation, in other words, how architecture estranges our collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world. Because architecture deprives people of their constructive and inhabiting capacities, by re/producing the need for the architect, the professional authority of the architect and the disciplinary authority of architecture.

The violent colonization of Abya Yala meant urbanization by dispossession. For example, “mexico's urbanization and early colonization were concomitant.” According to George Kubler (Kubler, 1983, p. 73), the first colonizers of so-called méxico established countless towns. The way in which these towns were created is unique in the history of spanish colonization. From the initial expeditions into the country, all authorities were involved in a continuous, unplanned, and highly productive effort to build cities. The paths taken by conquistadors, missionaries, bishops, priests, and settlers were filled with hundreds of new towns founded before 1580. Within one generation of the conquest, the spanish had provided Nueva España with all the necessary elements to form a colonial society. This included a central metropolis, an extensive network of provincial cities for european settlers, well-equipped mining and artisanal foundations, housing for millions of

indigenous peoples, and temporary accommodations for nomadic tribes on the outskirts of the colony. The towns varied in size, ranging from those that housed only a few families to cities with up to 60,000 inhabitants. Some towns served strategic purposes, while others were simple resting places along trade routes. Additionally, some towns were established to keep the indigenous peoples separated from the europeans.

The immediate urbanization of conquered lands was not a crucial aspect of the crown's colonial policy. Urbanization was initially carried out by the church, not the state, as a result of conversion efforts. Kubler, argues that the colonial expansions in which the church participated did not have notable urban features (Kubler, 1983, p. 73). This of course is driven by Kubler's white-colonial gaze and "superior taste," we would argue the contrary, that all these efforts, even if at the gaze of the architectural elite did not have outstanding urban features, constitute violent, concrete and outstanding architectural and urban features imposed through territorial coloniality. Just because these colonial expansions imposed different spatialities to the existent indigenous peoples. The domination of inhabitations by *el mundo de uno*.

The urbanization of the world and architectural labour as we are subjected today in Abya Yala came by boat. It arrived and expanded through the religious and moral enterprises of catholic missions, by way of the colonial logics of delimitation and exclusion of the *architectural world*. Evangelizing was educating. Educating was civilizing. Civilizing meant dispossession, deterritorialization, and domination, materially, symbolically and territorially.

Authority and so-called leadership

"...the white *man* acts in obedience to an authority complex, a leadership complex"
(Fanon, 2008, p. 73)

Fanon in *Black Skin, White Masks*, argued that "the feeling of inferiority of the colonized is the correlative to the European's feeling of superiority. Let us have the courage to say it outright: It is the racist who creates his inferior" (Fanon, 2008, p. 69). White superiority creates colonized inferiority and the white architect "acts in obedience to an authority complex, a leadership complex" (Fanon, 2008, p. 73). And as Edward Said, notes, "behind the White Man's mask of amiable leadership there is always the express willingness to use force, to kill and be killed" (Said, 2003, p. 226).

In 1423, in florence, Brunelleschi pretended to be sick and stopped all construction work on the cathedral, fearing that he might be replaced. This proved his leadership importance, as the master builders and workers were unable to continue without him, which was his intention. The tensions between Brunelleschi, who represented the new intellectual architectural profession, and the craftsmen, who followed the traditional

master mason practice, continued to rise. By 1434, when the cathedral's cupola was almost finished, Brunelleschi was imprisoned by the head of the stonemasons' guild for not paying his membership fees, even though he was not a member of the guild. Brunelleschi continuously purposely left gaps in his instructions to maintain control over the project and ensure his involvement, and most importantly its leadership. This was evident in his plan for Florence's cathedral in 1420, when he abruptly stopped providing instructions for building the dome, securing his position and preventing others from proceeding without him (Jolliffe & Crosby, 2023, p. 34).

Six hundred years after architects still uphold the same arrogance of authoritarian authorial leadership. A white-leadership complex. Or what Camilo Amaral in *Prince complex: Narcissism and reproduction of the architectural mirror*, notes, “an impulse of subjugating the other (a ‘prince complex’) is implicit in the way architecture transforms abstract machines into concrete forms, but also [reveals] how a narcissistic discipline reifies subjectivities to reproduce the field of architecture” (Amaral, 2016, p. 273). The hierarchization or leadership complex of the architect is imbricated through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination and sustained mainly through phallogocentrism, manual-intellectual division of labour, *sexual-racialized* division of labour, whiteness, authorship and professionalization. Fuck the *archē*! Not much has changed since Plato regarding the white *patiarchitecto*. Still a figure of authority, the *architektōn*, is a hierarchical figure in the building industry, commanding people how to live, other architects how to design, and also construction workers how to build, since architects only design, and arrogantly reproduce the manual-intellectual labour division. What constitutes architectural authority?

Alfredo Bonnano, draws the distinction between authority and power, as follows: authority refers to the ability of someone to command others to engage in specific actions. This concept assumes the presence of a power that enables this ability to give orders. Consequently, it is not always easy to differentiate between power and authority. Essentially, power comprises all the resources someone possesses to exercise authority, including the capacity to establish standards for both active and passive conduct (Bonanno, 2020, p. 21).

According to Deamer and Bernstein, there is a disconnection between architecture and the rest of the building industry, taking into account its points of pressure and possible technical connections. There is a lack of interest in discussing the production structure within architectural offices, which is also evident in the absence of discourse on the division of design labor in the overall building process. And, offer the following “path of professional development in architecture. From architecture's beginnings as a modern profession, in fact, its institutions have been interested in depicting the building process as organized around the concentrated allocation of functions with specific social actors. Since trades, contractors, and developers had a strong operative and decisional presence in such a process, a way had to be found to argue for the social necessity of the architect's role and to account for the actual spread of responsibilities without attaching it to a release of

expertise. Hence, authority on the subject of architecture had to be connected with authority over the operations of the building process. This could only happen by promoting, as John Soane famously did in the late eighteenth century, a principle of non-compatibility between the production of advice (i.e., design) and the production of goods (i.e., construction) and by concentrating the design function with architects insofar as they were professional” (Deamer & Bernstein, 2010, p. 120).

The authority of the architect and labour domination operates also at the scale of the architecture office, still some called studios or ateliers as some avant-garde geniuses like to name their working structures. The architecture office re/produces all the possible asymmetric powers of class, gender and race. Both in so-called colombia an méxico there are, still, architecture dynasties that have been reproducing themselves and their class power through architectural design, education and violent real estate speculation.¹⁴ Conventionally, “the structure of the architect’s office, mirroring the overall design-to-build trajectory, is divided vertically between master/partner/designer and production staff; staff then are further demarcated both vertically in relation to their proximity to the initial design concept and horizontally according to divisions of sequential specialization” (Deamer & Bernstein, 2010, p. 84). This structure, also depends on a high amount of unpaid labour, since architects do not consider themselves as workers, it has allowed for both an over-exploitation and under-organization of architectural workers, leading to precarious conditions.

As we have already mentioned, the obsession of architects for leadership and archetypes could be explained through the double meaning of *arkhé*, that as Malabou notes by way of Agamben, means both origin and principle / command and order (Malabou, 2024, p. 154). These two conditions seem to be inscribed in architectural labour and therefore in the production of the architect, who, situated through the colonial fact, always seeks his white origin and the impulse to command and create.

Manual-intellectual and sexual-racialized division of labour

*Como es domingo, Juan Albañil por la avenida
Va de paseo mirando cuánto construyó
Hoteles, condominios, cuánto lujo
Y ahora como no es socio, no puede entrar
Juan Albañil, no puede entrar, no puede entrar*

*Juan Albañil, hombre vecino
Cuánto ha soñado con la llamada igualdad
Juan Albañil pero dile a tus hijos*

Que en el cemento no hay porvenir

As it's Sunday, *Juan Albañil*⁵ along the avenue
He goes for a walk looking at how much he built
Hotels, condominiums, how much luxury
And now that he's not a partner, he can't go in.
Juan Albañil, he can't go in, he can't go in

Juan Albañil, neighbor man
How much he has dreamed with so-called equality
Juan Albañil but tell your children
That there is no future in cement

Juan Albañil - Cheo Feliciano - 1980

From Plato to Kostof passing through most contemporary architecture schools and professional associations, architecture defines itself by/for the manual-intellectual division of labour. Plato would say, “the reason is that every master-builder (*architektōn*) too is not *himself* engaged in work but is a ruler (*archōn*) of *workmen* (*ergatōn*)” (Plato, 2007, p. 429), and Aristotle would scream afterwards in chorus, “the architects (*architektonas*) in each *technē* are more honourable and know in a truer sense and are wiser (*sophōteros*) than the manual artisans (*cheirotechnōn*), because they know the causes of the things that are done” (Metaphysics 981a30-b2) (Aristotle, 1984, p. 446). This continues until today.

Today under the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*, this division is imbricated with the *sexual-racialized division of labour*, the *racism of the wage*, and the *patriarchy of wage* (Cuero, 2022) (Federici, 2021). The subordination of racialized women and men in construction labour, are both examples of how imbricated asymmetric power relations operate through class, race, sex-gender, in the building industry, putting the architect on the top of the design hierarchy.

Back to Kostof, he defines the architect as “conceivers of buildings. What they do is to design, that is, supply concrete images for a new structure so that it can be put up. The primary task of the architect, then as now [1977], is to communicate what proposed buildings should be and look like. The architect does not initiate buildings, nor necessarily take part in the physical act of construction. The architect's role is that of mediator between the client or patron” (Kostof, 1986, p. 6).

Territorial coloniality sustains the violent division of labour that characterizes the building industry, from indigenous peoples under the command of Martín Sepúlveda, proletarianized campesino people, peripheralized and impoverished workers under the command of real estate speculation to indigenous people building the so-called mayan train under the orders of the méxican army, Grupo Carso property of oligarch Carlos Slim and trans-national developers as China Communications Construction Group LTD (CCCC), spain's Acciona and portugal's Mota Engil, amongst others. Racialized and impoverished men do most manual labour of the building industry, while racialized and impoverished women are limited and excluded to cleaning labour at construction sites.

The *occultation of production*, as we have mentioned, by way of Spencer, Adorno and Marx, not only hides the labour conditions so that the products can be presented as commodities for consumption, concealing the process of production. "The work of building is of no concern to architects because the real work of architecture, as a commodity, is to positively express the abstract structures and concepts of neoliberal capitalism while mystifying its actual conditions of production" (Spencer, 2016, p. 74). But also conceals and sustains the imbrication of manual-intellectual and *class-sexualized-racialized* division of labour. That as noted, by way of the Hadid example (Wilson et al., 2015, p. 147), the labour conditions of construction workers attests the disposability of migrant and racialized bodies by the building industry, and how the architectural "conditions of labour are concealed so that the products of these can appear in the commodity form, as fetishized objects of consumption. As stages for the mass consumption of cultural production" (Spencer, 2016, p. 74). After all, not much has changed since Cicero and Vitruvius considered architecture as "one of the learned professions for which *men* of good birth and good education are best suited" (Briggs, 1927, p. 35) in (Sarfatti Larson, 2013, p. 3).

In Abya Yala the building industry is still characterized by small groups of workers with a conventional division of labour, manual tools, and reliance on mostly human labour. Many of these workers are paid wages below the minimum and are unable to secure employment in other industries due to structural limitations. Furthermore, they are unable to form unions due to their small numbers and short-term contracts. These conditions allow employers to exploit workers and generate high profits, which is why capital is so attracted to this sector. In cases where the process has taken on the characteristics of a large-scale industry, the direct worker is considered a worker with basic labour-rights. It is evident that, in both situations, the worker generates surplus labor that is acquired by others, and currently, the policies of neo-colonial capital development affect the worker (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 49).

Now, let us examine the role of the designer-architect in this process. The most common form of its activity is the control of production processes. As the designer of the work to be realized, and therefore as the one who predetermines the final form of the product. Or as the direct overseer of this progress, or as the enabler

of this dual activity. This general form takes various specific forms, depending on the relationship established with the “client” or owner of the capital invested in the realization of the work and/or the means of production.

1. Acting simply as a technical executive for the design and direction of the process, whether for private owners, capitalist owners, or the state, without the means of production. In this case, the architect is an indirect production worker, regardless of whether the salary is expressed as such or in the form of a commission. 2. If the architect owns the means of production and carries out and manages constructive processes for private owners, capitalist owners or the state; In this case, most often in the form of a fixed-price contract, the designer-builder not only directs the production process, but also appropriates a portion of the surplus value generated by the workers and the rest of the building. Leave it to the owner. Invested money capital and other parts of capital that participate in its realization as commodities. Clearly, when the architect is the owner of money-capital, the architect acts as a capitalist-owner and thus allocates to the distribution the amount of surplus-value corresponding to the capitalist-investors. If the architect is the owner of land, or commercializes the spatial product, its participation in the distribution of surplus value increases until appropriating its entirety, which is the case of current real estate-financial monopolies (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 50).

Architects “have a pathetic notion of design that isolates it from work. Architects design, constructors build; we do art, they do work” (Deamer, 2020a, p. 22). This division perpetuates the inability of architects to see themselves as workers.

A cautionary note on the recent discourse on intellectual labour, as Joan Ockman, underscores, “in architecture today, despite the proclaimed integration of all phases of the building process through high-tech management techniques, the rhetoric of immaterial production contributes to absolving architects from accountability to material bodies and places, not to mention provides an alibi from legal liability. [...] Certainly serious reflection on labor in architecture today must entail a recognition that buildings begin in both embodied and disembodied—material and immaterial production, not just in architects’ designs but also in raw materials from the ground and bodies on the construction site; and they also end there, in physical objects located in actual places as well as in images or ‘effects’ that enter into a cycle of future reproduction and commodification. Nor is the architect’s labor just a finite moment in this chain of production; it is implicated in both immediate and deferred ways at every stage of the building’s existence” (Ockman, 2015, pp. xxiii–xxiv).

Disabling professionals

The architect as most professional identities, are racist, sexist and classist categorizations, modes to comply and defend the authority complex proper of whiteness.

As we have seen, the beginnings of modern professionalism can be traced to the Italian Renaissance. In 1977, Kostof, argued he was “dealing with the profession of architecture, the specialized skill that is called upon to give shape to the environmental needs of others” (Kostof, 1986, p. 7). Also in 1977, Illich proposed naming the mid-twentieth century *The Age of Disabling Professions*—which continues to these days—, “an age when people had ‘problems,’ experts had ‘solutions’ and scientists measured imponderables such as ‘abilities’ and ‘needs’” (Illich et al., 2000, p. 11). Architecture is as disabling as a profession can be. Both in the 1977 text and an edited version of a talk given at the India International Centre on 13 February 1978, Illich takes architecture as one of the examples for his argument against professionalism. He denounces how “the professional dream of rooting each hierarchy of needs in the grassroots goes under the banner of self-help. At present it is promoted by the new tribe of experts in self-help who have replaced the international development experts of the sixties. The professionalization of laymen is their aim. U.S. experts in building who last autumn invaded Mexico serve as an example for the new crusade. [Around 1975], an M.I.T. professor of architecture came to Mexico for a vacation. A Mexican friend of [Illich] took him beyond the Airport where, during the last twelve years, a new city had grown up. From a few huts, it mushroomed into a community three times the size of Cambridge. [Illich’s] friend, also an architect, wanted to show the thousands of examples ‘of peasant ingenuity with patterns, structures and uses of refuse not in and therefore not derivable from textbooks. He should not have been surprised that his colleague took several hundred rolls of pictures of these brilliant inventions that make this two-million-person slum work. The pictures were analyzed in Cambridge; and by the end of the year, new-baked U.S. specialists in community architecture were busy teaching the people of Ciudad Netzahualcoyotl their problems, needs and solutions” (Illich et al., 2000, p. 37). Fuck us-aid! Fuck professional assistance!

As Illich noted in his 1984 speech to the Royal Institute of British Architects, inhabiting “is an activity that lies beyond the reach of the architect not only because it is a popular art; not only because it goes on and on in waves that escape *his* control; not only because it is of a tender complexity outside of the horizon of mere biologists and system analysts; but above all because no two communities dwell alike. Habit and habitat say almost the same. Each vernacular architecture (to use the anthropologist’s term) is a unique as vernacular speech. The art of living in its entirety—that is, the art of loving and dreaming, of suffering and dying — makes each lifestyle unique. And therefore this art is much too complex to be taught by the methods of a Comenius or Pestalozzi, by a schoolmaster or by TV. It is an art which can only be picked up. Each person becomes a vernacular builder and a vernacular speaker by growing up, by moving from on initiation to the next in becoming either a male or a female inhabitant. Therefore the Cartesian, three-dimensional, homogeneous space into which the architect builds, and the vernacular space which dwelling brings into existence, constitute different classes of space. Architects can do nothing but build. Vernacular dwellers generate the axioms of the spaces they inhabit” (Illich, 2014, p. 30).

Alicia Carrió notes by way of Illich and Herbert Spence, who explains that “professions had their origins in the power base that both feudal lords and organizations linked to the Church had over their subjects and followers. As these groups became economically independent, acquiring an inheritance or codifying their artisans’ craft or agricultural knowledge, they became special structures with their own ethics and moralities. These early forms of the transfer of knowledge have developed and determined new transmission structures.

In general terms we can say that the professions, such as we know them today, come from a long evolution where capitalism played a fundamental role, managing to mediate between artisans, small farmers, and day laborers. This evolution—not a peaceful one—begins between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, coinciding with European colonialist expansion; land privatization is implemented under the cover of wars and religious reform. But the concentration of knowledge into professions finds its foundational core in the mid-eighteenth century, when knowledge accumulated by artisans and laborers is investigated in a systematic way in order to be apprehended and, subsequently, mechanized for the Industrial Revolution. This removes the intervening role of specialized collaborators, a financial burden that allows for subsequent capitalist development, to the detriment of workers’ and craftsmen’s creativity and autonomy. It is in the course of these battles, waged between the power of industrialization and the slave, servant, or employee—depending on the time period—that the systematization of knowledge begins to appear.

As the objectification of these skills and knowledge sets occurred, the possibility of reproduction and accumulation excluded their original holders and introduced another type of agent who mediates the chain of production. Those considered today as professionals benefitted from this process and, investigating, fragmenting, and decoding this knowledge, made it their own. This process finds social and academic consideration in the universities, gradually organized to become mechanisms for the standardized production of experts who made available a ‘naturalization’ of knowledge.

When intermediation occurs in the course of capitalist accumulation, each party introduces the rules that legitimize them, taking control of the processes of fragmentation, coding, regulations, and protocols (relying on an increased incidence of experts, specialists, and intermediaries without whose legalized intervention the system would not hold up) that produce a lack of autonomy and allow enormous resources to escape from the hands of the ‘customer, consumer, patient.’

Illich, makes an interesting tour through this process:

‘Unlike yesterday’s liberal professions that provided the ethical backing for high status hawkers, the new dominant professions claim control over human needs, tout court. They turn the modern state into a holding corporation of enterprises which facilitates the operation of their self-certified own competences: equal needs are laid on the citizen/client, only to be fulfilled in a zero-sum game’” (Illich et al., 2000, p. 37) in (Carrió, 2015, pp. 172–173).

Bonanno, argues that anyone “who goes to the doctor and follows prescriptions, anyone who entrusts themselves to an architect for the design of a bridge or house or any other situation, delegates its autonomy into the hands of another person who is technically more skilled than, in its place, certain decisions: but this delegation of ours must always be revocable according to the turn of events and the proposals of the one to whom we have delegated. For an autonomous human there are no decisions of others that can take the form of ‘orders’: hence the conflict between autonomy and authority” (Bonanno, 2020, p. 21).

The professionalization of the architect came also with the institutionalization of the architecture office, as we have seen through the history of *l'Administration des Bâtiments Royaux*—The Royal Building Administration—, and today a structure “divided vertically between master/partner/designer and production staff; staff then are further demarcated both vertically in relation to their proximity to the initial design concept and horizontally according to divisions of sequential specialization” (Deamer & Bernstein, 2010, p. 84).

We have seen also the close relation between the professional architect and state power. As “a ‘client,’ the state acts in three particular ways:

- As a capitalist by appropriating the unpaid labor of construction workers. This is the case of the construction of so-called ‘social housing,’ in which case it assumes the multiple role of industrial, commercial and financial capitalist and rentier. Whether it uses the surplus value in the form of profit or interest, to deliver it to the builder, to pay the bureaucracy at his service or to ‘capitalize’ it, the only certainty is that it is the fruit of the exploitation of the worker. It acts in a similar way when it makes investments in public services, which will be sold to the users in ‘comfortable monthly installments’ that simultaneously include the profit of the invested capital, the interests of such capital and the rent of the occupied land. It is not by chance that public services are made profitable.

- As a general manager of society for the benefit of the interests of capital. By investing the funds from the taxation of all social agents (State budget) in infrastructure works and public services ‘necessary for economic development,’ it carries out a reverse redistribution of income, that is, it collaborates with the process of capitalist accumulation, since these works—‘general conditions of production and circulation,’ such as roads, aqueducts, sources of electric energy, etc., not assumed by the individual capitalists, not assumed by individual capitalists because of their low rentability, are indispensable for the process of reproduction of capital and benefit it as a whole. While for capital they are means of valorization and reproduction, for the wage-earner they mean a further reduction of his wages.

- As an instrument of the reproduction of the social relations of production (in particular of property relations) and of class domination, when its ‘commissions’ refer to works such as schools, colleges, official buildings, barracks, etc. Architectural and urban objects-works assume a double inseparable character: that of the seat of the repressive or ideological apparatuses through which the State dominates society in the name of

capital and reproduces its ideology, on the one hand, and on the other, means of life (education, health, culture, etc.) for the maintenance and reproduction of the labor force of the working class, the employees and even the bourgeoisie itself, which the state deducts not from the profit of the capitalists, since they contribute to its increase, but from the wages of the workers themselves, thus making them pay the cost of the means that ensure their own enslavement” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 52).

The genius individual author

“[T]o make something that appears to be convenient for use, and that can without doubt be afforded and built as projected, is the job not of the architect but of the *workman*. But to preconceive and to determine in the mind and with judgement something that will be perfect and complete in its every part is the achievement of such a mind as we seek” (Alberti, 1988, pp. ix–10).

“First of all, discourses are objects of appropriation” (Foucault, 1984, p. 108).

“What difference does it make who is speaking?” (Foucault, 1984, p. 120).

“Among the myths that appear central to the development and maintenance of the discipline of architecture from its modern beginnings is the notion of authorship. From the fifteenth century architects have staked their claims, defended their territories and maintained their status through arguments modulated around subtly changing notions of authorship and intention. [...] If architects claim to be authors, one might ask, first, exactly what are they authoring? [...] Who is to be identified with the role of authoring in architecture—and who is excluded from such an account? This is to consider the challenges that exist to the hegemony of architects in the fashioning of the built environment. [...] From Leon Battista Alberti to Cedric Price, architectural figures and the debates and theories that surround them oscillate around paradoxes and ambiguities that emerge from the projection of the 'classical' model that produces a link between a work and an 'authorial' creator. [...] The author is a construction produced out of the work as vice versa” (Anstey et al., 2007, pp. 6–9).

“The concept of authorship in architecture has always been tied to questions of architectural responsibility, but since the beginning of modernity, it increasingly raises issues of copyright, and underlines a blind quest for originality, somewhat shifting the emphasis from the work and its appropriateness to the individuality of the creative mind” (Pelletier, 2007, p. 92). “Since the Renaissance, and certainly since the

Enlightenment, the concept of invention has been associated with the idea of rupture, a breaking away from traditions or conventions and their forms and practices. [...] Invention denotes the moment when the supposed 'genius' of the architect-artist comes to the surface, when new expressions or solutions appear suddenly, without earlier announcement (Avermaete et al., 2007, p. 2).

"The author is a modern figure, a product of our society insofar as, emerging from the Middle Ages with English empiricism, French rationalism and the personal faith of the Reformation, it discovered the prestige of the individual, of, as it is more nobly put, the 'human person.' It is thus logical that in literature it should be this positivism, the epitome and culmination of capitalist ideology, which has attached the greatest importance to the 'person' of the author" (Barthes, 1977, p. 142).

"The very term *auctor*—from which *author* is derived—was very late to garner the connotations of originality with which it is today (dis)credited. Of the four terms from which *auctor* is held to derive, the three Latin verbs do not imply any sense of textual mastery. *Agere*, 'to act or perform,' is close to the Medieval Barthesian ideas of the scriptor as acting through a text which in some sense precedes its performance, *augere*, 'to grow,' for all its organicist resonances, does not suggest that the text originates with its author. *Auieo*, 'to tie,' derived from the poetic lexicon and referred to the connective tissue—metre, feet, etc.—by which poets such as Virgil structure their verses—in which regard it is more pre-figurative of the structuralist notions of bricolage and authors as assemblers of codes than the concept of author as a creative potency. Only the fourth root, the Greek noun *authentim*, 'authority,' is suggestive of authorship as hegemonic, and even here the idea of authority is entirely remote from that of in the first instance from their relation to tradition and ultimately from canon. If the Medieval view of the book could be unanchored from its theological moorings, it is unlikely that anti-authorial theories would find much to contest in this structural placement of the author" (Burke, 2019, p. xvii)

"The coming into being of the notion of 'author' constitutes the privileged moment of individualization in the history of ideas, knowledge, literature, philosophy, and the sciences. [...] It would be worth examining how the author became individualized in a culture like ours, what status it has been given, at what moment studies of authenticity and attribution began, in what kind of system of valorization the author was involved, at what point we began to recount the lives of authors rather than of heroes, and how this fundamental category of 'the man and his work criticism' began" (Foucault, 1984, p. 101).

"Prior to the nineteenth century, the author was defined less in terms of the individual who held most control over the end product than in the mind that generated the intention for a project. Consequently, the author of a medieval cathedral was more likely to be identified with the patron who ordered the construction than with the Master Mason who supervised the construction. In the Renaissance, with the development of tools of representation, the process by which an idea was conveyed—through drawings and their translation—became a determining factor. The architect, through his ability to convey the intention of a project, was

considered the true author of a building even if the process of construction was delegated to a third party” (Pelletier, 2007, p. 97).

“As it emerged historically, therefore, the notion of the authorial work appeared to bind production to the individual creator, suggesting that there is something of the 'self' in the work—the work becomes in some sense the 'property' of the creator. And it is worth noting, in this respect, that the patriarchal notion of an author 'fathering' his text, rather as God purportedly 'fathered' the world, has been an enduring myth in Western literary thought, metaphorically linking the male author with the authority of writer, deity, *paterfamilias*” (Anstey et al., 2007, p. 9).

According to Mario Carpo, “the modern history of architecture as an authorial art began with a building, Brunelleschi’s dome for the cathedral of Florence; but the new definition of architecture’s allographic and notational status came into being only with Leon Battista Alberti’s theory and his treatise, *De re aedificatoria*” (Carpo, 2011, p. 71). “Alberti claims that there is a structural distinction between the building as physical object, over which the builder rules, and the building as idea, which is the architect’s province and it becomes clear that architects do not 'make' buildings; they make representations of buildings” (Anstey, 2007, p. 20). “Alberti asserts the presence in the phenomenal object of a single persuasive, this quality is distinct from the building’s physical presence, and its existence is evidence of the will and mind of a—single— ‘creator.’ The architect as author/artist has arrived.” (Anstey, 2007, p. 19). “According to Alberti an architect may claim an authorial link to a work, but not necessarily an authoritative one” (Anstey, 2007, p. 19). “An original, autographic work—for example, a painting made and signed by the artist’s hand—is the unmediated making of its author. But in the Albertian, allographic way of building the only work truly made by the author is the design of the building—not the building itself, which by definition is made by others” (Carpo, 2011, p. 22). “A building and its design can only be notationally identical: their identity depends on a notational system that determines how to translate one into the other. When this condition of notational identity is satisfied, the author of the drawing becomes the author of the building, and the architect can claim some form of ownership over a building which in most cases he does not in fact own, and which he certainly did not build—indeed, which he may never even have touched. The transition from Brunelleschi’s artisanal authorship—‘this building is mine because I made it’—to Alberti’s intellectual authorship—‘this building is mine because I designed it’” (Carpo, 2011, p. 23). “Two instances of identity were crucial to the shaping of architectural modernity. The first was Alberti’s invention of architectural design. In Alberti’s theory, as mentioned previously, a building is the identical copy of the architect’s design; with Alberti’s separation in principle between design and making came the modern definition of the architect as an author, in the humanistic sense of the term. After Alberti’s cultural revolution, the second wave of identical copies in architecture came with the industrial revolution, and the mass production of identical copies from mechanical master models, matrixes, imprints, or molds” (Carpo,

2011, p. x). “Thanks to the cultural and technical logic of mechanical replication, authorship was extended from the author’s original to all identical copies of it” (Carpo, 2011, p. 25).

“The Albertian definition of the architect as a figure produces a tendency to read architectural intention primarily through an analysis of the architectural ‘work’—whether built or otherwise. This reading of architecture introduced habits that can appear long-lived in architectural history and criticism. Once intention must be read in projected buildings the habit of reading works of architecture as objects—like pieces of art, things with discreet beginnings and ending points—becomes established. [...] Alberti created an important equivalence between the architect and the ‘work’ in that he attributes to both a similar responsibility to define their places in the world through persuasion. Taken to its logical conclusion, this double responsibility created space in architectural discourse for a final notion that was to re-emerge during the late twentieth century—that of context” (Anstey, 2007, p. 20).

“A certain number of notions that are intended to replace the privileged position of the author actually seem to preserve that privilege and suppress the real meaning of his disappearance. The first is the idea of the work. What is a work? What is this curious unity which we designate as a work? Of what elements is it composed?” (Foucault, 1984, p. 103). Is it not what an architect has composed? “The word work and the unity that it designates are probably as problematic as the status of the author’s individuality” (Foucault, 1984, p. 104).

Patriarchitecture

The imbrication of patriarchy-capitalist colonial domination sustains architectural labour. And in turn architecture spatializes patriarchal-capitalist colonial domination. Drawing a genealogy of architecture and patriarchy would entail the whole of architecture’s history. The patriarchy of architecture is rooted through Alberti to Le Corbusier, Rogelio Salmons, or even recent women architects as Zaha Hadid, which is why it is important to differentiate patriarchy as a system of structural oppression to hegemonic masculinity as a modality of male socialization. Patriarchy and architecture are so entrenched that to talk about anti-patriarchal architecture seems an oxymoron.

A specter haunts anti-patriarchal praxis: the phantom of inclusive white-feminism. Recently this discussion was stirred when some women architects reclaimed netflix why there was no female representation in the series *arquitectura maestros* produced initially by Fundación Arquia, which interviewed 14 “masters,” of course all white-men. What were they expecting from the white-patriarch north? At least inclusion?

Mainstream white architectural feminism is a reactive movement, one that looks for a place at the table, to be included, a piece of power, to be the next patriarchitect commanding at the office and construction-

sites, to be the next pritzker and golden lioness. But some have been mobilizing a critique both to architecture and feminism—as white colonial technologies—, through anti-patriarchal material-discursive practices situated in Abya Yala, from communitarian feminism, autonomous black-caribbean feminism, indigenous epistemologies, to anarchist feminism. Rather than looking for inclusion and representation, anti-patriarchal practices are compelled to co-move beyond-against and beyond the imbrication of patriarchy-capitalist colonial domination, in order to imagine and practice here and now other modes of inhabiting and trans-forming the territory. As Mariana Ordoñez, Jesica Amescua and Ximena Ríos, underscore in *Actos de dominación y violencia patriarcal desde la arquitectura*, for them “it is not enough to ask for recognition and equal pay in our profession. [Women] must ask [themselves] how to break, from within architectural practice, with the violence that is exercised on other women, their families and their territories. This is why it is urgent to rethink together, collectively, congruently and ethically, the ways of managing, designing and producing our habitat” (Ordoñez et al., 2021).

Ordoñez, Amescua and Ríos (Ordoñez et al., 2021), put forward, four modes of patriarchal domination and violence re/produced by architecture: epistemic violence, economic violence, environmental violence and institutional violence. Although their text is focused on the patriarchal violence’s against women, compelled to a *trans-* critique and *fugitive hope* of blackness, mobilized by Bey, we would argue that the category of women falls short. As Bey notes, under the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, “men” as an identity as “women” “should also be in quotes.” “‘Woman,’ categorically, is also a violence. Not of the same register and tenor of ‘man,’ sure, but a violence nonetheless” (Bey, 2022, p. 91). In other words, if we are committed to co-move beyond-against and beyond the patriarchal-colonial regime of cis-heteronormativity, appealing to the category of women falls short, we should be “reaching for something else” (Bey, 2022, p. 110).

Hence, we co-move by way of Ordoñez, Amescua and Ríos’ four modes of patriarchal domination and violence re/produced by architecture: epistemic violence, economic violence, environmental violence and institutional violence, but we argue, these are not solely against *women*, as it stands by/for a white-colonial gender, instead these violence’s are against *anybody* that does not comply with white-cis-hetero-masculinity, with *men*. With this movement, we are of course not dismissing the violence that historically bodies gendered as women have gone through, not at all. We acknowledge these violence’s and honor the struggles against, but suggest that in order to co-move beyond the patriarchal-colonial regime of cis-heteronormativity, as Bey, even the category of women has to be problematized. Because women as a social category, proper of whiteness, as the indigenous and black experience under racist-coloniality has emphasized, they “were animalized, considered beasts of burden and non-human, and who did not carry the status of femininity” (Cuero, 2022, p. 18).

Ordoñez, Amescua and Ríos, argue that the concept of epistemic violence encompasses various ways in which violence is enacted in relation to the creation, dissemination, and acknowledgment of knowledge. This

includes denying certain people the ability to exercise their own knowledge and exploiting their intellectual resources without recognition. It also involves objectifying people and engaging in other forms of violence. Examples of this can be seen in marginalizing people's knowledge in the management, design, and production of habitat by only validating knowledge generated in dominant academic and professional spaces, thus perpetuating racism and colonialism. Additionally, it involves appropriating the multidimensional knowledge produced by women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity and engaging in epistemic extractivism. Lastly, it involves rendering invisible the knowledge, trade, and time contributed by all women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity involved in habitat production, using individual authorship and recognition as a means of control.

Environmental violence against women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity refers to any action or neglect that hinders or restricts their life by causing harm to the environment. This harm affects various aspects of their lives, such as their quality of life, integrity, health, economy, work, heritage, and culture. The violence is caused by human activities. It involves denying their possibility to participate, design, manage, produce, and make decisions about their living environment in both urban and rural areas. In indigenous communities, this type of violence is constantly exercised to weaken their self-determination. The exploitation of the land and the endangerment of natural resources that sustain the lives of women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity, their families, and their communities are examples of how environmental and epistemic violence is exerted through architecture. For instance, the construction of standardized housing prototypes can cause environmental harm and impose predetermined ways of living on women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity, treating them as objects of intervention without acknowledging their knowledge and abilities to manage their territories. This ultimately denies their possibility to at least a suitable habitat.

Economic violence refers to actions or omissions that impact the economy and livelihoods of women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity. It involves the use of money to undermine and dominate their lives. For instance, economic violence can occur when they are denied access to basic necessities such as food, clothing, recreation, decent housing, and healthcare. These forms of violence restrict their autonomy and economic independence. Additionally, economic violence includes the destruction of natural resources that support economic activities. It encompasses acts that hinder women's and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity food self-sufficiency and jeopardize biodiversity. Furthermore, economic violence is present when large-scale projects and architectural developments impose a capitalist and developmental economic model, displacing them from their lands and endangering their subsistence. This type of violence also involves the introduction of technologies that undermine local trades and production chains.

How is the exercise of environmental and economic violence manifested in architecture? Ordoñez, Amescua and Ríos, explain that it is seen through the implementation of megaprojects and architectural initiatives that endorse the concept of “development” based on patriarchal, colonial, and extractivist ideals, thereby endangering the natural environment of women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity, and their communities. Although these projects claim to create local employment opportunities and enhance the economy, they actually foster exploitative conditions and give rise to social and health conflicts. Another evident form of this violence is the use of inadequate and out-of-context “green technology,” which only serves to enrich a select few individuals, essentially promoting a form of “green capitalism.”

Institutional violence refers to the actions or lack of actions by public servants at any level of government that discriminate against women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity or aim to delay, hinder, or prevent their enjoyment and exercise their life capacities. This violence also includes preventing access to public policies that aim to prevent, address, investigate, punish, and eradicate various forms of violence. - The implementation of institutional programs that promote inadequate forms of housing that only benefit the economic, political, and quantitative interests of powerful groups, without considering the criteria for suitable housing or quality of life. - The enforcement of regulations and norms in construction that disregard the technical, construction, and territorial knowledge held by women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity, and their communities.

How is economic and institutional violence exercised from architecture? The possibility to adequate housing is affected when housing is commodified and institutional programs and public policies that promote uninhabitable spaces as homes are implemented, privileging quantitative and economic indicators over people's quality of life. Furthermore, in so-called México women face significant economic challenges with respect to property ownership in urban areas, as they only own 35.5% of the homes in so-called México, which leads to a vicious circle of violence and economic dependence. In addition, there are construction rules and regulations that hinder the use of local materials and traditional construction systems, which forces women and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity from indigenous communities to use industrialized materials that increase the cost of their homes and accelerate the loss of construction cultures.

How is institutional and epistemic violence exerted through architecture? This is accomplished by imposing projects that exclude people (and their knowledge), thereby depriving them of the opportunity to participate in decision-making. It is crucial to highlight that consultation, also referred to as “false participation,” serves to validate pre-determined projects and decisions made by political and economic power entities. In these scenarios, women, and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity, their families, and communities are denied the chance to share knowledge, ideas, experiences, and aspirations (Ordoñez et al., 2021).

If as we have noted, following Claudia von Werlhof we understand patriarchy as those relations of domination and violence that structure and organize both the socio-ecological relations and the production of our habitat, towards the separation of all forms-of-life, through the civilizing project that yearns, as von Werlhof argues, to divest from the mother and become independent from nature. Then, it is through architecture, through the *architecture-based mode of inhabitation*, that patriarchy pushes towards the rupture with the territory and the multifarious modes of living. Through architectural alienation, in other words, how architecture estranges the collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world, and constructs *the architectural world*. By monopolizing and capturing the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation and existence.

Petite bourgeoisie laments: the architect as artist

As Pradilla and Jiménez poignantly underscore, “although clarifying whether or not the designer-architect is an ‘artist’ adds little to the characterization of design as a social practice, we will dwell on it for a moment, since it is of such concern to bourgeois humanism and to designers eager to feel like ‘artists’” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 40).

The discussion of whether architecture is an art or a technique has been a constant in the history of professional architecture. The ideological conception of architecture—design at large—as art, “is, perhaps, the oldest and the one that has the largest number of systematizers and disseminators; ‘art historians’ who include in their works extensive chapters on the architecture of each ‘historical-stylistic’ period, without even worrying about the radical transformations suffered by this social practice in the different modes of production; the ‘famous architects when they explain the greatness and vicissitudes of their work or ‘theorize’ about it (Le Corbusier, Gropius, Wright, etc.); or the ‘theoreticians’ and ‘historians’ of architecture (Zevi, Whitcover, Gregotti, etc.). ; or the ‘theorists’ and ‘historians’ of architecture (Zevi, Whitcover, Gregotti, etc.). What do they mean when they say ‘art’? As Hadjinicolaou affirms, ‘Art does not exist (...) , to speak of Art is proper to bourgeois aesthetic ideology. Art does not exist: what exists are various types of production, such as the production of images, musical production, etc.’ (Hadjinicolaou, 1999). Although it is not defined, it would seem that ‘art-architecture’ is identified with the production of images, sort of huge hollow sculptures ‘enclosing’ a ‘space.’ We will refer to this identification on the assumption that the supposed ‘aesthetic of space’ is a purely ideological representation, insofar as the object ‘space’ is” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 39).

“For Freud, in the ‘artist’ the ‘pleasure principle’ prevails over the ‘reality principle’ or in other words, the tendency to playful activity that provides immediate enjoyment dominates over the tendency to submit the work of the unconscious to the code of socially useful work.

In the designer, the relationship is reversed.

In capitalist society, and even in other forms of society, the individual or social demand pre-exists the work, the design that prefigures it, and even the designer; it is the designer that justifies and determines it. Whether it comes from the State—collective consumption, headquarters of its administrative, repressive or ideological apparatuses—, from the individual consumer—housing as a value for personal use—, from the factory, commercial premises or head office, etc., from the real estate capitalist—works for rent or commercial exchange—, or from the industrial producer—design of objects for mass production—, this demand refers to useful objects whose components and characteristics are defined outside the mind of the designer. The creative will and the prefigured form are determined, and not in just any way, by the object's utility code. But this is neither the only nor the most important form of determination: ‘creative will’ and ‘created form’ are simultaneously determined by the social relations of production (types of property, forms of appropriation of production), by those of exchange and by the level of development of the productive forces (materials, processes of production of the object, labor force), determinations coming from the economic structure and not from the ideological superstructure, as in the case of the production of images, literary or musical, called ‘artistic.’

In the act of design, society requires the individual to perform an activity as part of the social division of labor that is specific to it, and performs it not by its ‘free will,’ but by the coercion that society imposes. ‘Enjoyment,’ if it exists, will come from the satisfaction of its subsistence needs ensured by its activity and, as we will see later, from the materialization of its design, which is not properly due to its work” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 40).

Just as art does not exist, architecture does not exist, to speak of architecture is proper to bourgeois aesthetic-spatial ideology. Architecture does not exist: what exists are diverse modes of placemaking and territorial trans-formation. Yet architecture is constantly and violently imposed in the world.

Today, the art and artist discussion is mainly mobilized through, what we have seen already regarding, the rhetoric of creativity and the creative and cultural industries, creative governmentality at large.

The venerable calling and labour reluctance

“‘Architecture isn’t a career, it is a calling!’ What? How had we fallen into the same ideology that Christianity used to make the poor feel blessed for their poverty? How

could architecture have become so completely deaf to the labor discourse that it could so unselfconsciously subscribe to the honor of labor exploitation?” (Deamer, 2015a, p. xxix).

Supposedly, the only previous attempt before 1977—argues Kostof—to write a history of the architect, had been written in 1927, from the previous empire, M. S. Briggs's *The Architect in History*, a member of the, Royal Institute of British Architects. A new book on the history the architect needed to be written, now from the bowels of the new empire, USA. A global thanks for this white-imperial effort.

Architects have edited entire books in order to ease the doubt of the venerable calling. That is the case of the already mentioned *The Architect: chapters in the history of the profession*, edited in 1977 by Kostof, who dedicated a course in 1974 at UC Berkeley, since “as historians they could help to focus the differences between confident establishment and doubt-ridden neophytes in the way of our own discipline—a look at the past. The course was the first step.” The book came out, as Kostof notes in the introduction, out of the classroom. Because, “since the heady sixties, students of architecture at Berkeley, as in other schools around the country, had been grappling with doubts about the relevance of their venerable calling,” to be architects, “conceivers of buildings.” The book, was not concerned with “vernacular architecture” or “anonymous architecture,” like “the great majority of buildings,” which are the result of efforts from “people who decide to build, settle for the common look of the community, and produce buildings in the accepted local way.” No. The book was meant to ease the doubts about the relevance of the venerable calling to be architects, it dealt with “with the profession of architecture, the specialized skill that is called upon to give shape to the environmental needs of others” (Kostof, 1986, pp. vi–vii). Let’s repeat, the disabling “profession of architecture, the specialized skill that is called upon to give shape to the environmental needs of others.”

The liberal concepts of authorship, genius and artist coupled with the notions of vocation and calling of the protestant work ethic, sustain the architect’s labour reluctance, what Deamer calls architecture’s work-aphasia (Deamer, 2016a) (Deamer, 2020a). “At the heart of the Protestant work ethic is the command to approach one’s work as if it were a calling” Kathi Weeks points to the “irrationality of our commitment to work as if it were a calling. [...] This ‘peculiar idea’ of one’s duty in a calling, ‘so familiar to us to-day, but in reality so little a matter of course’ has settled into the cultural fabric, making it difficult to grasp on its own terms” (Weeks, 2011, p. 42). Architects respond first to their venerable calling, lack labour consciousness and consider themselves some kind of creative genius, not subjected by labour coercion and respond to a higher calling to design beautiful spatial commodities.

Deamer, argues that, “not only does theory have a huge role to play in addressing our labor-aphasia, but also it must convince architects that we are not ‘other’ to the society of users, owners, developers we serve; we don’t merely hand over our gifts of a better world to these people, we operate in that world, one that unites

us by work. Until we identify as workers, we can't identify with other workers—the rest of the world. Part of our theoretical work then is to persuade architects that 'designing' rather than 'following a calling' is a job and as such is not pathetic, dull, or unimaginative but socially grounded" (Deamer, 2016a, p. 34).

"Architectural practice has ignored the fact that it is a site of structured production analogous to other forms of production. This ignorance is partly the result of the schizophrenia regarding the type of producers architects are. We think of ourselves as 'piece' laborers relying on the sale of individual goods even as we increasingly recognize that we produce, like doctors and lawyers, services. Feeling equally in and out of place in either mode, we ignore the issue of structuring architectural labor altogether. For those trained in assigning singular value to the aesthetics of the object, it is an adjustment to assign creative thought to the efficacy of process" (Deamer, 2011, p. 160).

Deamer, narrates an anecdote at a symposium, "a young audience member asked the distinguished panelists what she could expect from a career in architecture. One of the panelists answered fervently: 'Architecture is not a career. It is a calling!' For a profession that seems to have it all—architects' creativity, unlike artists, is professionally sanctioned; we make things that matter to the world—how could we be victims of the same capitalist ideology which, in the form of Christianity, asks the poor to feel righteous about their poverty? [Deamer's] first answer is—we don't believe we do work. We go to the office, we get a paycheck, but what we do is not work. We know we are producing an object (indeed, a big one) but we don't like to think that we produce a 'commodity.' We compare ourselves to doctors and lawyers but believe our work is too creative and culturally significant to be properly filed under 'service sector.' Consequently, we fail to conceptualize our work as work" (Deamer, 2020a, p. 22).

"The fact that we are the last discipline to come to any understanding of labor might be an indication that capitalist ideology has worked particularly hard to suppress our potential, potent value as caretakers of the constructed world. It scares to think this because it plays into an idea of disciplinary exceptionalism which has been architecture's excuse to look away from labor" (Deamer, 2020b, p. 16).

"While the division between design and construction has existed since the Renaissance, work-aphasia, and the unhappiness it causes, has not. Between the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution, drawings produced by the architect were intentionally incomplete to allow for the input of the constructor's craft. The drawings described the effect to be achieved and were considered objects of beauty in their own right. During the Industrial Revolution, when craft in construction was at risk of being spread out over a number of trades, architects and craftsmen together fought the effects of the division of labor by turning to the interior as the provenance of synthesized design and industrially produced craft. In the 20th century, in keeping with the (popular?) turn in economic concern from production to consumption, architects saw themselves as producing not just the modern, clean, unsentimental building but the modern, healthy, unsentimental citizen. While this

concern for the client as opposed to the constructor/laborer was initially ethical and public in nature, it quickly became practical and private as architects aimed to please their clients, not educate them. The architect's social concern, having shifted from builder to owner/user, disappeared altogether" (Deamer, 2020a, p. 33).

It falls outside the scope of this research, but it is important to note the perverse relation between universities, student and professional associations, in order to sustain professional precarization and architecture's work-aphasia. Just to mention three cases we could talk about two student associations; CESCA—*Colectivo de Estudiantes de la Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos*, Colombian Society of Architects Student Collective—in so-called colombia; and, CLEA—*Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Estudiantes de Arquitectura*, Latin American Coordination of Architecture Students—throughout so-called latino américa; and one professional association: SCA—*Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos*—Colombian Society of Architects—in so-called colombia.

In both student associations, as cogs between vocational education and abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour, all the set of privileges and violence's are articulated, and students, soon to be architecture's willing workers, are modulated into believing their work at the associations is not abstract labour, but some kind of altruistic activism outside of the logics of capital for the better advancement of the discipline and profession ultimately. But, when precarization is confused with altruism, it is a symptom of architecture's labour aphasia, it is modulated at the uni-versity through the violence of un-paid internships and later through student associations which are fundamental to articulate this lack of labor consciousness. To the point that self-precarization is normalized with the excuse of a major call to rescue/reform architecture and is used as an excuse to precarize others.

SCA, as a professional association, also does its homework in this crusade against labour consciousness. In 2023 after the 38th National Congress of Architecture and Urbanism, SCA released the *Manifiesto, Lecciones invaluable que resaltan la arquitectura como una fuerza más allá de una profesión*, Invaluable lessons that highlight architecture as a force beyond a profession. The manifesto holds two absurd architectural believes, one, that architecture can change the world and two, that architecture is not labour, not even a profession, it is more than a profession. It is a "transforming force that shapes the environment and people's lives through good practices that drive projects that promote quality and social well-being [...] consuming the territory, is the challenge" (SCA, 2023, p. 6). "It is urgent and necessary to recover the value of architecture in the construction of the city" (SCA, 2023, p. 7). Or as the SCA president Silvia María Mendoza Marzola says "architecture is more than a profession; it is a responsibility to society. We are committed to building a better future, creating spaces that improve the quality of life, strengthen social cohesion and are accessible to all. Our architecture is approachable, understandable, conscious and welcoming. Together, we create an environment where everyone can thrive and live more fully" (SCA, 2023, p. 8). We do not know in what fantasy world architects or architecture are doing all that. The SCA fantasy.

Through the usual lament of the loss of the value and role of architecture and architects, and the insistence that “architecture is more than a profession,” it is a “transforming force that shapes the environment and people's lives” and “a responsibility to society,” SCA promotes and sustains architect's labour aphasia. CESCA, CLEA and SCA are important cogs between the discipline and the profession, how each mobilize all the precariousness, violence, privileges and desires of the neo-liberal architect. But, above all, as institutions that ensure class privileges of the white-mestizo bourgeoisie.

Professional and disciplinary authority are well safeguarded in so-called México by the *Colegios* and *La Academia Nacional de Arquitectura*, “representing the legitimate and superior interests of the architectural profession.” At the local scale, the *Colegio de Arquitectos de la Ciudad de México* has as its mission “to be guarantors of the correct practice of the profession, and support and backing for the architects who are members of the *Colegio* in the different activities of the development of the profession. To promote and encourage best practices in the practice of the profession, in addition to being the authorized link with the authorities of Ciudad de México, for the discussion and analysis of the issues of the City related to professional activity. And to be an indisputable support for society. Always representing the legitimate and superior interests of the architectural profession” (CAM•SAM, 2023). And *La Academia Nacional de Arquitectura*, at the national scale, has as its mission “research, record, catalog, give opinions, defend, intervene and disseminate relevant works of architecture, neighborhoods, cities, monuments and natural landscape, from *pre-columbian* times to the present day” (La Academia, 2023). Architects need not worry, the disabling professional power of the white authority complex, the legitimate and superior interests of the architectural profession are well represented, just as its disciplinary power is well defended. Fear not, class privileges of the white-mestizo mexican bourgeoisie are well ensured.

Re/producing the neo-liberal architect

“I grasp my narcissism with both hands and I turn my back on the degradation of those who would make *man* a mere mechanism” (Fanon, 2008, p. 12)

“Architects are workers before they are entrepreneurs” (Frichot & Runting, 2016, p. 238)

In a recent lecture, *Tectonism: Architecture for the 21st Century*, tec(hno)to-architect Patrick Schumacher, the *leader* of parametricism and tectonism—one of whiteness' latest formal experiments—argued that “Parametricism/tectonism has a uni-versal scope, it encompasses the whole of the built environment and the world of artefacts, i.e. the totality of the human phenomenal world—physical and virtual—of the XXI century civilization (excepting only the residual raw nature that plays no role in structuring social interactions).”

It has an “exclusive competency: architecture and the design disciplines—from urban design and landscape design to interior-, product-, fashion-, and graphic/web/interface design—hold exclusive sway over the perceptual world (conceived as user experience), i.e. all production decisions with regard to the perceptual and interactual aspects of this *man*-made world (only excepting the residual vernacular environments at the margins of world society) are channeled through the needle's eye of our global design discourse” (Schumacher, 2023). Schumacher might be an easy catch to problematize the imbrication of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination with architecture, but we find this case very telling, because there is no mask (well... he was just wearing, for an inside lecture, some ridiculous sunglasses as if arriving from a 48-hour techno rave). Today architects try to wear all the possible masks of equality, justice and inclusion. But here is this patriarchitect-meta-theorist, distilling all his racism, sexism and classism, without any mask. This is not architecture gone wild. This is architecture unmasked. The violent uni-versal neo-liberal white-bourgeois ideology of design at its best.

As Pradilla and Jiménez say, these brief notes do not intend to solve a problem; they simply seek to raise it, and keenly underscore that “all of us who work in the field of design—architecture, urbanism, regional and urban planning, etc.—, represent our own practice differently: we are ‘scientists,’ ‘artists,’ ‘neutral technicians,’ ‘agents of development,’ ‘instruments of social change,’ etc. This is what we were taught at school, it is what we are told every day, and we, besides believing it, spread and reproduce this self-definition. It would seem as if these adjectives have the miraculous power of calming our conscience, by assigning us an honorable role in the ‘underdeveloped’ society. What we intend here is to unmask these mystifications, to criticize this ideology of design and to demonstrate that our technical practice is an instrument at the service of capital in its task of exploitation and social domination” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 9).

In the coming sections we will go through a situated genealogy, through so-called colombia and méxico, and show how architecture has always been a technology at the service of power and architects have always been technocrats at the service of power, and today under/for neo-liberal capitalism. But first let's see in a general sense what constitutes the neo-liberal architect. We have already mentioned, some characteristics regarding, the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject and neo-liberal subjectivation through the notions of homo oeconomicus, human capital, entrepreneur, consumer-citizen, the modulations that operate through vocational education, and creative and entrepreneurial governmentality. Now, what constitutes the architectural worker today, the architect, the *neo-liberal homo architectonicus*?

As already mentioned, we understand the architect as an eurocentric modulated labouring individual-subject, educated and disciplined through specific western-modern values, desires, and specific methods and abilities, as: drawing and analysis of images, modeling of form and space, reading theory, building design, construction supervision, obtaining a license depending on the context (Deamer, 2016a, p. 107).

Who is the modern architect? As we have seen by way of Schnapp (Schnapp, 2008, p. 7), “The twentieth century provides two contradictory but convergent responses to this question, responses that coexist and commingle during architecture’s century-long march toward professionalization and the achievement of an unprecedented degree of social visibility.”

The first response is articulated in Ayn Rand's novel *The Fountainhead* (1943) through the character of Howard Roark, a rationalist architect. This response is also portrayed in the film adaptation of the same name, starring Gary Cooper. In this view, every creative job is guided by an individual’s thoughts. While an architect requires many individuals to construct a building, they do not seek the opinions of others on their design. The individuals work together voluntarily and each has freedom in their respective roles. The architect may use materials like steel, glass, and concrete produced by others, but it is their touch that transforms these materials into a unique product that they own individually. In contrast to a mere technician or engineer, who masters modern machinery, the architect is a poet and philosopher who writes in aluminum and steel. The architect is a genius who transforms the built landscape into a self-portrait, a lasting body that represents their own spirit but endures for centuries. This modernist architect, “an individualistic descendant of the divine *arkitekton*,” possesses a transcendent thought, vision, plan, and logos for the earthly city. They collide with and overcome real-world obstacles such as bureaucracies, narrow-minded clients, and limited interests in their pursuit of realizing their vision. For this architect, a building is like a living being, with its own integrity, truth, and purpose. Just as a human does not borrow pieces of its body, a building does not borrow parts of its soul. The architect gives the building its soul and every aspect of its design, including walls, windows, and stairways, serves to express this soul.

Massimo Bontempelli articulates the second answer to the question: Who is the modern architect? in his writings on architecture from the 1930s. According to Bontempelli, the modern architect is someone who achieves the highest ideal of art, which is anonymity. This means that the work of architecture is completely detached from its author and becomes one with the world. Success in achieving this ideal means that the work of architecture becomes so necessary that it merges with the earth’s crust and becomes the natural identity of a place. This place represents a historical epoch and the collective identity of a specific historical moment (Schnapp, 2008, p. 7).

Today, the architect seems completely subsumed to its patron: neo-liberal capitalism. Dis/appropriating Alberti, we could say architects seem to be whom by sure and economic reason and method, knows both how to devise through its own mind and energy, and to realize by construction, whatever can be most efficient for state control and profitably fitted out for the needs of real estate and financial speculation, by the production of new forms. To do this, architects must be: entrepreneurial, competitive, flexible, resilient, original, innovative and creative. This is the ethos the neo-liberal architect must self-cultivate, these “qualities of

self-conduct” should be learnt by the neo-liberal architect in order to succeed, these are the *semantic dispositifs* of success. As Spencer reminds us, according to neo-liberal truth games, there is no choice for people, “politically or ontologically, but to govern itself, and to have itself governed, according to these imperatives” (Spencer, 2016, p. 23). This then is the neo-liberal architect.

As Viviescas argues, in so-called colombia the 1970’s and 80’s paved the way “for the market of businessmen and promoters of faculties dedicated—‘without political problems’—to manufacture designers and small businessmen, rather than architects” (Viviescas, 1994, p. 16). This re/production continues until today, but we would say small businessmen-architects. As we have seen, such process is modulated through the imbrication of the uni-versity, student associations as CESCA and CLEA, globalitarian apparatuses of territorial coloniality as UIA and ONU-Habitat, and in the following sections we will add paid and unpaid abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour, and professional architectural associations. Such has been the process of neo-liberalization of the architect through territorial coloniality.

The case of so-called méxico

The latin-american white-mestizo bourgeois architectural elite still dreams with studying at some white northern uni-versity in europe or usa. What this means is that inevitably some aspects of the particular neo-liberalization processes of the white north modulate the neo-liberalization of Abya Yala. Dis/appropriating again some words from Durito and changing neo-liberalism for architecture we might note: “Architecture made spatial doctrine’ is faithfully carried out by ‘junior architects,’ who have been trained abroad and who have successfully created a ‘virtual reality’ hiding poverty, repression” (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 104), spatial segregation and real estate speculation through all Abya Yala.

“Let’s say that we have an ordinary territory whose name was violently given by colonial power, it starts with an a and that is located, by chance, beneath the empire of stripes and turbulent stars. And when we say, ‘beneath,’ we mean just that, ‘beneath.’ Let’s say that this territory is struck by a terrible plague. Ebola? Covid? Cholera? No! Something more lethal and more destructive... architecture! Fine, we’ve already mentioned before this sickness, so we won’t stop and repeat. Let’s suppose now that a young generation of ‘junior architects’ has studied abroad the way to ‘save’ this territory in the only way that it conceives of its salvation, that is to say, without knowing its history and hitching it to the caboose of the fast train of brutality and human imbecility: neo-liberal capitalism” (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 107).

Guadalupe Salazar González, in her text, *La enseñanza-aprendizaje en la era digital. Formal o informal, especializado o difuso, información o formación*, published in ASINEA magazine, the *Asociación de Instituciones de la Enseñanza de la Arquitectura*’s editorial medium, argues and laments that “the architect and the urban

planner have lost their role and competence to other professionals coming from the financial system, due to the neoliberal model, deregulation, the scarce control of the State and the production of space as a commodity, today a mechanism to place capital surplus, even under the mode of ‘creative destruction,’ which is a very profitable business ((Joseph A. Schumpeter, 1944) and (Joseph A. Schumpeter, 1947); (Harvey, 2003)), because the architect lacks the financial and administrative knowledge and skills to insert itself in the global financial logic of the new capitalism of the 21st century [...] Architects' offices no longer design and build spaces, but rather global consortiums and companies, with global design and manufacturing outside of local requirements. Students are little prepared for this field” (Salazar González, 2021, p. 59).

We have contested through various arguments the lament of the loss of the role of the architect. We argue that the problem is not the lack of business skills of the architect to perform in the global financial logic of the new capitalism, but the professionalization of territorial trans-formation itself, the construction of the need of the architect and architecture ideology, or design at large. The re/production of the “profession of architecture, the specialized skill that is called upon to give shape to the environmental needs of others.”

The following three sections intend to exemplify through a non-exhaustive study, how architects have been produced and modulated in so-called México, and how they have been active participants of the imbrication of patriarchal-capitalist and colonial domination that sustains territorial coloniality. First, a very brief mention of how master-masons, *alarifes*, and clergy participated actively in the colonization of Abya Yala through the violent spatialization of military infrastructure, cities, and religious missions. The violent colonization of Abya Yala meant urbanization by dispossession. Second, we argue against hegemonic architectural historiography which divides time and space by styles, and places modern architecture as an episode of the twentieth century with distinct formal features. Beyond-against and beyond conventional colonial history, and drawing from Echeverría’s (Echeverría, 1995) rather than placing modern architecture as an expression of the so-called international style, we refer here to modern architecture as that peculiar spatialization of an historical form of civilizing totalization of human life that follows five distinctive features and violences: 1. Humanism 2. Progressivism 3. Urbanism 4. Individualism 5. Economism, and other features as uni-versalism, binarism / dualism, and the objectification/domination of nature. Sustained by the myths of: 1. Revolution 2. Nation-state 3. Democracy 4. Justice and 5. Equality and we could add individual-subjectivity. And, in the third section we delve further into the neo-liberalization of the architect through the building industry, the semantic dispositifs that operate in architect’s self-description and the rise of architectural coaching.

Architects, have been and still are active agents in the re/production of territorial coloniality, directly or indirectly through the spread and sustainment of design ideology.

Colonial master-masons, *alarifes* and clergy

Master-masons, *alarifes*, and clergy participated actively in the colonization of Abya Yala through the violent spatialization of military infrastructure, cities, and religious missions. The violent colonization of Abya Yala meant urbanization by dispossession. In the case of so-called México “urbanization and early colonization were concomitant” (Kubler, 1983, p. 73). In colonial México most of the early architects were associated with a guild, as Manuel Carrera observes, “the guild economically considered was an anti-capitalist institution, in that the spirit of enterprise and individual initiative was almost null” (Carrera Stampa, 1954, p. 47). Within this structure they educated, worked and trained younger people, and it was composed of various figures depending on their knowledge and skills, the senior master, was the owner of the means of production and directed the training processes and construction commissions. The guild is one of the first collective work organizations, a way of grouping and watching over the collective interests and needs, “it was a corporation of workers [...] that grouped together to protect themselves in the performance of the same trade; [they] established the rules on the way of working, guaranteeing the quality of the materials, the manufacturing techniques, the characteristics of the product and the defense of the interests of their members” (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 49). The first great change in the formation, and consequently, in the figure of the architect, occurred with the dissolution and prohibition of the guilds, between 1770 and 1814, with the disposition elaborated by José María Morelos in the *Constitución de Apatzingán*. (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 86).

Master-masons and *alarifes*, also participated actively in the colonization of Abya Yala through the violent spatialization of urbanization and architecture, as military infrastructures, roads, cities and other material colonial dispositifs. An example of this was Martín Sepúlveda, who was appointed master builder by Cortés after the conquest of Tenochtitlan and directed the construction of several important works, among them the primitive cathedral and royal houses. His presence in the capital was considered indispensable and therefore he was forbidden to participate in subsequent conquest campaigns. In the fulfillment of his duties, Sepúlveda must have dominated and commanded a large number of indigenous people, as this was the only available labour force (Kubler, 1983, p. 116). But, as we will see further, the main architectural colonization dispositif would be religious missions, through the construction of churches, monasteries and convents. The violent colonial coupling of education, evangelizing and building. The architect monk. “We shall have no mercy for the former governors, the former missionaries” (Fanon, 2008, p. 2)

To the point that, as Kubler describes, an organized movement existed to exclude Europeans from participating in architectural activities in the provinces. The Franciscan missionaries were adamant about prohibiting any Spaniards, apart from themselves, from interacting with the indigenous communities. The friars faced accusations of intending to transform Nueva España into a vast monastery, and there is strong evidence

suggesting that various influential members within the Franciscan order conspired in 1529 to completely halt civilian immigration to the colonies (Kubler, 1983, p. 119).

During the XVI century, there were four distinct methods of recruiting workers for construction. Slavery of indigenous peoples, which was terminated around 1561 and officially abolished by 1569, to be later replaced with the slavery of african peoples. Unpaid labor was utilized until 1550, while forced paid labor began as *cautequil*. Finally, from 1575 onwards, “free” paid labor became another option. The primary approach for obtaining unpaid labor involved assigning specific tasks to a designated number of indigenous peoples for a limited duration (Ortiz Macedo, 2004, p. 28).

The peculiar modern character

Hegemonic architectural historiography divides time and space by styles, and places modern architecture as an episode of the twentieth century with distinct formal features. Beyond-against and beyond conventional colonial history, and drawing again from Echeverría’s work, “modernity should be understood as the peculiar character of an historical form of the civilizing totalization of human life. Capitalism should be understood as a form or mode of reproduction of the economic life of humanity: a way of implementing that set of activities, which directly and preferentially concerns the production, circulation, and consumption of goods produced” (Echeverría, 2005, p. 1). He also emphasizes that “we are becoming permanently modern; the ascendancy of modernity is a *fait accompli*. Against the dreams of a postmodern condition, we are living within modernity and are immersed in a unique, universal and continual process of modernization” (Echeverría, 2005, p. 1).

Echeverría constantly reminds us of the incompleteness of the modern project. “The first thing to note about modernity as a structuring principle of the ‘really existing’ modernization of human life is that it is a civilizing modality which, although it dominates in real terms over other non-modern or pre-modern structuring principles it encounters, is nevertheless far from having annulled, buried and replaced them. Modernity is presented as an attempt that is always in the process of overcoming them, but as an attempt that is not fully achieved, that must be maintained as such, and that must therefore coexist with the traditional structures of that social world. In this sense it can indeed be said that the modernity we know so far is ‘an unfinished project,’ always incomplete; it is as if something in it incapacitates it to be what it pretends to be: a civilizing alternative ‘superior’ to the ancestral or traditional one” (Echeverría, 2009, p. 12).

Following Echeverría (Echeverría, 1995), rather than placing modern architecture as an expression of the so-called international style, we refer here to modern architecture as that peculiar spatialization of an historical form of civilizing totalization of human life that follows five distinctive features and violences: 1.

Humanism 2. Progressivism 3. Urbanism 4. Individualism 5. Economism, and other features as uni-versalism, binarism / dualism, and the objectification/domination of nature. Sustained by the myths of: 1. Revolution 2. Nation-state 3. Democracy 4. Justice and 5. Equality and we could add individual-subjectivity.

Many of these features were already at work by the XIX century, long before 1932 when Philip Johnson together with Henry-Russell Hitchcock, consecrated the international style in their exhibition “Modern Architecture: International Exhibition” at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, which focused on a stylistic reading of architecture. Particularly in so-called México, the architecture put at work after the in/dependence, which sought to construct the image of a modern nation was advanced during the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz, through various infrastructure projects and the work of both foreign architects as: Luis Long, Adamo Boari, Silvio Conti, Emile Bénard, Maxim Roisin, and mexican architects as: Juan Agea, Ramón Agea, Francisco Álvarez, Antonio Rivas de Mercado and Federico Mariscal amongst others (Piña Dreinhofer, 2013).

1843 was the date that marks a certain “artistic renaissance, since by a decree of president Antonio López de Santa Anna the reorganization of the disappeared Academy is ordered, to which masters who are sought in Europe, such as the Catalan painter Pelegrín Clavé, will be admitted. Years later, the Italian architect Javier Cavallari, former director of the Imperial and Royal Academy of Milan, was appointed director. From that moment on, the European influence in architecture is categorical, since, in addition, the most distinguished students are pensioned in Italy or in France, bringing back the French treatises on architecture that were in vogue, such as Durand's, Reynaud's and Violet Le Duc's, and later Cloquet's and Gaudet's. However, the architecture section at various periods was divided into two parts: the technical part was studied at the School of Mines and the aesthetic part at the School of Fine Arts. It was not until 1867, when the Academy was organized again, when the architecture section was united, remaining again as a School within the institution, temporarily, since years later it returned to its previous state” (Urquiaga Blanco, 2013, p. 4).

Neo-liberalization of the architect

Problematizing the neo-liberal architect from a situated account in so-called México and Colombia, means first and foremost, studying the various roles and changes that the architect has assumed entangled through the *longue durée* of the colonality of labour. Not only architecture as a eurocentric spatial technology was imposed, but it was violently imposed through abstract labour. Second, studying how architectural authority is re/produced through: authorship, leadership / hierarchization, colonial hierarchization, professionalization, manual-intellectual divide, sexual-racialized divide, cis-heteronormativity, whiteness, patriarchy. Third, the semantic dispositifs that operate through the logistics of desires, education, social networks—media, and environmental subjectivation at large, such as: entrepreneurialism, competition,

flexibility, resilience, sustainability, originality, innovation and creativity, amongst other signifiers of success. Fourth, problematizing the architect today involves studying its role in the building industry that sustains real estate speculation under financial capitalism, the necessary infrastructure for the sustenance of racist nation-states—i.e. borders, schools, prisons, roads, parks, amongst other through direct contracts and violent architectural competitions, and trans-national capital focused on mega-projects such as, dams, canals, trains, roads, amongst many forms of material extraction, energy and circulation infrastructure aimed at the efficient circulation of commodities. The building industry should then be studied through the imbrication of multiple disciplines and economic fields as: material extraction, material transformation, architectural and engineering design, architectural and engineering construction supervision and real estate marketing and sales, amongst others. Fifth, the rise and popularity of professional coaching, aimed at life-long training, and its mobilization of discourse and neo-liberal laboral competences for: marketing, leadership, entrepreneurship, social-networks, profit-making and the accumulation of value at large, in the form of wealth, authority, prizes, amongst others. And sixth, problematizing the neo-liberal architect from a situated account in so-called México and Colombia, involves the study of how cultural capital is re/produced through: festivals, biennales, prizes, grants, competitions and teaching. Many of these are not specific to architectural labour, but are imbricated through architectural education as well.

Let's review what we have seen regarding neo-liberal rationality. In chapter 1 *Within/together and against/apart neo-liberalization* we drew a genealogy of the neo-liberalization of both so-called México and Colombia, through various and in some aspects contradictory understandings of neo-liberalism: neo-liberalism as an ideological hegemonic project; neo-liberalism as policy and programme; neo-liberalism as state form, neo-liberalism as governmentality; neo-liberalism as rationality; neo-liberalism as pure theoretical shit and fourth world war; and neo-liberalism as unconventional forms of exploitation. And, argued five points: First, following Foucault's governmentality and technologies of the self, we need to focus diverse readings of neo-liberalism as modes of government of freedom through the conduct of conduct. Second, following Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell, neo-liberalism is an unfinished and ongoing project, hence we need to rather situate and problematize the particularities of neo-liberalization in Colombia and México. Third, following Pierre Dardot and Christian Laval, neo-liberalism is a mode of reason that implies first and foremost an economization of life and a ubiquitous form of our existence (Dardot & Laval, 2013, p. 3), we must problematize such production of subjectivity, as a regime of life and the false promise it sustains of the individual economic subject, *homo oeconomicus*. Fourth, we must problematize the particular neo-liberal semantic dispositifs, and its logistics. Fifth, situating such processes and dispositifs, asks to problematize neo-liberal territorialization through the *longue durée* of territorial coloniality. We also argued, that from all the truths that neo-liberalism pursues, the most

violent are: the notion of freedom through the individual subject and the supposedly minimization of the state in order for the market to move freely.

In the previous chapter, *Architectural education: pedagogies of the new, industries of the self*, we drew a genealogy of education under/for territorial coloniality. Through an introduction to the uni-versity as a uni-versal machine for the modulation of life and the coloniality of knowledge that still operates in Abya Yala, we then discussed the neo-liberalization of the uni-versity in so-called colombia and méxico, focusing on the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject under the regime of competences. The chapter traces the neo-liberalization of architectural education through professionalization, fetishization, commodification, financialization and cultural colonialism or education as imperialism, in order to provide a situated critique of architectural education in so-called colombia and méxico. It considered the influences of global modulation apparatuses such as the UIA-International Union of Architects and the fields and forces of coloniality. Closing with a briefly presentation of neo-liberal dispositifs related to entrepreneurialism and the new, and how they operate through architecture and the building industry.

Through the following sections, on the neo-liberal architect, in both so-called méxico and colombia, we will focus on how, these understandings, arguments and truth games, are imbricated with the production of the architect through abstract labour.

If, as mentioned before, the uni-versity prepares, modulates, educates, and disciplines docile bodies willing and obliged to work by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, through the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject and through specific disciplinary architectural discourse, values, desires, aspirations, semantic dispositifs and working competences, architectural abstract labour, is the prime site for these bodies to fully practice all these abilities, from simulation to direct territorial violence. The uni-versity produces the desiring neo-liberal architect and the labour market must construct the necessary infrastructure to fulfill such wishes. Yet, it does not deliver. The same violence of the impossibility of actually be/coming an individual subject is then repeated through the impossibility of be/coming a complete worker, a total architect.

Neo-liberalization does not unravel in a linear nor organized manner, at some points it is advanced by governments, private capital and global apparatus of power. The following are examples of how the neo-liberal architect is modulated, in both so-called méxico and colombia, through labour semantic dispositifs and their logistics of desires, real estate speculation under financial capital and the building industry at large, grants, biennials and prizes, social networks and hegemonic media, and architectural competitions, amongst other.

What better way to study how architects define themselves than through the acclaimed, the in/famous, the starchitects. The following are just a few examples of how architects, those strong enough to love

architecture, those that have succeeded in the privileged ladder of territorial coloniality, define themselves and/or the offices they command. First, Michel Rojkind together with Fernando Romero who are probably the epitome of the neo-liberal architect. If so-called México was a neo-liberal music festival, Michel Rojkind and Fernando Romero would headline the closing event, there is just not enough stage for these two stars, their creativity blinds us all. Rojkind leads “Rojkind Arquitectos a creative studio of design, business tactics, and experiential innovation based in Mexico City. At Rojkind Arquitectos we are committed to creating designs that are not only innovative in terms of programming while adapting digital design to local crafts, but also consider the impact they have on the people and communities they serve” (Rojkind Arquitectos, 2023). Fernando Romero, once the son-in-law of oligarch Carlos Slim, leads Fernando Romero Enterprise, “a global architecture and industrial design firm with offices in New York, Mexico City, Madrid and Shenzhen” (Fr-ee, 2023). Another example could be, Tatiana Bilbao, now the spearhead of architectural white feminism in so-called México, leads, Tatiana Bilbao ESTUDIO a “Mexico City based architecture studio, founded in 2004. At the core of the studio’s practice is an analysis of the context surrounding projects, which scale from masterplans to affordable housing typologies. A goal of the work is to both contribute to its surroundings while remaining flexible to absorb shifting needs” (Tatiana Bilbao Estudio, 2023). Or, Sordo Madaleno, commanded by Javier Sordo Madaleno Bringas, Javier Sordo Madaleno de Haro and Fernando Sordo Madaleno de Haro, as this white-dynasty notes “leadership flows from three generations of the Sordo Madaleno family” and regarding the architecture enterprise, state “Sordo Madaleno inhabits the global mindset and taps into the richness of the local context in an increasingly interconnected world. As architects and strategic thinkers, we are inspired to craft human-centered environments that promote connection and maintain a deep focus on sustainability. These are fundamental benchmarks of design excellence” (Sordo Madaleno, 2023). And lastly, from this non-exhaustive short list, in order to continue with another dynasty, now on the right path of neo-liberalization, LEGORRETA®. Founded in 1965 by Ricardo Legorreta, Noé Castro and Carlos Vargas Sr., as Legorreta Arquitectos (now LEGORRETA®) through the years, the now architecture trademark®, has “learned to solve problems with creative, fresh and practical solutions but always sticking to the project schedule and budget” (LEGORRETA®, 2023).

These brief examples sustain and reproduce the full array of white neo-liberal semantic dispositifs, as: creativity, innovation, flexibility, sustainability, leadership or business-tactics, that as mentioned before do not only signify discourse, but *encubren* other modes of inhabitation and re/produce material-discursive practices, modes of being architect through abstract labour and most importantly design, or create as many of these would say, architecture in order to construct and re/produce this world. The logistics of desires operates through our mimetic desire and *mimetic faculty* (Benjamin, 1979b) as Benjamin would say, “the gift which we possess of seeing similarity is nothing but a weak rudiment of the formerly powerful compulsion to become

similar and also to behave mimetically” (Benjamin, 1979a, p. 69). The starchitect sustains the modern notion of the genius, originality and authorship, most of these architects studied architecture during the 1980s and 90s, probably one of the first fully neo-liberalized generation of architects produced through architectural education. These are now the images of the architect that architecture students aspire to be through the mimetic desire and faculty. Where the re/production of the neo-liberal architect is headed. Education and labour are also closely entangled through these figures, since many of these architects teach or have had bureaucratic positions at architecture schools, as Felipe Leal, Bernardo Gómez-Pimienta, and many many others.

Neo-liberal subjectivation means becoming fit by/for capital, becoming white. And architectural coaching as becoming fit for professional subjection is more and more popular. As we have mentioned, neo-liberal architectural competencies are mobilized through the accelerating market of labour and life coaching, such as ARQcoaching and Lxarch *Lideres para la arquitectura*—Leaders for architecture. Other sites of architectural coaching include Domestika, “the fastest growing creative community in the industry, where top experts share their knowledge and pass on their skills through professionally produced online courses.” Courses, include: “Entrepreneurship through innovation techniques,” in which “you learn how to use creativity as a key tool to solve the daily challenges of your entrepreneurial process and make your business idea a reality;” ‘Science-based interior design for creative spaces,’ in which “you discover how to apply science to interior design and create spaces that enhance creativity, collaboration and innovation;” ‘Creativity applied to architectural projects,’ in which “you learn how to generate a concept from references and create added value by incorporating storytelling;” or “Design of luxury spaces” in which “you combine creative branding and strategic thinking to design interior spaces” (Domestika, 2023).

Another coaching example is Adpprentice, “your AI-powered architectural Personal Assistant via WhatsApp, that will help you take an almost unfair advantage” (Adpprentice, 2023). With Adpprentice you will be able to: increase your creative capacity, improve your productivity and get conceptual proposals (Adpprentice, 2023). “Adpprentice shoots you directly to professional royalty” (Adpprentice, 2021). Adpprentice aims to bridge the gap between the classroom and real-life architectural practice. Their objective is focused on young people who are about to start studying architecture, those who are already studying, or those who have completed their academic preparation in architecture programs such as the AAD Praxis Program. This program offers the opportunity to join a “recognized” architectural firm and guarantees active participation in all design processes from the beginning. Participants receive constant mentoring from the studio directors and the team of senior designers. Adpprentice is a professional enterprise—*emprendimiento*—led by mexican architects Heriberto Hernández Ochoa and Raúl Juárez Perezlete. They have over 25 years of

experience in architectural design and have a strong interest in training architecture students from scratch. One of their main motivations is the increasing difficulty in accessing uni-versities nowadays. Public uni-versities have a high demand, resulting in a low percentage of enrolled students compared to applicants. On the other hand, private uni-versities, both nationally and internationally, pose economic limitations that are not affordable for most students. During the 2021 Venice Biennale, Adpprentice published the free guide *Become a Self-taught Architect*. This guide will serve as a roadmap for soon to-become neo-liberal architects interested in acquiring the skills and abilities of the profession. They also published the DAAMN Manifesto, proposing a “radical idea of making accessible to all an alternative path for the training of architects.” This path aims to remove obstacles in both public and private uni-versities and democratize access to quality education. The manifesto suggests that it is possible to self-train as an architect, utilizing free resources available on the internet. With the desire, determination, and necessary discipline, people can achieve self-training as an architect within a reasonable period of time. However, this task is not easy, you won’t be able to self-train on your won, which is why Adpprentice offers on-demand tutorials to support those who choose the not so self-training path, via whatsapp. And finally shoot yourself to professional royalty (Arellano, 2021).

The last example is ACTO, located in so-called ciudad de México, as one of the most recent schools for architecture, while rather more close to a coaching institute, “for the training of architects based on the development of creative potential” their “work focuses on maximizing learning opportunities through a pedagogy centered on the individual [...] From a range of topics carefully selected by a group of professors, the student chooses the subject that matches his or her personal interests and, through various exercises, makes decisions that will be useful in their academic and professional training.” Some of their coaching courses, include: *Proceso Creativo*—Creative Process—“a workshop for students and/or professionals in the disciplines of architecture, art and design. Participants will use creativity as a tool to rethink their situation in the world and to enhance their contributions to it through their work. In this workshop they will learn about their own creative process by methodologically analyzing the development of a personal project. Simultaneously, the human attributes that favor the development of creativity will be studied and the stages of its process, its elements and its levels of contribution will be distinguished.” Because, “the great contributions to civilization have invariably had a fundamental creative element that attributes to them an extraordinary and transcendent character. Creativity is not a human ability that manifests itself only through art, but its possibilities of expression are infinite. Today it is necessary to build a new awareness of the value of creativity in shaping individual identity and human progress in order to propose authentic solutions to the challenges facing societies.” Or, *Nuevas Prácticas*—New Practices—“a workshop that invites architecture students in semesters 8, 9 or 10, interested in assembling their learning into a personal synthesis of knowledge, or for those who do not know what might be the best first step in their immediate professional future” *Nuevas Prácticas* also addresses

“professionals (5 years or less after completing their bachelor's degree) who are interested in: building clarity in their current professional development, applying to work in a prestigious architectural firm, applying to a master's program, starting a professional practice of their own, or defining a personal discourse” (ACTO, 2022).

Ultimately ACTO is mobilizing an important effort towards re/producing white-mestizo bourgeois power, and sustaining class privilege by coaching mexican architecture students how to enter “prestigious” master programs from the global north and re/produce territorial coloniality, if they have the misfortune to return to under-developed so-called méxico. Because as Durito might have said: architecture as white-bourgeois spatial doctrine is faithfully carried out by ‘junior architects,’ who have been trained abroad and who have successfully created a ‘virtual reality’ hiding poverty and repression (Sup Marcos, 2005, p. 104).

All these coaching examples, provide the perfect cog between neo-liberal education and neo-liberal architectural labour, all the desires, values and necessary competencies of the soon to be architects are mobilized through the imperative of life-long learning that current modalities of labour coaching offer. Architectural coaching works together with the student and professional associations, we have already mentioned. Both coaching and these associations grease the logistics of desire, truth and freedom, under neo-liberal creative and entrepreneurial governmentality, and from these the neo-liberal homo architectonicus is re/produced.

The case of so-called colombia

We have seen by way of Fanon, that white superiority creates colonized inferiority (Fanon, 2008, p. 69). The peripheralizing discourse of coloniality, considered colombia still by the beginning of the XX century as an inferior and illiterate territory in terms of architecture. Pablo de la Cruz during the *Segundo Congreso de Mejoras* in 1920, as part of the *comisión de Estética y Embellecimiento*, presented a study in which he described bogotá as an accumulation of *edificios destartados*, rickety buildings, in which the only salvageable production was the Capitol. The Capitol was, of course, product of white architecture genius, or part of the rising colombian petty-bourgeoisie that had studied abroad (González Escobar, 2013, p. 200).

This lament, makes a good example of colonial self-disdain. Which is to say, as Fanon, by way of Wynter, “noted the extent to which all *native* and colonialized subjects had been conditioned to experience themselves as *if* they were, in fact, as *genetically inferior*” (Wynter, 1995, p. 45). Territorial coloniality conditions people to experience not only genetically, but also spatially inferior. The periphery will never be like its center. Fortunately not! Fuck the center! As mentioned before, a recurrent lament in architecture, and particularly in so-called colombia, is that architects have lost their social recognition and that their work does not have the exposure it deserves. The last scream of this architectural lament, the last enterprise against the

supposed oblivion of architects in so-called colombia, is *Andina*, “a private business association made up of twelve architecture and design offices that develops collective constructions for the sustainable development of the territory. From ethical reflection, business management, experimentation and criticism” they “come together to strengthen daily life.” Given, “the lack of exposure of the work of architecture in colombia in the international media and the absence of publications about it” (Andina, 2023), Andina has joined forces to publish a book and share with the world the latest on neo-liberal architecture in so-called colombia. A previous example of this collective enterprise was *Archipiélago de Arquitectura*, who have edited three books between 2010-2023, a group of architects that in their early beginnings during the 2000s made their way as rising stars in the architectural scene through architectural competitions—heavily sustained by unpaid-labour—and the neo-liberal and neo-colonial rhetoric of eco-social design, and complexity theories, brought from the white-north.

We have contested through various arguments the lament of the loss of the role of the architect. We argue that the problem is not the lack of exposure in international media—being recognized by our beating father, the global north—nor the absence of publications, but the professionalization of territorial transformation itself, the construction of the need of the architect and architecture ideology, or design at large.

The following three sections intend to exemplify through a non-exhaustive study, how architects have been produced and modulated in so-called colombia, and how they have been active participants of the imbrication of patriarchal-capitalist and colonial domination that sustains territorial coloniality. First, a very brief mention, of how since colonial times, Abya Yala, and in this case so-called colombia, has endured constant control through, what territorial coloniality considers, the correct modes of inhabiting, through construction methods and building materials. Particularly during colonial times, in so-called colombia the control by the *Real Audiencia* through various decrees. And also, how during colonial control, the clergy was active in the indoctrination, exploitation and control of communities. Many monasteries, churches and convents had active catechesis that included also the modulation into building crafts. This modes of control, particular to territorial coloniality are an example of how architectural authority imposes and dispossesses, without the necessarily direct performance of the architect. Various modes of control, continue to this day through epistemic and territorial coloniality that defines what/how one can build and inhabit, reproducing architectural values imbricated through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

Second, how territorial coloniality demanded the modulation of “good” architectural taste. People in so-called colombia had to be exposed to the canons, educated out of their “architectural infancy.” They did not know how to live properly. They had such bad constructive taste. This was done through several means as, pamphlets, press, and exhibitions (González Escobar, 2013, p. 201). And particularly, as we have previously noted, through the establishment of an architecture school. Good taste, morality and progress were the main

semantic dispositifs mobilized by the new nation-state, the press and the rising bourgeoisie in order to establish a market for architectural services and deprive people of their constructive and inhabiting capacities. Modern architects in so-called colombia, openly and cynically talked about territorial whitening processes of displacement, dispossession and gentrification, as Rogelio Salmona, who notes regarding *las torres del parque*, in an interview: “the proposal was to eliminate the slums, not for humanitarian reasons, but for aesthetic reasons. It was necessary to provide another environment for the high bourgeoisie, because when they came to the *Circo de Toros* they were surrounded by whores” (Portilla, 2005, p. 28).

And, in the third section we delve further into the neo-liberalization of the architect through the semantic dispositifs that operate in architect’s self-description, architectural competitions and competition culture at large, and the rising figure of the arch-influencer in so-called colombia.

Colonial master-masons, *alarifes* and clergy

The control of modes of inhabiting, construction methods and materials is not new. Since colonial times, indigenous peoples were imposed certain construction methods, modes of inhabiting and building materials, until today through strict building regulations, that establish the correct modes to build and inhabit, to everyone. This modes of control, particular to territorial coloniality are an example of how architectural authority imposes and dispossesses, without the necessarily direct participation of the architect, but throughout design ideology at large.

All throughout Abya Yala, the spanish established *Reales Audiencias* in order to control the territories and act as intermediaries with the crown in europe. In so-called colombia the *Real Audiencia del Nuevo Reino de Granada* later *Real Audiencia de Santafé de Bogotá*, acted as an spatio-territorial apparatus of *blanqueamiento*. Just as two examples, the decrees of February 23 of 1560 and April 30 of 1556, ordered “the suspension and demolition of all works built in *bahareque* and straw, on the main square and the street that leads to the ‘old market’ square, on the road to Tunja ‘no straw houses should be built, only stone and tile houses, and those already started should not be continued, for the reasons contained in the said order, with penalty and reception, as well as in the surroundings of this city” (Real Audiencia, 1948, pp. 148–149) in (Corradine Angulo, 1989, p. 70). Through decrees as these, colonial power controlled the trans-formation of the territory and imposed material and spatial conditions to indigenous peoples, in order, as Alberto Corradine and others suggest, to “transplant” sevillian architecture into Abya Yala (Corradine Angulo, 1989, p. 67). Various modes of control, continue to this day through epistemic and territorial coloniality that defines what/how one can build and inhabit, reproducing architectural values imbricated through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

During colonial control, in so-called Colombia—as many other territories—, the clergy was active in the indoctrination, exploitation and control of communities. Many monasteries, churches and convents had active catechesis that included also the modulation into building crafts. Also, many members of the clergy were part of the military, as the case of fray Luis Zapata de Cárdenas, former military converted to second archbishop of *Nuevo Reino de Granada*. “Zapata de Cárdenas’ catechism appears as a great project of sociocultural organization that sought to determine the spaces and the role to be played by each of the various social actors in those spaces. Consequently, it established the construction of Indian villages in the manner of the towns of the colonizers of the time: a grid plan of wide streets in the center of which was to be the plaza, around which, and in hierarchical order, stood the church, generally facing west; the priest’s house, to its left; and other buildings, such as the school, the infirmary, the prison, the houses of the indigenous, the same as the community fields and a cemetery to bury the unbelievers, since the faithful were to be buried in the church. The inhabitants of these towns were under the control of the *doctrinero*, the supreme authority in both the temporal and spiritual life of the indigenous. The *doctrinero* had to resolve all kinds of conflicts and determine the distribution of the collective harvest. He had to take care of the most disadvantaged and also acted as notary. On the other hand, the population of the doctrine had to submit to the authority of the *doctrinero*” (Marín Tamayo, 2008, p. 124).

“The doctrinal friars were not only recipients of tribute from the indigenous people, they also did not escape the temptation to put the ‘evangelized’ at their service. Mercedes López in a documented study affirms that ‘the Church claimed its right to participate in the advantages of the abundance of population through servitude’ and mentions several cases where Franciscans and Dominicans, during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, employed indigenous people to work in the convents of these orders, in tasks ranging from carrying firewood and doing domestic chores to building convents and churches” (López Rodríguez, 2001, pp. 82–84) in (Plata, 2016, p. 290).

The peculiar modern character

After the *independence* the dominant discourse considered there was a decline and loss of building traditions, which they felt should be restored by educating craftsmen into architects (González Escobar, 2013, p. 207). The anonymous text *Arquitectura*, published first in 1873 in the newspaper *La Escuela Normal* of Bogotá, and later in *El Artesano* of Medellín, is an example of the classist and colonial notion of architecture by arguing that architecture only “became an art in the history of nations when they had reached a certain degree of civilization, opulence and luxury.” As González Escobar underscores, “social traditions, the absence of formative processes and the material conditions of the country were among the arguments repeatedly stated in the press between 1840 and 1880, as fundamental reasons that prevented a better development of architecture.” To the

point that some found “pertinent to ask: When or at what time can there be architecture in our society?” (González Escobar, 2013, p. 207).

Since, 1890, “the architect Gastón Lelarge, for example, wrote a text that focused on Mariano Santamaría's project for the Veracruz Bazaar to demonstrate the hypothesis that construction in Bogotá had entered the ‘path of universal progress,’ especially since 1890 due to foreign influence, whereby the old ways of building had ‘given way to the newest ideas.’ In this text Lelarge emphasized that there was a new architectural period and that the facade of this Bazaar marked ‘in a decisive way the transition between the old and the modern way of building’; he also affirmed that the judgment was only possible by competent people, that cultural refinement was required to demand this type of work and, above all, that this progress demanded submission without ‘restrictions to the ideas of the architect.’ This transition between the ancient and the modern was also a struggle between the science and talent of the architect, as opposed to ‘the poverty of imagination and intellectual culture of the master-mason’” (González Escobar, 2013, p. 270)

As already mentioned, in 1920 during the second *Congreso de Mejoras*, the architect Pablo de la Cruz and the engineer Lazcano Berti presented two studies to the *Estética y Embellecimiento* commission, following a peripheralizing discourse of coloniality, considered so-called colombia still by the beginning of the XX century as an illiterate territory in terms of architecture. de la Cruz described so-called bogotá as an accumulation of *edificios destartados*, rickety buildings, in which the only salvageable production was the Capitol. The Capitol was, of course, designed and coordinated along almost 80 years by european architects, and colombians that had studied abroad. Regarding Berti's text, its main focus was not on buildings but rather on the absence of proper professional training and the ability of the population to appreciate architecture in a country that, according to him, was still in its architectural infancy, lacking innovation, educational institutions, and a scientific approach. Berti identified three categories of architects who claimed the title without having obtained a degree: construction architects who were originally master masons, self-taught draftsmen who called themselves architects, and engineers from the *Facultad de Matemáticas e Ingeniería* who had scientific training but lacked aesthetic and artistic sensibility (González Escobar, 2013, pp. 200–201). All these discourses on lack of good taste, architectural infancy, civilization, luxury, progress and morality, contribute to sustain and reproduce the supposed colonial inferiority of the peripheries.

Profound changes occurred in the decades spanning from 1930 to 1940 in response to the concept of modernization, which was closely linked to “rationalist architecture,” liberal governments, and ideas originating from the united states. It was within this atmosphere that the faculty of architecture at UNAL commenced its operations in 1936, and it was during this time that started the construction of the campus of *ciudad universitaria*, the first of its kind in Abya Yala (Londoño Niño, 2014, p. 5). Silvia Arango Cardinal, argues that “in the mid-1940s, interesting transformations in Colombian architectural ideology were brought about by a

new generation of architects, most of whom were born between 1910 and 1925. If the objective of the previous generation was to create the social and professional image of the architect, the objective of this one was to catch up by absorbing all the international trends” (Arango Cardinal, 1984, p. 18). This meant a direct engagement with territorial coloniality, now not imposed by colonial europe, but sustained by the local white-mestizo bourgeoisie and of course their class members or serfs, the architects.

Territorial coloniality is then not only sustained and imposed from outside, but also through internal colonialism. If territorial coloniality was reproduced from the XVI to the XIX by white spanish europeans, from the XIX century until today, such imbricated domination and asymmetric powers are sustained by the wannabe-white local bourgeoisie, together with international influence. Two examples of the imbrication of such power by modern architects, could be, the visits by Le Corbusier to so-called bogotá and later the plan for bogotá’s civic center, which was mobilized by the obsession of some politicians and architects with the work of the swiss architect. Another example was the sub-valorization of local education, even though by 1936 the architecture school at UNAL was already functioning, many architects still preferred to study first in europe and the in the usa, due to the european war of 1914–1945. Such was the case of Rogelio Salmona, one of the sacred bulls of colombian architecture, who went to work with le Corbusier in paris for six years, to later go back to so-called bogotá. Salmona, together with Guillermo Bermúdez, Fernando Martínez Sanabria, Carlos Martínez Jiménez and the Proa generation, or real estate speculation offices as Cuéllar, Serrano Gómez, and Obregón y Valenzuela, would radically change the architecture profession and pave the way for the 1970’s early neo-liberalization process.

The violent anecdote, we have mentioned of Salmona, exemplifies the attitude towards the production of architecture and the city, regarding las torres del parque project in bogotá, Isabella Portilla, notes: “San Diego was a socially repressed place, not to mention *la Colina de la Deshonra*—the Hill of Dishonor—, which was marginal; the only residential area in the sector was *Bosque Izquierdo*,’ recalls Rogelio Salmona, the whimsical sculptor, from the dining room of his apartment in Tower B—at torres del parque.

In the fifties, the excess of slums made the sector uninhabitable. So, in response to the complaints of the people, the Torres del Parque project was undertaken, led by him, with the support of the *Banco Central Hipotecario* (BCH). ‘The proposal was to eliminate the slums, not for humanitarian reasons, but for aesthetic reasons. It was necessary to provide another environment for the high bourgeoisie, because when they came to the *Circo de Toros* they were surrounded by whores,’ says the architect with a touch of irony. Thus ‘Las Torres,’ as they are known in Bogotá, were created to harmonize the area, and began as low-income housing. According to Salmona, the construction of the duplex apartments was undertaken with the intellectual and liberal proposal of the BCH: to bet on good architecture, offering more opportunities at better prices.

Thanks to the intervention of Belisario Betancur, a member of the Board of Directors of *Banco de la República*, the fees for the awarding of housing to young people were modified, because at that time there were no payment facilities and the only people who could buy a house were those who already had their own” (Portilla, 2005, p. 28).

Neo-liberalization of the architect

We have studied previously how the neo-liberalization of the architect in so-called colombia is imbricated with the neo-liberalization of housing and the building industry at large, through the case of UPAC and the transference of the “responsibility” of building social housing from the state to private capital, and how this has scaled violently through the merchantilization and financialization of housing, and real estate speculation at large. Or, most recently through the infamous *Economía Naranja* and its real estate speculation machine.

The following, are brief examples of how the neo-liberalization of the architect, operates through the semantic dispositifs used in self-description, architectural competitions and the rising figure of the arch-influencer in so-called colombia.

We have already seen, through the mexican context, how architects define themselves. Now let’s study some brief examples of so-called colombia. First, an example of an old neo-liberal generation, Giancarlo Mazzanti, the epitome in so-called colombia of the architect-researcher, a neo-liberal uni-versal figure that has spread through figures as SO-IL, Alejandro Aravena or Frida Escobedo in so-called méxico. The architect-researcher mobilizes all its cultural capital through the uni-versity in order to better advance its economic capital through its architecture office. Mazzanti, directs now Equipo Mazzanti, an “architecture and research studio” in a 2015 interview, Mazzanti notes that the office seeks to “build transformation, generate appropriation and new forms of social inclusion in the neighborhoods and sectors where they work” (Mazzanti, 2015) and then uses the example of *biblioteca española*, a project that has brought international attention to the office for its supposed social transformation of a *comuna*—impoverished and peripheralized neighborhood—in medellín, apparently through the miracle of a formal whim—now in ruins—, built with the generous charity of the colonial spanish royal family.

Second, the rising stars, the rather taller than smaller office, Taller 301, now rebranded as Taller Architects, following the footsteps of neo-liberal role models as Mazzanti, Daniel Bonilla or Juan Pablo Ortiz, Taller, “specializes in architecture and territory” their, “practice has a highly academic approach to design challenges. Investigation is a crucial component in the process that leads to integral solutions for their clients.” Taller, “think architecture should be rigorous and precise, [...] by working with universal concepts” they

“develop specific solutions,” their “interests are driven by society's genuine needs: global issues” and consider “every single gesture is important: maximum effect with minimum means” (Taller, 2023).

Third, an architect who wished to live in any fab-lab somewhere in the “prestigious global north,” but unfortunately was condemned to birth in “underdeveloped” so-called colombia. Juan Ricardo Rincón, learned very well the entrepreneurial lessons of the creative and cultural industries, his parametric whims and entrepreneurial cultural ventures have been mobilized through la feria del millón, an art fair that started in his own-designed *Centro Creativo Textura*, a small example that with the proper parametric facade any neighborhood can be displaced and bring occasionally in the petty bourgeoisie hungry of cultural consumption. Rincón is also the architecture editor for Exclama magazine, but that story is *harina de otro costal*.

The last two cases are examples of neo-liberal architecture corporations. Contexto Urbano, “creates innovative spaces to live, work and play. Integral concepts that generate value. Balance between emotion and logic. Designs spaces for everyone” (Contexto Urbano, 2023). And, last Arquitectura e Interiores, now AEI Spaces, “is an architecture, design and construction firm” AEI is “committed to creating spaces that empower people through creativity and innovation, seeking to generate unique experiences in each project based on the understanding of each client and their culture” (AEI, 2023).

There is another type of architectural office, the *alternative practice*, these operate behind the farcical mask of research and criticality. Captured by the logistics of desires, managed by the white-colonial north, epistemic coloniality and cultural imperialism, these offices, both in so-called colombia and méxico, are modulated through what we have seen in chapter 1, by way of the logistics of formalism and fame. New form, money, social and professional recognition are success. The logistics of success are mobilized through biennales, prizes, media, grants, social networks, diplomas and entrepreneurship at large. Through the neo-liberal promise that we all can and want to be the next starchitect. But let's face it, dear critical *archipreneurs*, there are just not enough galaxies for so many wannabe stars. The conventional practice as research critical *studio*, *taller*, or *atelier*, as they prefer to be called—in operative terms just a regular hierarchical office—works at the intersection of art, design and architecture and claims property of a specific topic, expertise or problematic, such as: peace, gender, participation, diversity, inclusion, biodiversity, planet alignment, art-chitecture, nature, vernacular systems, graphic representation, amongst many other.

These offices still re/produce the false claim that there could be such a thing as critical architecture, and distance themselves from supposedly conventional architecture offices. Many of these alternative offices claim to be different because they do practice as research critical architecture. Which means they have a foot in academia, a foot in the building industry or real estate speculation—which is the same—, a foot in journals, and a foot in biennales and exhibitions. Yes they have many feet. As any *social alpinist*, and as the capitalist hydra, the neo-liberal *alternative architecture practice*, is a chameleon-like octopus.

The now defunct estudio altiplano in so-called colombia makes a good example, during 10 years the “studio” re/produced a hierarchical structure and a close complicity with the state, real estate speculation and the white-mestizo bourgeoisie. Yet they claimed to be different. No, they were not the same as Contexto Urbano they claimed. In their words, altiplano positioned “its practice at the intersection between the architectural object and the architecture of landscape and territory. [altiplano] focus on the development of architectural processes that generate new spatial experiences through diverse formats articulated through the co-production of knowledge. [altiplano] has a strong conviction in collective work, in collaboration with other architects and professionals from different disciplines. Since the studio was founded, [altiplano’s] practice focused on developing projects of different scales. [altiplano’s] lines of work converge in a proposal to expand the architectural practice. [altiplano’s] teamwork operates in generating, informing and questioning individual specialization through the knowledge of the other. This generates a critical practice that promotes the constant formation of new models of action” (altiplano, 2018). All these while working in complicity with real estate speculators, and oligarchs as Woods Staton, the owner of the mcdonalds franchise for many countries in so-called latino américa.

We know these “well intentioned” and “critical” spatial practices because we ourselves were part of altiplano. But make no mistake, neither well intentioned nor critical, these neo-liberal *critical architecture practices* are just another mask of architecture. We need to repeat, architectural alienation, which is to say, how architecture estranges our collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world, deprives people of their constructive and inhabiting capacities. No matter how much architects want to insist on the possibility of designing and building *other worlds*, this will never happen, not through the white/colonial disciplinary and professional authority and its modern-capitalist-patriarchal project, which will only continue to re/produce the same *architectural world*. Not *behind the white-mask of amiable leadership* (Said, 2003, p. 226). This is why we are not co-moving towards alternative architectures but towards alternatives to architecture.

All these examples have in common the nonsensical believe that trough design, that is the bourgeois ideology of design, it is possible to change the world. But this change is never a radical trans-formation that might lead to *other worlds*, but rather a reactive design that sustains and improves the colonial logics of delimitation and exclusion of the *mundo de uno*.

As the mexican cases, these examples sustain and reproduce the full array of neo-liberal semantic dispositifs, that as mentioned before do not only signify discourse, but re/produce material-discursive practices, modes of being architect through abstract labour and most importantly design, or create as many of these would say, architecture in order to construct and re/produce this world. The *architectural world*.

At the scale of the market, architects are ruthless competitive entrepreneurs. Competition is structured through its two main clients: private capital and the state. Architects compete for private commissions by licking and mobilizing all their class privileges, cultural capital or any other tool at hand. For state commissions the same could happen, although some countries like so-called México and particularly so-called Colombia are under the regime of public architectural competitions. Through its supposed democratic mask/discourse to open access to “everyone,” architectural competitions are constantly coordinated by SCA (Colombian Architects Association) and diverse state entities. Nothing but a constant bloodshed of horrendous renders and un-paid labour.

Architectural competitions are part of the long uni-versal modulation of individual authorial genius and part of larger competition culture. “The spirit of competing has a background in the Jesuit schools, known for their efficient and competitive education. *Sancta Æmulatio*, the holy urge to compete, was encouraged by giving each pupil an *æmulus* with whom *he* should compare *himself* and who had as *his* task to stimulate learning (Liedman, 2007). Through continual comparisons the students were to be spurred on to improve their performance, which was training in being both colleagues and rivals” (Rönn et al., 2013, p. 8).

“Socialization into competition culture was started, already during the architects’ education when the competition became a central exercise in the learning process” (Rönn et al., 2013, p. 8). “Since 1648, with the birth of the *École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts* (1648-1968) in Paris, the education of an artist, and later of an architect, ‘has relied on the transmission of symbolic capital by masters and pupils’ (Stevens, 2002, p. 168) under an organized system of implicit professional knowledge, with a continuous use of competitions ((Kostof, 1995), (Kostof, 1986); (Malacrida, 2010); (Cuff, 1991))” (Guilherme, 2014, p. 427)

“The programme was structured around a series of specific anonymous competitions and each student progressed from entry examination until the diploma by winning competitions. These competitions and exams were part of the French academia tradition (Malacrida, 2010, p. 60). To enroll to the school, proposers would take up to two years in preparation and would be subjected to rigorous oral and written exams, including nude drawing. ‘Competition was intense and the end results were beautifully drawn projects in traditional styles which were often defensible only on grounds of ‘good taste’ and intuition. The style was mostly neoclassical and the favourite building type was the monument.’ (Lackney, 1999)

These competitions ensured that the fundamental hierarchy of the members of the academia (the teachers and juries: who defined what good art and architecture was) and those that would ascend to it (the students: who were prized and hence were the good artists and architects). ‘Projects were judged by a jury of professors and guest architects, usually without the students present. The jurors used the same criteria by which the students designed’—good taste.’ (Most schools still use some type of ‘jury’ or review system today.)’ (Lackney, 1999)

This syllabus of competition culminated in the grand prix de *l'Académie Royale*, more well known as the *Grand Prix de Rome*. 'In reality, the architectural course of the school and the competition were always intertwined and complementary in the search and statement of grandiosity and sumptuousity.' (Malacrida, 2010, p. 60). 'For the diploma, they were required to win more competitions, complete a thesis project, and gain a year's work experience. Culmination of the process for a select few was the annual Grand Prix de Rome competition, open only to French citizens. The winners were sent to the French Academy in Rome for four years of study and were guaranteed an official government position when they returned.' (Draper, 1986, p. 210)" (Guilherme, 2014, p. 429).

"Architectural competitions are based on three fundamental presuppositions: (a) that drawings and visualizations may transmit credible knowledge and (b) that quality in architecture is something that may be seen and transmitted via images. And in a principal view, (c) that architectural projects is a practicable method for investigating the future and testing ideas. Through visualizations the observer gets a fast and clarifying, efficient and easy to grasp overall picture of the architectural projects" (Rönn et al., 2013, p. 11).

In so-called Colombia, a system of public architectural competitions has been institutionalized with the leading influence of SCA, but, there are historical precedents, since 1575, with the competition for the Cartagena cathedral, which involved the competition between *alarifes*: Juanes Guerra, Hernando Esteban, Eugenio de la Vega and Simón González who won the commission (Ulloa Vergara, 2015, p. 23) (Uribe González, 2015, p. 46). Today, competitions are regulated by Law 80 of 1993 of the General Statute of Public Administration Contracting and Decree 1082 of 2015 on merit-based competitions. In order to participate, architects must have an architectural license and RUP-*Registro Único de Proponentes*—Unique Registry of Proponents—, in which the bidder must be registered in any of the following activities: Project Management, Civil Engineering and Architecture or Temporary Personnel Services. In some cases the jury may consider asking additional experience in the form of built area or years of work experience in a specific position or activity.

On average architectural competitions involve the work of an office for a month, the size of the teams will vary according to the capacity of each office but usually the teams have at least one person per board, on average the competitions have 4-6 boards for teams of 4 to 10 people for a single competition. The amount of competitors could vary from a few to the hundreds depending on the size, complexity, budget and "prestige" of the project.

Competition teams depend mostly on unpaid or underpaid labour—and for all the offices except the winners all the work will be free-labour—, in many cases the teams have a large number of interns who are still students, offices and mostly big star-architect offices, use the desires of aspiring architects as a bargaining chip for them to willingly work for free, in order to have such experience on their cvs. Teaching them that risk is a

valued feature. Competitors enter expecting winning either economic capital through the design contract award or cultural capital through their economic loss of free-labour (Deamer, 2015b) and ‘research-driven’ formal extravaganza. Competitions provide the perfect set for creative governmentality, as Schwartzberg, notes “in material terms, creativity is the measure by which workers will cannibalize themselves for the sake of the company—extreme work hours, no parallel commitments (love, friendship, community, etcetera), and no separation between the private, the public, or the social. This kind of creativity rewards competition-induced nervous breakdowns and narcissistic pathologies. In most architecture offices, creativity is defined by the necessary over-production of senseless images and models for the feeding of the offices’ media spectacle machines” (Schvartzberg, 2015, p. 189).

The conventional structure of a competition team, generally follows the office structure we have already mentioned “divided vertically between master/partner/designer and production staff; staff then are further demarcated both vertically in relation to their proximity to the initial design concept and horizontally according to divisions of sequential specialization” (Deamer & Bernstein, 2010, p. 84). Competition teams have the leading architect or the office partners drawing their formal whims, and a team of architects translating that into specific areas and forms in order to produce as many iterations as possible. Usually the period of labour for an architectural competition includes long and exhausting working sessions, even on weekends, sleep deprivation, all under the well-trained authoritarian regime of the patriarchitect in charge. At last, all the simulations of architectural studios during the years of education/modulation/discipline at the uni-versity bear fruit, architects are now willing to submit to various forms of patriarchal and professional violence, all for the sake of competing, winning and defeating other architects. Architecture competitions have become a neo-liberal dispositif that sustains *Sancta Æmulatio*, the holy urge to compete.

Creative governmentality rules instagram. As all social networks, as twitter, pinterest and we suppose tiktok as well—but un/fortunately we do not have *yet* the pleasure of its addiction. The logistics of desire operates also through social networks and the rising arch-influencer and media at large. A neo-liberal rising star and future role-model for aspiring arch-influencer could be the case of Mathew Burbano Sanabria through his instagram account, now with almost 100k followers. This rising star, fits as the perfect cog between neo-liberal education and neo-liberal architectural labour, all the aspirations, values and desires of the soon to be neo-liberal architects are presented through catching-eye visuals and reggaeton slang.

Burbano has made his way by providing coaching to students and recent professionals. From posts that will lay in simple steps how to layout a board, what fonts to use, how to draw simple diagrams to general tips for “architectural visualization”—or the regime of the render. A full array of neo-liberal semantic dispositifs—or trends as he refers to—are at work through most of Burbano’s posts. Burbano starts 2023 by providing his audience of *arquis super estrellas*—super star architects—, a list of eight architectural trends; 1. Sustainability,

energy efficiency and reduction of carbon footprint; 2. Resilience, buildings designed to resist natural disasters; 3. Intelligent Technology, buildings connected technologically; 4. Flexibility and Adaptability, buildings designed to changing needs; 5. Health and wellbeing, design elements that promote good health and well-being, as natural light; 6. Innovation, the opportunity to explore new forms and materials, that help improve the performance and sustainability of buildings; 7. Community participation, collaboration and community participation with local residents; 8. You and me baby (Burbano, 2023).

Burbano's account is symptomatic of the regime of the render, of architectural visualization and most importantly of the precarity of architectural labour, which in recent years has pushed recent graduates in so-called colombia to sustain more than one job, because architecture offices pay the bare minimum—if they pay. These precarious conditions have popularized the labour of architectural visualization, contributing to the construction of increasingly complex simulations and a whole labour market of 3d modeling, rendering and post-production of images, in order to maintain the regime of the photo-render and the collage.

Coda

Fuck the architect! Fuck the *archē*! Not much has changed since Plato regarding the *arquitecto*. Still a figure of authority, the *architektōn*, is a patriarchal hierarchical figure in the building industry, commanding people how to live, other architects how to design, and also builders, since architects only design, and arrogantly reproduce the manual-intellectual divide.

Kostof starts his book (Kostof, 1986) stating that the architect is probably the second most oldest profession of the western world. It probably is. Let us pretend it is. The *architektōn*, as Landrum argues, was not the master-builder but leader-maker of beginnings. So, to refuse the architect, is profoundly anarchic. Fuck the *archē*! Fuck the beginning that has produced this world, and fuck the leader-maker that has designed and coordinated the construction of this world! Fuck the architect and the architecture that continues building this fucking world!

An important influence that was just briefly mentioned, through the historical case of the colombian architect, is media and in recent decades social-networks. A full account of the processes of neo-liberal subjectivation and the logistics of desires mobilized through media, falls beyond the scope of this research. A full study is waiting to be advanced. Nevertheless, some brief notes could help exemplify how neo-liberal semantic dispositifs circulate through sites such as Archdaily, and various social-networks and the rise of architectural influencers, as Burbano or Andrés Gil Z.

An example of how neo-liberal entrepreneurial values, desires and aspirations are mobilized through the logistics of desires could be the case of Archdaily, many of their articles mobilize energetically the neo-liberal

rhetoric of innovation, sustainability, resilience and entrepreneurship. Such is the case of the 2016 article *Arquitectos como desarrolladores inmobiliarios: los pros y los contras*, Reasons Why Architects Can Make Great Developers (or not?), in partnership with Archipreneur, written by Lidija Grozdanic and translated to Spanish by Isadora Stockins. Grozdanic, in an attempt to claim the autonomy of architecture, argues for a supposedly “emancipatory trend” through violent real-estate speculation. She starts with the conventional lament—screams in architect— and says: “Today, a majority of architects work solely on the design end of the development process. It is common knowledge that the net value of architectural services in a project’s total value amounts to a very small percentage (it’s usually in single digits), which puts architects near the bottom of the financial structure in the architecture, engineering and construction, AEC, industry.

Stuck between developers, clients, contractors, and subcontractors, architects are usually in a role that implies great responsibility but proportionally low compensation for it. When we add to that the grievance of not having full control of a project, it becomes clear as to why an increasing number of architects either transition to real estate development or transform their design offices into design-builds.

Though still in its infancy, this transition seems indicative of an emancipatory trend that’s taking place, where architects take matters into their own hands and thus claim their rightful position within the industry” (Grozdanic, 2016a, 2016b).

Or, the 2014 article by Juan Pablo Urrutia, *Formación de arquitectos con espíritu emprendedor*—Training of architects with an entrepreneurial spirit—, (Urrutia, 2014) in which he argues, “it is urgent to restructure the curricula of architecture schools in order to be in tune with the working environment and society as a whole. It is essential to create the conditions to train architects with an entrepreneurial spirit.” Urrutia starts, again, with the conventional lament—laments in *arquitecto*— and says: “being a proactive professional is the condition that would allow the recovery of fields dominated by other professionals and technicians, also to look for new labour niches related to architecture, and to develop a more active attitude to influence and promote changes, an issue that could be addressed by assuming the profile of an architect with an entrepreneurial spirit.” Through a nationalist rant, he argues that “the development of entrepreneurial capacity is strategically important for the development of countries, both for its capacity to generate employment and for its ability to produce products that are not very massive and to adapt quickly to changes.” His arguments aim at recognizing that “entrepreneurship is not related to personality traits but to a form of behavior, which can be changed and learned,” hence fostering educational and professional opportunities for such modulation. The modulation of architects into an entrepreneurial spirit should understand “entrepreneurial personality as a person with innovative, flexible, dynamic, risk-taking, creative and growth-oriented traits. [...] Entrepreneurs are more exposed to market transformations; their permanence depends more on continually reinventing their products and services; and their success depends less on their professional expertise than on other skills to

mobilize others to become collaborators in the entrepreneur's cause. Entrepreneurial life is driven by bringing value to the community through some new product or service, e.g., in social anomalies, entrepreneurs see opportunities for new products and services" (Urrutia, 2014).

This then is the neo-liberal entrepreneurial architect this world has created and keeps re/producing. To repeat through Pradilla and Jiménez, this short notes do not pretend to solve the problem; they simply seek to raise it. And as Rem Koolhaas, Madelon Vriesendorp, Elia Zenghelis and Zoe Zenghelis (Koolhaas et al., 1972) never said:

Exodus ~~or~~ *as* revolution.

~~Nothing~~ *Some things* ~~ever~~ happens here,

~~yet~~ *and* the air is heavy with exhilaration.

Chapter 5

Learnings and doings, the death of the reign of *homo educandus* and
homo æconomicus

Autonomy is not a place you enter but a groove that enters you

“The reign of *homo educandus* and *homo æconomicus* go hand in hand. Liberation from the one cannot occur without liberation from the other” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 62)

“One of the specific features of modern bourgeois societies is the separation between work and learning, between school and workshop” (Pradilla Cobos & Jiménez, 1973, p. 65)

“Every social formation that had a beginning is bound to have an end: professions will not last forever” (Robert, 2022, p. 84)

“Thank you for reminding me that our real purpose of ‘making’ is to encourage possibilities for presencing in and through experimentation. That study is wake work toward incompleteness, so we may more tightly interconnect the tender synapses of our callused souls. That abolition starts with the self, so we may lose our individuated selves in favor of a blurred, irreducible sociality of the senses. Enough with worrying about what they say or do. May this be an open invitation for more friends to join in the incompleteness of this fucked-up world. Let’s keep making something different. Together. Now. We all we got. And ‘all’ is all we gotta be” (Lee, 2021, p. 172)

“Our aim has to be to make ourselves ungovernable to the white power structure” (Kom’boa Ervin, 2021, p. 122)

“What the beyond of teaching is really about is not finishing oneself, not passing, not completing; it’s about allowing subjectivity to be unlawfully overcome by others, a radical passion and passivity such that one becomes unfit for subjection” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 35)

“...simply insisting on escape does not mean one escapes...” (Bey, 2023, p. 14)

Let’s take the all-too-familiar tale of education and labour and stand on its head (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 3) and *co-move* from professionalizing education to autonomous learnings, and from abstract labour to autonomous doings. What are some of the modes of learning and doing that co-move and put at their center

the potency of imagination and rehearsal of *other worlds*, other modes of *inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence*, beyond-against and beyond the architectural world that sustains by/for the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*? These assemblage of *material-discursive practices*, point to the inseparability of modes of *inhabiting earth* and *forms for existence*. Beyond-against and beyond the *architectural world*, we co-move, dream and rehearse towards anarchic worlds, ungovernable modalities of inhabitation, *beautiful experiment in how-to-live*, towards collective trans-formations, and *become ungovernable* (Hartman, 2019, p. 203) (Hartman, 2021, pp. xiii–vi). What can we learn from these experiences?

This chapter is distributed in two sections: learnings and doings. The first section, on learnings, emerges from the *mutually illuminating intra-actions* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular learning praxis, and how these move beyond-against and beyond the *education-based mode of study* and schooling. All these learning modalities have in common a fundamental focus on problematizing the coloniality of being, the colonization, monopoly and captivity of our modes of existence, reduced, and homogenized to that of the modern individual-subject, through education and schooling, and move towards other modes of becoming, modes that put learning at its center as a collective, autonomous activity to sustain life. Following the invitation of Esteva, by way of Illich, to re-claim verbs as learning, rather than nouns as education, we understand learning as the possibility and collective potency to compose other modes of existence, to *study*, problematize and trans-form the territory. Modes of *sentir-pensar-hacer*—feeling-thinking-doing—together that allow sharing *saberes-sentires-haceres*.

The first part *Beyond-against and beyond education and schooling* of the section on learnings first outlines, through the work of kalicabra (kalicabra, 2019), in which they understand education—managed “learning” or education-based mode of study—as; a product to be consumed, pure imposition, standardized violence, an unequal system and a method of standardization. And we understand education as: the re/production of social orders, uni-versalization, the rule of consumption and pre-alienation or the training of: bondage, obedience and labour. Followed by a second part *Modes of learning and non-hegemonic education*, which outlines, also following kalicabra, and how they understand self-organized learning as; collective process, contextualization of *saberes*, critical thinking, unlearning and as emancipating responsibility; and we understand learning as: un/learning, trans-versal processes, situated *saberes*, relational *sentir-pensar-hacer*, anarchic trans-formation and *study*.

This will not be another “attempt to package and sell one more reform initiative or proposal about improving or expanding the educational system. It has no new literacy project for the illiterate. It has no ‘informal education’ remedy for those left sick or incapacitated by ‘formal education.’ It does not create multicultural medicines for the diseases of monoculturalism” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 3).

The second section, on doings, problematizes the colonality of labour, that is how abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour has captured life. To the point in which we live to work, rather than work to live. And outlines an abolitionist critique of labour by way of the *mutually illuminating intra-actions* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular material-discursive practices, and how these move beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. The first part of this second section, *Beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract labour*, problematizes abstract labour as: the service of humans in bondage, the valorization of life, abstraction, white patriarchal rule and racist colonial rule.

We do not work because we enjoy it. Fuck the colonial labour morality! Fuck the bourgeois ideology that work dignifies! Fuck the white-vocation-calling of architectural labour! We work because we constantly have to economically justify life, our existences. We are exhausted of this! This is why as Krisis Group emphasizes, labour is the key form of capitalist domination (Krisis-Group, 1999), in other words, the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is fundamentally sustained through labour. Abstract-alienating-subordinated labour “is the backbone of the capitalist system and the commodity is the heart of a heartless world” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 2).

The second part *No will to work* of the section on doings, engages forwardly with an abolitionist critique of abstract labour and outlines the struggle against labour through: abolition of labour, against the vocational calling of architectural labour, fugitive deprofessionalization, doings, and communal and anti-colonial doings.

The same as education, “after centuries of domestication, the modern human being can not even imagine a life without labour. As a social imperative, labour not only dominates the sphere of the economy in the narrow sense, but also pervades social existence as a whole, creeping into everyday life and deep under the skin of everybody” (Krisis-Group, 1999, p. 39).

Education under the current conditions, is nothing more than vocational and capitalist coaching, bondage training. There is no point in trans-forming education if it continues fueling its vocational purpose. An educational trans-formation without an integral trans-formation, or a labour trans-formation is absurd. Any educational trans-formation should go in hand with a labour trans-formation, situated through the intra-action of modes of doing and modes of learning. Modes that co-move towards the rebellions of spatio-territorial learnings and doings, that challenge uni-versal dominant modes of spatialization, inhabitation and existence, that fall under architectural labour and education.

Learnings

Beyond-against and beyond education and schooling

“Education still remains the privilege of a small minority” (Kropotkin, 1995, p. 18)

“Of course, school is not, by any means, the only modern institution which has as its primary purpose the shaping of man’s vision of reality. The hidden curriculum of family life, draft, health care, so-called professionalism, or of the media play an important part in the institutional manipulation of man’s worldview, language, and demands. But school enslaves more profoundly and more systematically, since only school is credited with the principal function of forming critical judgment, and, paradoxically, tries to do so by making learning about oneself, about others, and about nature depend on a prepackaged process. School touches us so intimately that none of us can expect to be liberated from it by something else” (Illich, 1971, p. 47)

“The educator does not inculcate the dominant ideology because it is expressly intended, but because it is not perceived as such. Because the educator is also a prisoner, without knowing it, the educator will introduce young people into the prison. Since the educator is integrated, the educator will be an integrator. Its apoliticism will be the main reason for its political efficacy” (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 6)

“If prison/school are two sides of a common institutional structure that operates by way of individuation, then perversion is a pre-carceral breaking out of prison, a pre-scholarly dropping out of school, that continually reveals the ubiquity of the total education that hunts it down and puts it to work” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 63)

“The ‘age of schooling’ began about two hundred years ago. Gradually the idea grew that schooling was a necessary means of becoming a useful member of society. It is the task of this generation to bury that myth” (Illich, 1980, p. 53). A few generations, have passed since Illich entrusted such task. We have not yet buried this myth. Still as Illich, underscores, “the desire for education has actually given way to the compulsion of schooling” (Illich, 1980, p. 54). Let’s refuse the desire for education along with the compulsion for schooling.

“Capitalism is the first mode of production in which the children of the exploited are entirely disciplined and educated in institutions organized and controlled by the class that dominates them. It is evident

that every school is a center of ideological discipline and training of the labor force. The school together with the family and work are necessary compartments for the total organization of this society. So much so, that the passage from one to the other of these compartments is painful. And this pain cannot be eliminated by patching up the relations between one ghetto and another but only by destroying each of them” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020d, p. 41).

Education as we are subjected today in Abya Yala arrived by boat. It arrived and spread initially through the religious and moral enterprise of catholic missions. Educating was evangelizing. Evangelizing was civilizing. Civilizing meant dispossession, deterritorialization, normalization, proletarianization, forced inclusion, amongst other violences. Civilizing meant the re/production of the individual proprietor (Carrillo Trueba, 2016, p. 49). Some were not even considered human enough to be civilized. Any critique of architectural education that ignores these colonial conditions is mere white reformism.

The following are some notes towards an abolitionist critique of education by way of the *mutually illuminating intra-action* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular learning praxis. Material-discursive practices that might shed some light and move beyond-against and beyond the imbricated modulations of vocational education and co-move towards autonomous learnings. Education is problematized through the imbrication of: reproduction of social orders and hegemonic rule, uni-versalization under coloniality, commodification and consumption, and professionalization as training in bondage.

The distinction between education and learning, and the structure of the sub-chapters, is derived from Esteva and dis/appropriated from the work of the mexican collective kalicabra, and their book *Nuestro aprendizaje será autogestionado o no será*, Our learning will be self-managed or it won't be, in which they draw a distinction between “learning” and learning. They refer to “learning,” “as that teaching process that is imposed, managed by others from outside and specialized under a heteronomy. And [...] remove the quotation marks when it is self-organized learning, that getting to learn that people carry out under their own terms and under a regulation agreed” collectively (kalicabra, 2019, pp. 8–9). Or, to repeat, what Meyerhoff proposes as modes of study, that enables a more nuanced understanding, between *alternative modes of study* and *education-based mode of study* (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 15). Meyerhoff's “critique is aimed neither at the term ‘education’ nor at educational institutions, but rather at the education-based mode of study. [Meyerhoff's] concept of modes of study is similar to the Marxist concept of modes of production, which is defined as a configuration of means (i.e., forces) of production and relations of production. But, unlike orthodox Marxists, who envision ‘natural progress’ through changing modes of production (e.g., from feudalism to capitalism to communism), [Meyerhoff] do not theorize any necessarily developmental, progressive, or teleological relations between different modes of study. Also, instead of using the term ‘modes of production’ [Meyerhoff] prefers ‘modes of

world-making.’ The former tends to carry the orthodox Marxist baggage of a dualistic worldview (i.e., material base vs. ideological superstructure), whereas ‘modes of world-making’ implies a monist worldview with ideas and materiality on the same immanent plane of existence. By asserting that modes of study and modes of world-making are co-constitutive, [Meyerhoff is] discouraging a dualist or transcendent view in which adopting a certain mode of study could give a vantage on the world from a point outside and separate from the world” (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 20).

For our case, rather than using quotation marks as *kalicabra*, we draw this distinction as education and learning. Under the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*, education is forced compulsory learning. Education is learning *enforced by economic or political means, by the carrot or the stick. (The carrot is just the stick by other means)* (Black, 1986, p. 2). We understand learning as autonomous collective practices in which people dedicate attention *to* and *in* the world, as the possibility and collective potency to imagine and rehearse other modes of becoming, to *study*, problematize and trans-form the territory. Modes of *sentir-pensar-hacer* together autonomously that allow sharing *saberes-sentires-haceres*.

The following sections work through *kalicabra*’s structure in which they understand education—managed “learning” or education-based mode of study—as; a product to be consumed, pure imposition, standardized violence, an unequal system and a method of standardization. And we understand education as: the re/production of social orders, uni-versalization, the rule of consumption and pre-alienation or the training of: bondage, obedience and labour.

Education is the re/production of social orders

“Security? Culture? The rule of law? In the meantime, I look around and wherever there are colonizers and colonized face to face, I see force, brutality, cruelty, sadism, conflict, and, in a parody of education, the hasty manufacture of a few thousand subordinate functionaries, ‘boys,’ artisans, office clerks, and interpreters necessary for the smooth operation of business” (Césaire, 2001, p. 42)

The *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*, re/produces a hierarchical, authoritarian society, and such society will re/produce a hierarchical, authoritarian education.

Education, just like capital, was initially promoted by force. Presently, police and military forces are still employed to expand and intensify control over education. Nevertheless, education is now recognized as a personal and collective need. Similar to other necessities, it has evolved into a supposedly fundamental right. Beyond a mere bureaucratic state imposition, education has become a legitimate and uni-versally recognized

societal obsession, motivating knowledge and competence consumers to willingly, fervently, and compulsively acquire their restraints and thereby contribute to the re/production of patriarchal-colonial capitalism (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 14).

As Esteva, Prakash and Stuchul argue, in *From a pedagogy for liberation to liberation from pedagogy*, we have been lured and modulated into the belief that schooling and education are necessary for a good life. We have been schooled. The cult of experts has tricked us into thinking that professional expertise is required for learning and living. We have been schooled to accept a specific type of institutional structure (such as schools) that is hierarchical, centralized, compartmentalized, and normalized, which offers the illusion of planned choice and freedom. Through a curriculum-focused education, we have learned how to measure, evaluate, and rank knowledge, ourselves and others. Additionally, we have come to believe that schooling leads to learning, school-based learning leads to wisdom, and this wisdom should result in improved living, measured quantitatively. We have come to overlook the negative impact that an excessive focus on “quantity” or “quality” (in education, career, income, possessions, etc.) can have on our spirit, body, culture, and nature (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 22).

Education under capitalism is a means to modulate society and re/produce social orders. In chapter 3 *Architectural education: pedagogies of the new, industries of the self*, we reviewed the genealogy of education and the current conditions of the uni-versity and higher education under/for neo-liberal capitalism. Reiterating a key point discussed, Illich, reminds us that the term “education” is a relatively recent concept, which is often overlooked. The concept of educating children was first mentioned in French in 1498. In English language, the word “education” appeared in 1530. It took another century for the word and idea of *educación* to become known in spanish. Before the term “education” was used, people would study specific subjects like classics or law, rather than being educated for life. During the XVI century, theological disputes centered around the concept of “justification” and its role in politics and violence. The church split, leading to different beliefs about the inherent sinfulness of humanity and predestination. However, in the XVII century, a new consensus emerged that humans were born incompetent for society and required “education” to improve. Education became seen as a process rather than just acquiring knowledge and skills, and it was considered a necessary commodity for the benefit of all. Justification in the eyes of society became essential for those born with inherent stupidity, comparable to the original sin. Schooling and education are closely connected, much like church and religion or ritual and myth. The rituals and myths of education help sustain and perpetuate the curriculum, which is created by the underlying myth. The term “education” as a broad concept of social justification is unique to christian theology and not commonly found in other cultures. The process of schooling is what distinguishes schools from other historical learning institutions (Illich, 1977, p. 75).

John Amos Comenius (1592-1670), a Moravian bishop and educator, is considered a precursor of modern schooling. He proposed a system of compulsory education with seven to twelve grades, aiming to

provide enlightenment to all individuals. In his work, he likened the process of educating children to the alchemical practice of refining base elements to create gold. Comenius believed that education could transform people and society, making it more accessible and beneficial for everyone. However, despite their efforts, alchemists were unsuccessful in their pursuits, but they continued to seek new explanations for their failures and tried again (Illich, 1977, p. 72).

Since such alchemical attempts, “not only education but social reality itself has become schooled” (Illich, 1971, p. 2). Education is forced compulsory learning. Let’s take the “the all-too-familiar tale of education and stand on its head” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 3). This is not another attempt to improve education.

Let’s establish from the outset that “school cannot be a space of freedom in the midst of social coercion; its action would then be innocuous, because the effects of the relationship of the individual with the other social instances would be much stronger. Starting from the principle of authority the school does not withdraw from society, but is included in it” (Gallo, 1997a, p. 3).

As Miguel A. Elorza, in *Educación libertaria y comunalidad*, argues, the current educational systems play a role in maintaining capitalist society by training the workforce needed for primary and industrial production, legitimizing capitalist relations of production, and alienating certain groups who see education as a means of social advancement. Additionally, these systems justify unemployment for those who lack access to education and modulate people into potential consumers. The education provided to young people through schools has been used by the ruling classes as a tool to maintain their control. The hierarchical structure of modern schools, with authority figures at the top and students at the bottom, contributes to an authoritarian environment that often prioritizes irrelevant content. Instead of preparing young people for justice, fraternity, solidarity and affectivity, the school system restricts freedom, stifles creativity, and fails to uphold principles of justice. Education, which should be a positive force, instead becomes a source of alienation and suffering, to dehumanize people (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 29).

This notes are intended for co-moving beyond-against and beyond education towards learning. Because, as Tolstoy underscores: “education is a compulsory, forcible action of one person upon another for the purpose of forming a [hu]man such as will appear to us to be good; [...] The difference between education and culture lies only in the compulsion, which education deems itself in the right to exert. Education is culture under restraint. Culture is free” (Tolstoy, 2008, p. 5). “Education is the tendency of one to make another just like itself” (Tolstoy, 2008, p. 6).

John Holt argues that education, particularly the compulsory and competitive school system, is the most authoritarian and dangerous social invention. It serves as the foundation for a modern worldwide slave state, where people are reduced to mere producers, consumers, spectators, and fans, driven by greed, envy, and fear. Instead of trying to improve education, our goal should be to eliminate it and allow people to shape

themselves (Holt, 2003, p. 2). As Illich, noted, Holt was a “monomaniacal guy” who passionately took charge of spreading his ideas through his newsletter and association. He was known for his unique habits, such as wearing a green helmet in the subway to avoid distractions and listening to recordings of poetry (Iván Illich & Cayley, 1992, pp. 209–210). When asked to define education, Holt rejected the term, as it implies a separation of learning from everyday life and a designed process where one person imposes their will on another. Instead, he believed in a process where people become more informed, intelligent, curious, competent, and skillful through their interactions with the world and the integration of learning, work, play, and socializing. He struggled to find a single word to replace “education,” but suggested that “living” could be a suitable alternative (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 73).

Holt, closes *Instead of Education* with two clear lines: “education—compulsory schooling, compulsory learning—is a tyranny and a crime against the human mind and spirit. Let all those escape it who can, any way they can” (Holt, 2003, p. 125).

Education is uni-versalization

As noted previously, education as we are subjected today in Abya Yala arrived by boat. Educating was evangelizing. Evangelizing was civilizing. Civilizing meant dispossession, deterritorialization, normalization, proletarianization, forced inclusion, amongst other violence.

Since colonial times, education sustains a sort of double bind, on the one hand it promises progress for all, “the illusion that education delivers employment, prestige and social mobility, which proved real for a minority, lead many people to accept its high price: severe cultural destruction and dismembering of family and community life. Step by step, the social majorities received proof that diplomas did not certify competence or skills but the number of hours and years during which the ass of a student has sat in a school chair. Far from guaranteeing employment, they doom many of those advancing up the educational ladder to permanent frustration” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 15). While on the other hand it violently “creates two classes of people: the educated and the uneducated or undereducated. The educated, a minority, receive all kinds of privileges from their position. The rest get all kinds of deprivation and destitution. No literacy campaign or educational project has or can overcome that deprivation and destitution in any society” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 13).

The abolition of education, moves beyond-against and beyond some of the now popular claims about the decoloniality of knowledge, which similar to Illich’s critique to “those who are concerned mainly with the curriculum claim that it is outdated or irrelevant. So, the curriculum is filled with new packaged courses on African Culture, North American Imperialism, Women’s Lib, Pollution, or the Consumer Society” (Illich, 1977, p. 73), sustains that new and decolonial curriculums should be included in schools and uni-versities.

One of the main apparatuses of the colonality of knowledge is the imposition and re/production of education through schooling, as means to modulate people and re/produce *the world* under/for amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. The decolonization of knowledge means fundamentally the abolition of education and schooling, not decolonial education, not decolonial curriculums managed by schools.

“Educators continue to educate the world in the fallacy that education is as old as the hills. However, the idea of education is exclusively modern. Born of capitalism, education perpetuates it. The past is colonized every time the cultural practices or traditions for learning or study of pre-modern or non-modern peoples are reduced to that category understood as education. Across the globe, education is promoted in the name of equality and justice. Education is presented as the best remedy for the oppressive inequalities of modern society. It produces, however, exactly the opposite. Education creates the most oppressive of the class divisions now in existence, separating people into two groups: the ‘knowledge capitalists’ and the ‘destitute.’ In this new class structure, more value is attributed to those consuming more knowledge. And because society invests in them in the creation of ‘human capital,’ the means of production are reserved for them. The few receive all kinds of privileges; the many suffer all kinds of discriminations and disqualification” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 13). This educational division of labour, operates both at the scale of internal colonialism and globalitarian coloniality.

Together with the state, the school has become a uni-versal institution. Or as Illich, argues, “the school has become the established Church of secular times. The modern school had its origins in the impulse towards universal schooling, which began two centuries ago as an attempt to incorporate everyone into the industrial state. In the industrial metropolis the school was the integrating institution. In the colonies the school inculcated the dominant classes with the values of the imperial power and confirmed in the masses their sense of inferiority to this schooled elite. Neither the nation nor the industry of the pre-cybernetic era can be imagined without universal baptism into the school. The dropout of this era corresponds to the lapsed *marrano*¹⁶ of eleventh-century Spain” (Illich, 1980, p. 108).

Although the colonizing enterprise placed great emphasis on education, it was not referred to as such. Attempts to impose the official state language and literacy upon indigenous peoples were not the main focus of education, which aimed to “civilize” and bring them out of their “barbarian” condition. However, this goal was never achieved, as the majority of indigenous peoples were able to preserve their own culture despite formal domination by the spanish. “From the first priests of the sixteenth century until today’s initiatives, education represents a threat of cultural extinction for [indigenous people]. The threat became a reality for many: millions of [indigenous people] ceased to be what they were; they had no longer the supportive hammock (Esteva, 1987) of their cultures; the promises of education were fulfilled for very few of them. Many [indigenous people] saw in education a path to liberation under the assumption of a *mestizaje*: the only way to escape from the

discrimination, exclusion, and oppression associated with the condition of being [indigenous people]" (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, pp. 33–34).

Martin Carnoy in *Education as cultural imperialism*, argues that, "the spread of schooling was carried out in the context of imperialism and colonialism—in the spread of mercantilism and capitalism—and it cannot in its present form and purpose be separated from that context. This is not to say that schooling was not affected by the cultures into which it was introduced; however, the effect was small relative to the principal relationships that schooling was designed to promote. Thus, although schooling which originated in the metropole promoted change from one hierarchy to another—from the traditional hierarchy of the colonized culture to some form of the hierarchy of European mercantilism or capitalism—this change was carefully defined. The structure of schools, since it came from the metropole, was based in large part on the needs of metropole investors, traders, and culture. Western schools were used to develop indigenous elites which served as intermediaries between metropole merchants and plantation labor; they were used to incorporate indigenous peoples into the production of goods necessary for metropole markets; they were used to help change social structures to fit in with European concepts of work and interpersonal relationships; and, within advanced capitalist economies such as the United States, schools were used to fit white workers and, later, disenfranchised minorities into economic and social roles defined by the dominant capitalist class" (Carnoy, 1977, p. 15).

Education is the rule of consumption

"Education is the economization of learning, transforming it into the consumption of a commodity called knowledge" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 15). "The very modern idea of teaching everything to everyone, of providing the same knowledge to every member of a society, of educating all of them to give to them vital competence, transformed learning and knowledge into a commodity. It applied to learning the premise of scarcity: the economic principle that people's wants are very great, not to say infinite, but the means are limited, although improvable. The logic of this assumption defines the economic problem par excellence: to allocate resources (limited means to alternative, unlimited ends). Once defined as education, the conditions for learning, always sufficient in every culture for its own requirements, became scarce. Once the premise of scarcity became the main principle of organization for society, with modernity and capitalism, the allocation of means for learning and for the distribution of the new commodity called knowledge, always limited, started to follow the pattern of injustice: some had access to them; others did not. Furthermore, the ways and means of learning still available for the destitute were restricted, eliminated, or radically devalued. The very experience of knowing was transmogrified into the mechanical consumption of abstract, unfleshed, disembodied, genderless texts, now called 'knowledge'" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 17).

Even before *Deschooling Society* (1970) (Illich, 1971), Illich's criticisms of the education system were well-known, as seen in his works *The Futility of Schooling in Latin America* (Illich, 1968) and *School: The Sacred Cow* (Illich, 1973), which sparked intense debate upon their release in 1968 and 1969. However, it was *Deschooling Society* that brought him the recognition and notoriety necessary for his "successful marginalization." As Vice-Rector of the Catholic University of Puerto Rico and a member of the Board governing the island's entire educational system in 1958, Illich realized how compulsory education perpetuates structured injustice by teaching people to blame themselves for their perceived failure to achieve the illusion of equality and success. Through conversations with Everett Reimer he understood that the obligation to attend school restricts the right to learn for the vast majority, combining the inherent poverty of many children with a newfound internalized sense of guilt for not succeeding academically (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 68).

In the 1960s, Illich and Reimer, along with Valentina Borremans who was the cofounder and director of the *Centro Intercultural de Documentación* (CIDOC), organized seminars and discussions attended by various intellectuals including John Holt, Paulo Freire, and Peter Berger. These seminars led to the publication of *Deschooling Society* in 1970, which paid tribute to two participants who had passed away, Paul Goodman and Augusto Salazar Bondy. These seminars focused on the monopoly of the industrial mode of production and explored alternative concepts suitable for a postindustrial era. The first industrial sector Illich examined was the school system and its presumed outcome, education. In 1971, seven papers from this period were published under the title *Deschooling Society*. The book argued that uni-versal education through traditional schooling is not possible and that alternative educational webs should be established instead. Illich and Goodman criticized the discriminatory nature of the education system and called for a reform that would liberate learning from traditional institutions. The reactions to this book revealed that Illich's description of the negative hidden aspects of compulsory schooling—referred to as the "hidden curriculum"—was being misused, not only by advocates of free schools, but also by schoolmasters who were eager to transform themselves into adult educators (Illich, 1977, p. 68) (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 70).

"The critique of a de-schooling Illich died a quick death once he recognized the ridiculous impact of his most famous book on nourishing the very institutions he identified as oppressive, unjust, and violent. The Illich who rose out of the ashes of the dead de-schooler knew well the folly of fame; knew well the danger of writing for abstract audiences. Forsaking the temptation of fame and fortune, following in his Christian tradition, he chose the path of friendship, of seeing himself in the eyes of his friends. He thus wrote only for his friends, rather than for abstract audiences. "In Lieu of Education" (1977) was written by the Illich who celebrates the worlds, the traditions of the uneducated, the undereducated, the illiterate, and the drop out. It is the Illich who showed us the wealth of worlds, the richness of those Two-Thirds worlds of people whose being forsakes the curricula and the pedagogies of the pedagogues in the global classroom. It is this Illich who forsakes

the desire to convert people into de-schooling their lives. It is this Illich who so fully celebrates the vernacular gender of his vernacular worlds, of his 12th century ancestors, uneducated and uneducable. From this Illich, we have learned to use the word “education” with extreme caution because of the toxicity of the enterprise with which it has come to be inextricably connected. It is the post-Deschooling Illich who recognized that ALL education is consumer training, transmogrifying people into individuals, who can fit into and function within a society of consumers as either prisoners of addiction or prisoners of envy” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 21).

In conversation with David Cayley, Illich, reflects on his friendship and distance with Freire, and makes it clear that he “moved from the criticism of schooling to the criticism of what education does to a society, namely, foster the belief that people have to be helped to gain insights into reality, and have to be helped to prepare for existence or for living” (Iván Illich & Cayley, 1992, p. 207).¹⁷

This movement, also allowed Illich to explain the commodification of learning through the hidden curriculum and the schooling of consumers. Against the pretended holiness of the educational industry, the schooling industry. Illich introduces the concept of the hidden curriculum, “that only through schooling can an individual prepare for adulthood in society, that what is not taught in school is of little value, and that what is learned outside school is not worth knowing. [Illich calls] it the hidden curriculum because it constitutes the unalterable framework of the schooling system, within which all changes in the visible curriculum are made. [...] What is important in the hidden curriculum is that students learn that education is valuable when it is acquired in the school through a graded process of consumption; that the degree of success the individual will enjoy in society depends on the amount of learning he consumes; and that learning about the world is more valuable than learning from the world. The imposition of this hidden curriculum within an educational program distinguishes schooling from other forms of planned education. All the world’s school systems have common characteristics as distinguished from their institutional output, and these are the result of the common hidden curriculum of all schools” (Illich, 1977, p. 70).

“The hidden curriculum translates learning from an activity into a commodity for which the school monopolizes the market. The name we now give to this commodity is ‘education,’ a quantifiable and cumulative output of a professionally designed institution called school, whose value can be measured by the duration and the costliness of the application of a process (the hidden curriculum) to the student. The grammar school teacher with an M.A. commands a greater salary than one with fewer hours of academic credit, regardless of the relevance of the degree to the task of teaching.” (Illich, 1977, p. 71)

“The more education an individual consumes, the more ‘knowledge stock’ acquires and the higher it rises in the hierarchy of knowledge capitalists. Education thus defines a new class structure for society within which the large consumers of knowledge—those who have acquired greater quantities of knowledge stock—can claim to be of superior value to society. They represent gilt-edged securities in a society’s portfolio of human

capital, and access to the more powerful or scarcer tools of production is reserved to them” (Illich, 1977, p. 71). Such as those who pursue a PhD.

“Many decades of reliance on schooling have turned knowledge into a commodity, a marketable staple of a special kind. Knowledge is now regarded simultaneously as a first necessity and as society’s most precious currency. (The transformation of knowledge into a commodity is reflected in a corresponding transformation of language. Words that formerly functioned as verbs are becoming nouns that designate possessions. Until recently ‘dwelling’ and ‘learning’ and ‘healing’ designated activities. They are now usually conceived as commodities or services to be delivered. We talk about the manufacture of housing or the delivery of medical care; people are no longer regarded as fit to heal or house themselves. In such a society people come to believe that professional services are more valuable than personal care. Instead of learning how to nurse grandmother, the teen-ager learns to picket the hospital that does not admit her.) This attitude could easily survive the disestablishment of school” (Illich, 1977, p. 79).

Education as the rule of the market means that production and most importantly consumption rule. On the education of potential consumers, Illich had very clear that “education for a consumer society is equivalent to consumer training. The reform of the classroom, the dispersal of the classroom, and the diffusion of the classroom are different ways of shaping consumers of obsolescent commodities. The survival of a society in which technocracies can constantly redefine human happiness as the consumption of their latest product depends on educational institutions (from schools to ads) that translate education into social control” (Illich, 1977, p. 81).

Under the current neo-liberal government of freedom or the conduct of conduct, “the university is not only an apparatus or instrument of the State, but has also become an extension of the enterprise-form: for this reason, education is seen as just another commodity that is available to be acquired according to a series of possibilities” (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 90). “School as enterprise and Enterprise as school” (Martínez Posada, 2010, p. 143).

Martínez Posada, argues, that “the current problem is not education as an instrument (‘apparatus’) of the State, but as an extension of the enterprise-form, because education has become a commodity whose purpose is the increase of ‘intellectual assets’ and labour competencies in a knowledge economy. This translates into a scenario for proposing analyses and reflections that question the place of knowledge and subjects as a market” (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 14). We agree with respect to the commodification of education, but as argued before, the neo-liberalization of the state is not “less state,” but on the contrary, a stronger state at the service of capital. This is an example of how capitalism, entangles, both private and public milieus, considering that both are at the service of/for capital.

Education is pre-alienation or the training of: bondage, obedience and labour

“We are so perverted by an education which from infancy seeks to kill in us the spirit of revolt, and to develop that of submission to authority; we are so perverted by this existence under the ferrule of a law, which regulates every event in life—our birth. our education. our development, our love, our friendship—that, if this state of things continues, we shall lose all initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves” (Kropotkin, 1970, p. 197)

Education is more and more just labour training. A machine of neutralization. Illich notes that we have grown accustomed to discussing the worker’s alienation from their work in a class society, through Marx’s writings. However, we must now acknowledge that people are also estranged from their learning when it is treated as a commodity of a service profession, and people are reduced to being consumers (Illich, 1977, p. 71).

Illich, underscores that “alienation, in the traditional scheme, was a direct consequence of work’s becoming wage-labor which deprived man of the opportunity to create and be recreated. Now young people are pre-alienated by schools that isolate them while they pretend to be both producers and consumers of their own knowledge, which is conceived of as a commodity put on the market in school. School makes alienation preparatory to life, thus depriving education of reality and work of creativity. School prepares for the alienating institutionalization of life by teaching the need to be taught. Once this lesson is learned, people lose their incentive to grow in independence; they no longer find relatedness attractive, and close themselves off to the surprises which life offers when it is not predetermined by institutional definition. And school directly or indirectly employs a major portion of the population. School either keeps people for life or makes sure that they will fit into some institution” (Illich, 1971, p. 46).

Education is then, pre-alienation at the service of abstract labour. Through schooling, in all its levels, people are modulated into domesticated, obedient, disciplined citizen-workers. Schooled to labour. Let us remember that capitalism and modern education, the education-based mode of study, are co-constitutive. And as Federici notes, “one of the preconditions for capitalist development was the process that Michel Foucault defined as the ‘disciplining of the body,’ which in [Federici’s] view consisted of an attempt by state and church to transform the individual’s powers into labor-power” (Federici, 2004, p. 158). Because “the human body and not the steam engine, and not even the clock, was the first machine developed by capitalism” (Federici, 2004, p. 176).

But, as already mentioned, not everyone gets even to be schooled to labour, education divides people into two groups: the educated and the uneducated or undereducated. The educated, who are a minority, enjoy various privileges due to their education, while the rest face deprivation and poverty. Despite efforts to promote

literacy and education, these societal inequalities cannot be eradicated through schooling (Esteve et al., 2005, p. 13). Also, these two classes, the educated and the uneducated, justify unemployment for those who lack access to education and further modulate people into potential consumers (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 29).

If we understand labour as abstract-alienating-subordinated-forced activities under capitalist production, the *service of humans in bondage in generalized mercantile society*. And, education as learning *enforced by economic or political means, by the carrot or the stick. (The carrot is just the stick by other means)* (Black, 1986, p. 2). Then students are not *non-workers*. Students are wageless workers. In fact, as Nick Mitchell underscores, students are not only unwaged labourers, but most of them, after the neo-liberalization of universities, pay to labour ((Boggs et al., 2019; Mitchell, 2023a, 2023b)). This is why, for Mitchell, a university is “a social institution in which the majority of the work produced is by workers who receive no wages in order to work, and conversely are expected to pay in order to work” (Mitchell, 2023a).

Martínez Posada in *La universidad productora de productores: entre biopolítica y subjetividad* and *Subjetividad, biopolítica y educación: Una lectura desde el dispositivo* (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 14), draws a critique of education and the university through the work of Foucault. From this reading, Martínez Posada argues that pedagogical practices become mercantile practices, which no longer prioritize educating people for life but instead focus on training them solely for labour. Life becomes labour. Therefore, it is assumed that neo-liberalism establishes the structure in which social spheres, including education, can function as markets and be associated with mechanism of competition (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 14).

Higher education, university education at large is composed then, as a collection of cognitive services that are provided in various locations worldwide, with the objective of strengthening a highly skilled and advanced labour force (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 95). Vocational training aims to construct a subjectivity that corresponds to the economic and disciplinary demands of the capitalist market; a subjectivity that internalizes the goals of the enterprise (Martínez Posada, 2014, p. 97). Through this frame, Martínez Posada, defines the university as a dispositif for the bio-political production of producers.

But as Carnoy, argues, assuming that schools are only meant for developing vocational skills is naive. Schools have additional, and even more important, functions. They transmit culture and values and guide people, as mentioned, into different social roles. They also help maintain social order. It is hard to imagine getting rid of schools as organizers of roles without significant changes in the economic and social structure itself. The conventional school emerged within capitalist economic and social systems to prepare people for different roles in those systems. In school, those who possess qualities highly valued by the economy and society, such as verbal ability, time awareness, and a preference for external rewards over internal ones, tend to excel. In capitalist societies, schools primarily reward those who are most desired by capitalistic economic,

social, and political institutions. In capitalist societies, education plays a crucial role in determining future social positions, even if it does not necessarily teach practical skills for future employment (Carnoy, 1977, p. 8).

In the previous section, we mentioned by way of Illich, that over the course of many decades, education has transformed knowledge into a marketable commodity. This has led to a shift in language, where words that used to describe verbs now refer to possessions. For example, activities like dwelling, learning, and healing are now seen as commodities or services to be obtained. In this society, professional services are valued more than personal care, and people no longer believe they are capable of taking care of themselves. This mindset could continue even if schools were no longer in existence (Illich, 1977, p. 79).

Commodities as housing are produced by the professional expertise of the architect, and as we have seen in chapter 3 *Pedagogies of the new industries of the self*, architectural education is fundamentally organized through the hierarchical/patriarchal rule of the architectural office. Hence the importance of the design studio pedagogy along the curriculum. As Franco La Cecla, argues in *Against Architecture*, “architectural schools give us little cause for hope. Every year [...] thousands of new architects [turn out], diplomas in hand, all of them determined to win the Grand Prix of the profession. The lust-driven models to which they subscribe are those that fall under the rubric of the unbridled freedom of the Genius, a hybrid of tsarist power and academic influence-mongering” (La Cecla, 2012, p. 115).

As we have mentioned, design studio pedagogy, relies on what Martínez Posada calls, the institutionalization of habits. By way of Berger and Luckmann, Martínez Posada argues that such institutionalization occurs when habits or repetitive actions, which stem from behavioral patterns, particularly when the existence of processes of institutionalization of the bodies of the forms of coexistence and of the social order is reflected in the technologies of the self. When the typification of habitualized actions are shared by others, it leads to the institutionalization of habits, which involves considering historical context, authority, and control (Martínez Posada, 2014, pp. 64–65).

The movement beyond-against and beyond education, towards deschooling, as Illich argues, “deschooling society means, first and foremost, rejecting the professional status of the profession which, in order of seniority, comes just after the oldest in the world, by which [Illich] means teaching. The qualification of teachers now constitutes a barrier to the right to teach, just as the corporate structure and the professional credentials of journalists represent a barrier to the right to freedom of information. The compulsory presence rule is contrary to the freedom of assembly. The deschooling of society could only be conceived as a cultural mutation whereby people regain the power to enjoy its constitutional freedoms” (Illich, 2006, p. 316). This includes the refusal not only of the status of architectural education and teachers, but most importantly, as we will see further in this chapter, the refusal in general of the professional status of architectural labour.

Because, as cuadernos de Negación, underscores: the domination of capital, enforced through wage, compels every person who is physically capable to operate within the framework of the division of labour. People are required to engage in activities that may not yield immediate profits but will ultimately contribute to the expansion and perpetuation of capital's dominance. From the perspective of children who are compelled to go through the same educational system, this is essentially the purpose of schooling. It represents the idea of capitalist equality in the face of unlimited learning opportunities (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020d, p. 19).

Modes of learning and non-hegemonic education

“At this point, I see no other way out than the abolition of school and the death of society. It is, therefore, a matter of abolishing the logic that organizes the educational system and the State itself, and not education itself. We have been talking and imagining for decades a world without racism, without class discrimination, where difference does not articulate systems of oppression. However, for our plans to gain (more) materiality, it is necessary to abolish: the school, the State, and all forms that imprison our *schizophrenic* ways of living” (da Silva, 2022, p. 8)

How do we dare to critique education! If education leads the way to the *good* life. Or is it to *this* life? But, we do not want *this* life! We are aware of the contradiction and privilege of writing a PhD dissertation beyond-against and beyond education. We are also aware of the privilege of refusing that which we have been given. Education. But we refuse education in order to struggle against exactly what we are meant to re/produce, because, again, as Esteva notes, education “creates two classes of people: the educated and the uneducated or undereducated. The educated, a minority, receive all kinds of privileges from their position. The rest get all kinds of deprivation and destitution. No literacy campaign or educational project has or can overcome that deprivation and destitution in any society” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 13). How to problematize vocational education if today institutions no longer even have to convince or motivate us to be educated? When we are the willing students of capitalism.

If, as we have seen, education through schooling is forced learning of vocational skills and most importantly the modulation of social roles for the re/production of patriarchal-colonial capitalism, universalization, and, consumer and labour training. What are the modalities of learnings that co-move against such modulation? Learnings that struggle beyond-against and beyond “the reign of *homo educandus* and *homo aeconomicus*.” That if we follow, Prakash and Esteva, “liberation from the one cannot occur without liberation from the other” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 62). And as Illich highlights, “a revolution against those forms of

privilege and power that are based on claims to professional knowledge must start with a transformation of consciousness about the nature of learning” (Illich, 1977, p. 84).

To put it in another way. Following Meyerhoff's, concept of modes of study, we could elaborate on modes of *unlearning*. What if we understand *unlearning* as a broader category, a trans-versal and constant activity of trans-formation of and in the world, as activities in which people devote attention to *undoing* the world and themselves, *practices of world un-making*. And that this sustained attention modifies their capacities and dispositions for *trans-forming* the world. A mode of *unlearning* could be way of *compos(t)ing* the means and relations of study (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 13). In the same way we could say that modes of inhabitation are ways of *composi(t)ing* the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation.

This is not an exhaustive investigation, the following experiences draw from the *mutually illuminating intra-actions* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular material-discursive practices, and how these move beyond-against and beyond education, schooling, the colonial project of the uni-versity, the colonality of being through the false promise of the uni-versal individual-subject and the colonality of labour through abstract labour.

Most of these learning experiences, *alternative modes of study*—material-discursive practices—are not part of the architectural industry. We feel the reasons do not merit a thorough explanation. Much has been said against architecture, its violences and failures. Co-moving with/through other modes of learning might shed some light, recognize *missed/encounters*, and refuse architectural education and architectural labour. Refuse architecture at large.

In recent years in architecture an interest has grown on what has been labelled “radical pedagogies.”¹⁸ While acknowledging the relevance of some of these vocational projects for architecture, we are here concerned with counter-learnings that move beyond-against and beyond the amalgam patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination and the current neo-liberal government of conduct of conduct through the uni-versity. Foucault explores the concept of counter-conduct in his 1977-78 *Lectures at the Collège de France: Security, Territory, Population*. He emphasizes the need to give up the word dissidence, and proposes the “doubtless badly constructed word ‘counter-conduct’—the latter having the sole advantage of allowing reference to the active sense of the word ‘conduct’—counter-conduct in the sense of struggle against the processes implemented for conducting others.” Foucault questions “‘misconduct (*inconduite*),’ which only refers to the passive sense of the word, of behavior: not conducting oneself properly.” He underscores that the concept of counter-conduct “enables us to avoid a certain substantification allowed by the word ‘dissidence.’ Because from ‘dissidence’ we get ‘dissident,’ or the other way around, it doesn't matter, in any case, dissidence is the act of one who is a dissident” (Foucault, 2007b, pp. 232–233). Basole on a similar path, notes that, “counter-discourses emerge at numerous social sites, in the variety of social processes that constitute the postcolonial experience. These sites

could provide radical alternatives to Eurocentric thought-categories—other ways of making sense of the world, [other ways of ending/subverting the world and producing other worlds, as *practices of world un-making*]. These constitute an archive of ‘available’ alternatives to European modernity” (Basole, 2009, p. 37).

The following sections work through kalicabra’s structure in which they understand self-organized learning as; collective process, contextualization of *saberes*, critical thinking, unlearning and as emancipating responsibility; and we understand learning as: un/learning, trans-versal processes, situated *saberes*, relational *sentir-pensar-hacer*, anarchic trans-formation and *study*.

Learning as unlearning

“The explosion will not happen today. It is too soon . . . or too late” (Fanon, 2008, p. 1)

“We have, I hope, outlived the era of the industrial state. We shall not live long, in any case, if we do not replace the anachronism of national sovereignty, industrial autarchy and cultural narcissism—which are combined into a stew of leftovers by the schools. Only within their sacred precincts could such old potage be served” (Illich, 1980, p. 55).

We have not. And a boosted potage of leftovers is still served in the same precincts. We will not live long. Will we be able to *unlearn* the current social structures and cognitive matrices that produce *this* world? Could *unlearning* be a process of resignification and reconfiguration towards an-other world(s)? Will we be able to end *this* world before it ends us? As Rolnik notes, micro-political trans-formations move at a slower pace than hegemonic violence. And Krenak argues, that maybe we won’t be able to trans-form ourselves in the given civilizational catastrophe, and the way to preserve life will be the end of humanity, not the end of the world. Because, “the earth has had countless other configurations, many of them without us on it, so why is it that we cling so stubbornly to this idea of the earth as humanity’s backyard? The Anthropocene plays such a dominant role in shaping our existence, our collective experience, and our idea of what humanity means. Our adherence to a fixed idea that the globe has always been this way and humanity has always related to it the way it does now is the deepest mark the Anthropocene has left” (Krenak, 2020, p. 31).

“We say we want to burn it all down, that we want to end the world as we know it & abolish white supremacy & prisons & heteropatriarchy. but do we truly mean that? is that something we are ready for? because that would entail, as Fred Moten says, the absolute overturning, the absolute turning of this motherfucker out; it would entail racial & gender abolition—thoroughgoing abolition—& the impossibility of knowing ahead of time the identification of the being before us & the tortuously elegant openness to having

our assumptions undermined & the utter cessation of biological, binaristic, sociohistorical determinism” (Bey, 2022, p. 105).

In 1995, Wynter, wrote in *1492: A New World View*, that “we need a new world with new social structures and cognitive matrices, founded on reciprocal relations” (Wynter, 1995). A new world does not mean changing this world, much less taking power to reform it. Because, as Moten, reminds us, “what it is that is supposed to be repaired is irreparable. It can’t be repaired. The only thing we can do is tear this shit down completely and build something new” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 152). A new world means, imagining and rehearsing, *in as many ways as possible* and needed.

Esteva, argues that the most challenging aspect of our learning experience has been the need to unlearn what we have previously learned. It is not about acquiring new knowledge, but rather about undoing the ingrained professional thinking that has modulated us. This process of un-learning is extremely difficult because it is essentially a process of undoing ourselves, and in doing so, we feel like we are losing ourselves (Esteva & O’Donovan, 2014). Apart from the problematic ontological considerations, for Maldonado-Torres, de-colonial pedagogies are practices of un-learning imposed and assumed schemas, and of reconstituting being again. As an intrinsic part of the discourse on coloniality and the de-coloniality of being, but also connected to doing, that is, to the practices of unlearning and re-learning as theoretical and political actions (Maldonado-Torres, 2013, p. 12).

Un-doing and losing ourselves, means, co-moving beyond-against and beyond: the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, cis-heteronormativity, and the distinct capitalist social roles tied to abstract labour, towards incompleteness and collectively becoming unfit for neo-liberal subjection. “Unavailable for servitude” (Hartman, 2019, p. 265).

How do we learn to un-learn? What are the material-discursive-practices that engage with the seeming paradox of learning to un-learn? To unlearn everything we have learned, everything we have learned in order to produce this exhausted, dominated and violent *world*. Experiences that rehearse the seeming paradox of *studying* to *unlearn*, *un-learning-studies*.

By way of Meyerhoff’s concept of modes of study, as “a generalized way of composing the *means* and *relations* of study in any given place and historical moment” (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 14). We understand, in general terms, modes of *unlearning*, as activities in which people devote attention to and in the world. “This sustained attention modifies their capacities and dispositions for understanding the world” (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 13). A mode of *unlearning* is a way of composi(t)ng the *means* and *relations* of study, as trans-versal and constant activities of trans-formation of and in the world, as *practices of world un-making* (Moten & da Silva, 2021).

Un/learning studies, might be close to the notion of *re-existencias*, proposed by Adolfo Albán Achinte. Re-existence, or r-existence “as the dispositifs that communities create and develop in order to invent life on a daily basis and thus confront the reality established by the hegemonic project that has inferiorized, silenced and negatively made visible the existence of afro-descendant communities from colonial times to the present day. Re-existence aims to decenter the established logics in order to search in the depths of cultures—in this case indigenous and afro-descendant cultures—for the keys to organizational, production, food, ritual and aesthetic forms that allow dignifying life and re-inventing it in order to continue transforming itself. Re-existence points to what the community, cooperative and union leader Héctor Daniel Useche Berón ‘Pájaro,’ murdered in 1986 in the municipality of Bugalagrande in central Valle del Cauca, Colombia, once asked, ‘¿*Qué nos vamos a inventar hoy para seguir viviendo?*’—‘What are we going to invent today to continue living?’” (Albán Achinte, 2013, p. 455).

Un/learning practices could bring together a discursive arrangement that intra-acts and expands with the relations Lucy Nicholas suggest between anarchism-post-structuralism-queer theory. As Nicholas argues: “many anarchist pedagogical practices and perspectives can be understood together with post-structuralism and queer theory” because they concern with the production of subjectivity ‘according to maximum possible ‘autonomy.’ These perspectives tend to consider the processes of production of subjectivity ‘as fundamentally situated and collective. As such, anarchist pedagogical approaches can resonate with post-structuralist notions of the subject as non-foundational and, therefore, while not predisposed to any particular way of being.’ Drawing from the work of Michel Foucault and Judith Butler, Nicholas argues that ‘post-structuralism and queer theory [...] offer to anarchism a pedagogical praxis that overcomes the possible impasse of non-foundational poststructuralist ontology, while acknowledging the complex terrains on which power operates to restrict this autonomy. Queer theory shares with the post-structuralist anarchist perspective the ethical impulse that the self (especially the sexual self) must be a willed creation, a result of some kind of agency free from coercion, alongside a more complex ontology that rejects a simplistic individualistic autonomy as the root of this.’ Nicholas emphasizes that the notion of the process of subjectivation elaborated by post-structuralism and queer theory challenges the notion of ‘autonomy,’ which ‘must be transformed to avoid assumptions of a reductive liberal individualism at its root and take into account the unavoidable constitutive aspects of relations with others, discourses, and social context that shape what autonomy can be. The ways that we learn to be selves [identification], and the extent to which they are as ‘autonomous’ as possible should be a concern for those concerned with developing pedagogical practice that departs from anarchist ethics” (Nicholas, 2012, pp. 242–259).

Queer praxis could be understood as a *material-discursive practice* of becoming, and queer pedagogies as un/learning rehearsals of becoming, that questions the “linked processes of learning and teaching to break down

traditional, and often oppressive, regimes of knowing and being” (McNeil et al., 2017, p. 1). Elizabeth McNeil, James E. Wemers and Joshua O. Lunn in the introduction to *Mapping Queer Space(s)*, in *Mapping Queer Space(s) of Praxis and Pedagogy*, make a brief genealogy of queer pedagogies, starting with William F. Pinar’s germinal compilation *Queer Theory in Education*. Pinar points out that gender discrimination and heterosexism cross the whole field of education (Pinar, 1998). Education often simulates the promise of intellectual progress as a mask for the reality of the re-production of “normality” and “neutrality.” For Pinar, if queer can mean an “open network of possibilities,” queer can mean the possibility of opening education to these possibilities. According to Pinar then, queer pedagogy opens up the possibility of a reaction to the systematic and heteronormative structure of education. Following Pinar, Mary Bryson and Suzanne de Castell claim that the value of queer pedagogy is the potential to disturb the forced status quo by rethinking education in terms that subvert the reproductive telos of the dominant ideology. For Bryson and de Castell, queer pedagogy is “a radical form of educative praxis implemented deliberately to interfere with, to intervene in, the production of ‘normalcy’ in schooled subjects” (Bryson & de Castell, 1993, p. 285). In their opinion, as McNeil, Wemers and Lunn concur, “queer pedagogy can transform education from a technique at the service of tacit heteronormative reproduction, which, as Pinar emphasizes, has maintained much learning and teaching in the West, into a technique to actively change normality” (McNeil et al., 2017, p. 2). Susanne Luhmann has also explored the radical potential of queer pedagogies to destabilize (hetero) normality, encouraging “an ethical practice by studying the risks of normalization, the limits of its own practices, and the im/possibilities of (subversive) teaching and learning” (Luhmann, 1998, p. 130). As McNeil, Wemers and Lunn Luhmann underscore, queer pedagogies can destabilize hegemonic concepts of the dominant ideology or the normal precisely because it can make both students and teachers think about how their subjectivities are produced (McNeil et al., 2017, p. 3).

We understand modes of *unlearning*, also, by way of Viníciux da Silva, in the text *Learning and Unlearning at the End of the World: Toward a Trans Black Radical Imagination Against Pedagogical Colonialism*, who introduces “pedagogical colonialism or colonial pedagogy. Inspired by Denise Ferreira da Silva (Ferreira da Silva, 2007) and bell hooks ((hooks, 1994); (hooks, 2003); (hooks, 2010)), [da Silva] uses these terms to refer to how pedagogical theory (which underlies the epistemological foundations of the educational system) is crossed by the colonality of knowledge and power. This effort is also an effort to construct new visions about education, grounded, above all, in radical imagination and black and queer anarchism” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 5). da Silva starts by asking some potent questions regarding the possibility of imagining modes of learning beyond the “ontoepistemological foundations of colonial modernity” and “the logic of knowledge beyond the tyranny of Reason and the Enlightenment” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 1). And honors the “role of radical imagination in the

teaching and learning processes towards the construction of a Corpus Infinitum (Ferreira da Silva, 2019), an entangled world, a future without coloniality” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 1).

Da Silva situates and entangles modes of un/learning through *black trans radical imagination* (da Silva, 2022b) and *anarchism*. By way of Acácio Augusto and Edson Passetti, da Silva (da Silva, 2022c, p. 7) notes how anarchist education and learnings, strengthen autonomy, value rebellion, and turn “to criticism with rupture, transformation, and the irruption of inventiveness” (Augusto & Passetti, 2010, p. 7). And, through the experience of coloniality in so-called Brazil, da Silva is compelled to teach and think “about education as a *practice of freedom* [through a field] mostly composed of black and trans/travesti people, especially in Brazil and Latin America, such as Abigail Campos Leal, Maria Clara Araújo, Jota Mombaça, Isadora Ravena, Nilma Lino Gomes, among others” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 9).

By way of these archives and experiences, da Silva “proposes three movements for a praxis of the radical imagination: 1) unlearning colonialism; 2) decolonizing the imagination; 3) building anti-colonial counterpedagogies” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 9).

By unlearning colonialism, through the work of Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyěwùmí in *Unlearning Lessons from Coloniality* (Oyěwùmí, 2019), da Silva notes that “decolonizing knowledge implies provincializing knowledge, that is, situating the logics from which knowledge is produced and validated. [...] In other words, shifting the logic of knowledge enables decolonization of knowledge from the understanding that knowledge is encoded from a specific lens. What happens is that the Western, as a political project, codifies all experiences from its own distinctive categories, as if the world can be read-only through these points of view, through the lens of a single history. With this, we can understand that knowledge is not, in fact, universal, and unlearn one of the foundational assumptions of colonialism and modernity: that there is only one way of living and being in the world (and being the world)” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 10). “Unlearning colonialism is not a simple task. Unlearning implies rewriting, reorganizing, and recovering alternative ways of living that were inserted into the logic of difference in order to think the world differently. In order to undo/unlearn colonialism” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 10).

“Decolonizing the imagination is a dangerous thing. As writer Walidah Imarisha rightly points out, ‘When we free our imaginations, we question everything. We recognize none of this is fixed, everything is stardust, and we have the strength to cast it however we will. To paraphrase Arundhati Roy, other worlds are not only possible but are on their way — and we can already hear them breathing. That is why decolonization of the imagination is the most dangerous and subversive decolonization process of all’ (Imarisha, 2015)” (da Silva, 2022c, p. 10).

da Silva understands imagination, and we resonate—which is to say we co-move—, “as the act of creating the possible, reinventing reality, and inaugurating new worlds. Imagination speaks so that the absent

becomes existent and therefore displaces what is given. Or rather, what has been given to us as stable. The world as it has been made known to us. We live in a world for which there seems to be no alternative. 'We live in capitalism. Its power seems to be inevitable. So was the divine power of kings. Human beings can resist any human power and change it' (Le Guin, 2014).

The radical imagination is, also, an act of refusal. A rebellion. Imagination does not bow to what is said to be 'unrealistic,' imagination remakes the world and has the revolutionary potential to, by reimagining the present, invent the future (da Silva, 2022a). When there seems to be no way out, the decolonized imagination summons us to create escape routes, to map the catastrophe, and to bring to the world what once seemed impossible. But what is the impossible if not something that is already inscribed in the possible?" (da Silva, 2022c, p. 11).

Lastly, regarding anti-colonial *unlearning* praxis, da Silva considers important to think through counter-pedagogies. "Understanding pedagogies as learning processes (not only educational), Monica Hoff states that 'Unlike pedagogies, counterpedagogies are not structured as palatable or even recognizable responses to power structures, nor are they concerned with teaching new ways of learning; they are, therefore, living processes, individual and collective, of unlearning the world and the set of knowledge, norms, and manners that this world considered should be learned until then. They are not telling us, therefore, only about the right to exist as a citizen, but about the right to exist outside the norms determined by the state and the social order that determine what a citizen is' (Hoff Gonçalves, 2019, p. 51). [...] Black, indigenous, and trans bits of knowledge are counterpedagogies and imagine the world differently, from different methodologies (or beyond methodologies) and reinvent our being by showing that it is possible to exist in otherwise ways" (da Silva, 2022c, p. 11).

Learning as trans-versality

As argued in the introduction, trans-versality, following Guattari's proposal is "a dimension that tries to overcome both the impasse of pure verticality and that of mere horizontality: it tends to be achieved when there is maximum communication among different levels and, above all, in different meanings" (Guattari, 1984, p. 18). And as David Cooper emphasizes in the introduction of *Molecular Revolution*, transversality, "also connotes an intellectual mobility across discipline boundaries and above all the establishment of a continuum through theory, practice and militant action"(Guattari, 1984, p. 3).

Trans-versality moves though the apparent opposition between pure horizontality and pure verticality, or between pure autonomy and pure heteronomy. That as Jean Robert, who called himself a conservative

anarchist, in *La libertad de habitar*, accurately asks, what is the unavoidable minimum of heteronomy that is necessary for the exercise of autonomy? (Robert, 1999, p. 13).

Autonomous experiences might light some paths through this question and impasse. Autonomous learnings draw directly from the principle of *autogestión*, self-organization. As Ramón Vera, argues, “The term *autogestión* is very suggestive. Because institutions manage our time and our actions (they administer us, dose us, and make us depend on them). Self-organization, on the other hand, implies that we ourselves take responsibility and solve our problems, our needs and general understanding. That is totally subversive” (Vera Herrera, 2012, p. 95). Not the “fable of the self-management of the existing” (Barbarroja & Tari, 2016, p. 39), but as Marcello Tari and Vicente Barbarroja argue in *Azufre rojo. El retorno de la Autonomía como estrategia*, the introduction to the spanish edition of *Un comunismo más fuerte que la metrópoli: La Autonomía Italiana en la década de 1970*, the self-organization of another *use* of ourselves and of the world. “Immanent to a certain intensity of sharing, to an attention to joy and play—in the activity that sustains what we create and that sustains us by creating it—but also to the effort required, in giving birth and in caring, in growing and in remaining. Moreover, as Piperno argued and as the Zapatista or Bolivian experience shows, it is insurrection that signals not only the opening that pushes us to experiment massively with another form of life—and to create or recreate the world where it can unfold—but also the place from which to take up again the thread of thought” (Barbarroja & Tari, 2016, p. 30).

Guattari insisted that, “to speak of self-management [self-organization] itself, without any context, is a myth. It becomes a type of moral principle, the commitment that the self of a group or company will be managed from and by itself” (Guattari, 2015, p. 283). “Self-management as a political order word is not an end in itself. The problem is defining the type of relationships, the forms to promote and the type of power to institute at every level of organization” (Guattari, 2015, p. 284).

Self-organized or autonomous learning, “is to expand our capacity to learn and do, rather than the capacity to buy packages of knowledge (Esteva, 2009). These packages are the product of the disdain that comes from assuming that people are naturally ignorant (Illich, 1985), a preconception that we accept only because we are societies introduced into a circle of consumption of minds managed by others. So we cannot begin a reform of the learning process or go beyond the consumer society if we do not understand that these types of systems are inevitably reproduced in ourselves. These forms clip our wings, rip off our roots and are forcibly grafted onto us” (kalicabra, 2019, p. 12).

“We support self-organized learning by listening to Illich, who in the 1970s was already warning us:

If we do not challenge the assumption that valid knowledge is a commodity that under certain circumstances can be forced on a consumer, society will be increasingly dominated by sinister pseudo-schools and totalitarian information managers. The pedagogical therapists will drug their students more in order to

teach them better, and the students will drug themselves more in order to obtain relief from the pressures of the professors and the career for the diplomas (Illich, 1985, p. 73).

This is why we [co-move towards a practice of learning, not through imposition,] but along the path of recognition of the freedom to do things for ourselves. That is to say, to act. And in this process of liberation, this dictatorship of [education] has no place” (kalicabra, 2019, p. 17).

“Mercantilized knowledge becomes education taught by ‘experts’ in the official educational, economic, scientific or welfare system, until it becomes detached from the community from which it arose (Vera Herrera, 2012). This is one of the dangers of the idea of learning as a personal journey with only individual merits, when the reality is that we build ourselves to a large extent by contributing to the learning of other people, especially those with whom we share capabilities and interests and therefore common searches.

The place of teaching-learning is itself a collective space, one in which and with which people learn and at the same time teach. *Saberes* are not things we can buy, they are weavings of relationships; they are processes, and cannot be individual (Vera Herrera, 2012). Like (Illich, 1985), instead of asking ourselves what someone should learn, [...] we encourage attending to the relationship with the people with whom we learn, in order to share what we believe, know or want to know. Emphasizing attention to the humanistic relationship, in the sense of keeping in mind that in any fragment of knowledge with which we relate today the fundamental meaning of the human is in dispute (Marina Garcés, 2017).

Is it not more acceptable a system of learning where the only kind of sanction admitted—if sanction can be called this—is the understanding of the concordance, or dissonance, between conduct and one's own and common good? A system in which the valid punishments are the immanent ones and not those originating in the discretion of a teacher (Cappelletti, 1980). Within these teaching-learning living environments, imposed hostility, normalized aggressiveness and the hierarchies of which we have already spoken, vanish. With self-organized learning we aspire to [autonomy], which always, like knowledge, is built collectively (Vera Herrera, 2012).

Getting to know is then the intelligence of the whole body practiced in the context of [autonomy], which when done collectively creates generations of love, self-determination, interdependence and self-regulation of [people] within a community (Betasamosake Simpson, 2014). [...] The personal desire to learn, is motivated and reinforced by the joy of free discovery, as well as by the presence and appreciation of the people with whom we live together during the teaching-learning process. Although the process of meaningful learning does not end here, in the collective process, but must be added to the specific context in which we live as a collective, because after assimilating that we are all related, it is also necessary to learn to relate to it, as a way to again *habitar y habitarnos*—inhabit and inhabit ourselves” (kalicabra, 2019, pp. 30–32).

Learning as situated saberes

Learning is situated common knowledge, that co-moves beyond-against and beyond the uni-versal modern-colonial civilizatory project.

Illich insisted that, “the deschooling of society implies a recognition of the twofaced nature of learning. An insistence on skill drill alone could be a disaster; equal emphasis must be placed on other kinds of learning. But if schools are the wrong places for learning a skill, they are even worse places for getting an education. School does both tasks badly, partly because it does not distinguish between them. School is inefficient in skill instruction especially because it is curricular. In most schools a program which is meant to improve one skill is chained always to another irrelevant task. History is tied to advancement in math, and class attendance to the right to use the playground” (Illich, 1971, p. 16).

What do we mean by learning, to learn? We understand learning as the possibility and collective potency to compose other modes for existence, to study, problematize and trans-form the territory. Modes of sentir-pensar-hacer together autonomously that allow sharing *saberes-sentires-haceres*. Drawing from the mexican collective, kalicabra, in their publication, *Nuestro aprendizaje será autogestionado o no será*, Our learning will be self-organized or it won't be, they argue that learning in opposition to education, “is developed in terms of freedom. However, the educational complex has taken on the task of making us accept learning as a pigeonholed and quantifiable program. The set of measurable bodies classified as students is managed by another variable of initial container of knowledge recognized as teachers. The student-teacher correspondence is then subjected to the hypothesis that learning itself is the only result of a curricular teaching, in a process that apart from anything else is at the service of someone else's goals, being that someone else a superior entity that pretends to be the only one competent to develop, impart and validate knowledge. Thus, from a very young age, freedom in our own learning process is taken away from us” (kalicabra, 2019, p. 8).

Let us “refuse the assumption introduced of the society forced to alienated study, under a hidden curriculum that we learn in an osmotic and implicit way without being formally explained what they are trying to do with our minds. This hidden curriculum demands an order and replication of behaviors and attitudes, it dictates to us that everything in life has a great secret and that our quality of life depends on knowing that secret revealed only by teachers and in cascades of information. This assumption forces us to conceive of the world as a pyramid of classified packages, accessible only to those who carry the appropriate labels (Illich, 1985).

The principles of autonomy in the educational process are nothing new, we find them today, for example in the *Escuelita Zapatista*, where it is possible to experience the practice of autonomy in community, since within it there are no teachers, but a collective that learns and teaches (Baschet, 2015)” (kalicabra, 2019,

pp. 8–9). Other examples can be found on communal and popular learnings or anarchist and autonomist learnings as we will see further on.

Learning is closely related to *saberes*, non-hegemonic common knowledges. As Esteva, argues, “*saberes/knowledge* are not things, they are weavings of relationships. They are processes. If we continue to see local *saberes/knowledge* as things, we will remain in the nostalgia of what is lost or privatized with intellectual property. If we reclaim with community strength the knowledge and strategies that we build collectively—the vision that we share in the common work from our corners, which are centers—defense will be more likely. This is another meeting point between the current pockets of resistance and Illich's thinking from more than forty years ago: *saberes* cannot be individual and can only be achieved collectively (a collective that is not a mass but something more than the sum of its parts). This is not easy to recognize without a revolution in the ‘educational milieu’ that does not mean a more refined logistics or economy of education, nor an opening of the educational menu, nor daily spheres of instruction or ‘non-schooled’ training equally certifying, but a deschooled culture that recognizes the intrinsic value of the diverse and of the continuum of *saberes* that we build together” (Esteva, 2012, p. 91).

The Zapatista experience has at its core an autonomous non-hegemonical education, even though it is not directed towards de-schooling, its potency relies on the anti-colonial, anti-capitalist and anti-patriarchal approach to rebel indigenous learnings. There are two modes of sharing Zapatista education, one from/for/with the communities at its base, and the second from/for/with the networks of other rebel experiences that gathered for the *Escuelita Zapatista*.

“From the perspective of the indigenous Zapatistas, the demand for political-educational autonomy is constructed in frank social, cultural and political opposition to the management of the official schools in their territories. In the opening speech of the round table *La educación autónoma* in Oventik, during the first *Encuentro de los Pueblos Zapatistas con los Pueblos del Mundo* (December 30, 2006), [...] Magdalena, from the *Caracol* Oventik, declared in this public event that:

the educational models that exist in any part of the world have only served the destruction of humanity, of nature and the interests of the great capitalists and exploiters of humanity; those who prepare the education that they impart in the official schools have been concerned with developing study plans and programs at all levels favoring the interests of power, they have never been concerned with elaborating a model of education according to the needs of the peoples and the national and international reality. These testimonies show the Zapatista repudiation of the centralist indigenist model, incapable of generating processes that strengthen consciousness and ethnic identities. The imposition of ideological and normative ways of conceiving and orienting education by state institutions represents a real threat to the innovative practices of administrative and pedagogical management of schools managed by indigenous authorities. The main strategies of Zapatista

rejection of governmental educational policy are inscribed in a logic of non-conformity of Mayan families with the educational attention they receive from State agents” (Baronnet, 2021, p. 206).

As Jérôme Baschet, in *¡Rebeldía, resistencia y autonomía! La experiencia zapatista* (Baschet, 2018), argues, it is important to emphasize the involvement of multiple actors in this educational mobilization, including teachers, students, zone coordinators, parents, community assemblies, education commissions in autonomous municipalities, *Juntas de Buen Gobierno*, and EZLN instances. The role of an education promoter is seen as a “position,” somewhat similar to community positions, but without a limited time frame. The community is committed to supporting the promoter's basic needs, but it is also seen as a service to the community rather than a job with a wage. The interaction between promoters and the community assembly is crucial, as it allows for collective appropriation and control of the educational process. The assembly is where the promoter's commitment and the community's support towards them are agreed upon, educational guidelines are discussed, and any difficulties are resolved. The main achievement is getting almost everyone involved in the creation of an emerging educational experience, which is constantly evolving as part of the struggle for autonomy. Zapatistas proudly claim that autonomous education is education of them, for them and by them. (Baschet, 2018, p. 61,274).

The involvement of communities in education and the strong interaction between educators and assemblies ensure that education is not separate from community life but rather emerges from it. This connection is evident in various aspects, such as adapting school schedules to fit the collective life of the community (e.g., suspending classes during the coffee harvest, which involves the participation of all family members, including children) and learning from real-life situations (e.g., local environment, health, community values, and the Zapatista struggle, which require skills in mathematics, reading, and writing). Importantly, education should not be isolated from other forms of learning experienced within the community, such as participation in assemblies. The fact that adults express this concern indicates that there is no contradiction, but rather a blending of school education and extracurricular learning. This breaks away from the classical school model's claim to possess the only legitimate knowledge. If the school emerges from the community, it is essential to recognize that the community is also the school (Baschet, 2018, p. 61).

An important aspect of autonomous education is the role of promoters, who are responsible for educating but have limited impact. Promoters are not seen as specialized teachers and do not consider themselves education professionals. They are connected to the community and have a close relationship with students due to their brief training and young age. The lack of institutionalization of autonomous education requires constant reformation of the teaching profession. As, Bruno Baronnet underscores, “as key actors in this education ‘for autonomy.’ promoters participate in the construction of a ‘habitus of rebellion’ (Gómez Lara, 2009, p. 325), which ‘is nourished by the practices and ways of thinking embodied in images, texts and

discourses, at the same time that these schemes once elaborated and internalized become reproducers of rebellious practice and thought” (Baronnet, 2021, p. 207).

Autonomous education makes a great example of what Sup Marcos has called *localization*, the movement beyond the opposition of localism and globalization, since they start from their own, from the communitarian, from the indigenous (understood from its languages and cultural traits), but refuses to confine itself to these dimensions. The indigenous and the communitarian are not its only horizon, since the Zapatista struggle implies assuming a perspective that is not only national, but also planetary. This combination of vindication of what is proper and openness to the other, is part of an emancipatory project that involves indigenous and non-indigenous people, national and international perspectives, and the struggle to build a world where many worlds fit (Baschet, 2018, pp. 60–63).

As Zibechi, underscores, “in the autonomous schools, the climate of trust enables the construction of more horizontal relations, facilitating the participation of parents and students in the management of the school. Children are involved in many of the community’s tasks, including the support of the school and its teachers. There is no distance between school and community; they are part of the same web of social relations.

If the official school has a hidden curriculum through which it transmits values of individualism, competition, vertical organization of the educational system and superiority of teachers over students, Zapatista education is the opposite. It seeks to make the students appropriate the history of their community, to reproduce and sustain it. What in state education is separation and hierarchy—teacher-student, classroom-recreation, knowing-not knowing—in autonomous schools is integration and complementarity” (Zibechi, 2015a, p. 92).

Close to the Zapatista experience, as we mentioned in the introduction, *comunalidad*—communality—in various Oaxacan Indigenous communities has been mobilizing potent learning experiences and problematizations. As Elorza Morales, in *Educación libertaria y comunalidad*, argues, “the school becomes, for indigenous peoples, the main enemy of the community, since it attacks the most sensitive part; the conscience of the infants, if the conscience of the infants is transformed by inculcating a new vision of the world that is opposed to the community principles, the destruction of the forms of communal life is advanced” (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 69).

“The modern school, built for the cities, with contents different from those of the community, with a language different from the mother tongue, pretending to instruct the children for practices very different from the forms of community life and those that confront the daily life of the schoolchildren. The school, as an instrument of the state, permanently attacks community life and takes the community out of it. The confrontation: civilization against the community is present in the school, as civilization advances, capitalism

wins and the community loses. And on the contrary, when the community advances, capitalism loses and communality wins” (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 70).

“Historically, the community has been aggravated under the pretext of building the new civilization. The concept of ‘community culture’ in *Los Altos de Chiapas* (Vogt & Viqueira, 1973) was elaborated by scholars from Harvard and Chicago universities, such as Sol Tax and Evon Vogt, who represented the indigenous peoples as survivors of the pre-hispanic era, as beings detained in time and isolated in space, separated from national political-economic relations and from the mestizo culture. This knowledge served to apply technical solutions to national problems—the problem was the indigenous people and their historical backwardness and, therefore, the ‘solution’ was to ‘modernize the indigenous people through the modernization of their community cultures’” (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 62)

“Communality has been historically recognized in the indigenous peoples of the Americas and particularly in Oaxaca. Ricardo Flores Magón wrote in 1911: ‘In these communities there were no judges, no mayors, no jailers, nor any moth of that kind. Everyone had the right to the land, to water for irrigation, to the forest for firewood and to wood to build the *jacales*. The plows went from hand to hand, as well as the yoke of oxen.’ Further on he adds: ‘Each family tilled the extension of land that was calculated to be sufficient to produce what was necessary, and the work of weeding and raising the crops was done in common, the whole community meeting together, today to raise Pedro's crop, tomorrow to raise Juan's, and so on. To make a hut, all the members of the community put their hands to work’” (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 77).

“As Jaime Martínez Luna argues: ‘Living communality implies respect for the knowledge of others, however contradictory it may be to our own. It means making the experience a whole and a we in movement. It is to link the school to the community and the community to the school.’ He later adds: ‘To teach or learn communality implies the design of pedagogical work based on community knowledge. In other words, this implies the integration of a learning model oriented and based on the organizational and knowledge pillars of the community.’ The concept of ‘Communality’ was incorporated as an educational principle in the State Education Law of Oaxaca, this fact allows the native peoples to propose new forms of teaching that correspond to their characteristics and needs. Martínez Luna, considers that in order to teach communality, it is necessary to live it, the school must accept to be part of the community, therefore, both students and teachers must maintain within the school the forms of community life. That is to say, it is to tear down walls that enclose knowledge, to communalize knowledge. Teachers should encourage children to be genuine, promote their values and beliefs and identify with them their needs and respect their diversity . This works in communities that are still in resistance and in those that want to build their resistance. Whether they are indigenous or not, but aspire to have communal ways of life” (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 80). Benjamín Maldonado, adds “the concept of communality is key to understand the objectives of the resistance and its liberation struggles.

Communality is the essence of the indigenous being because it expresses its will to be collective and to conceive life and its organization in this way” (Maldonado Alvarado, 2002) in (Elorza Morales, 2019, p. 60).

Learning as relational *sentir-pensar-hacer*

Education through schooling still sustains, and educates, the modern cartesian split between mind and body, which perpetuates the western nature-culture divide and the colonial-divide civilized-savages, and disregards the imbrication of emotions and affections through the regime of white-patriarchal rationality. Patriarchy has modulated the architect as a rational, individual genius., thus excluding any form of emotion and affection. Learning, in contrast, nurtures relational counter-hegemonic practices of studying, through the inseparability of *sentir-pensar-hacer*—feeling-thinking-doing.

Relational learning puts at its center the inseparability of feeling-thinking-doing. Orlando Fals Borda’s work revolved mainly around three discursive-practices: *Investigación Acción Participativa IAP*, Participatory Action-Research, *Socialismo Raizal*—vernacular—for lack of a better word in english— socialism—and *sentipensar*—feelingthinking. This last concept, is derived from Fals Borda’s research “for the two volumes of the *Historia doble de la Costa*, talking with fishermen of San Martin de la Loba, where according to Victor Manuel Moncayo in his text *Orlando Fals Borda: Una sociología sentipensante para América Latina*, a man told him about the ancestral practices of ‘thinking with the heart and feeling with the head.’ Closely related to this concept of ‘the sentimental’ is the idea derived from the amphibian culture, the ‘*Hombre Hicotea*.’ which arises from the fishermen of the San Jorge River, and which not only includes ‘being sentimental,’ but implies something more, and that is to be enduring in the face of life’s setbacks, to know how to overcome difficulties, since it respects the times, it waits; utopian idea that could be thought of in the processes of social resilience. The *hicotea* has its times, in the summer it sleeps, and in wet weather it comes back to life with interest and energy, equal or superior to the rainy season before; According to the subjects, protagonists of the research and who are called *hicotea men*, they say that they suffer but also enjoy, and when making the balance, in spite of poverty, joy is winning, and thus the amphibian culture is the summary of the dominant way of life in the riverside cultures and of the sentient being who assimilates with a simple philosophy of life, the contingencies of work and the experiences of beings who feel and think with their senses connected to the nature of the river and its savannas, and of their ancestral community societies” (Sentipensante, 2019).

Following Fals Borda, we use *sentir-pensar-hacer*, and add doing in order to stress the inseparability of our situated existences and the distinct modes of feeling, thinking and doing. Always together.

Arturo Escobar traces four fundamental beliefs of the modern onto-epistemic order of rationalism, also known as the cartesian order. First, the belief in the individual-subject, resulting in the destruction of

communal and place-based forms of relating (Esteva & Prakash, 2014). Second, the belief in reality, while the physical world and our perception of it may seem real, the problem lies in how the rationalistic tradition interprets this as the belief in an objective reality or an external world that exists independently from the multitude of interactions that shape it. This belief in the real leads to a mindset of dominating nature, which serves as a cornerstone of patriarchal culture, and the assumption of *One World* or a uni-verse with *One Truth* as the foundation of neo-liberal globalitarism. Third, the belief in science, which is largely supported by the belief in science as the basis for valid knowledge claims in modern societies. While there are well-known discussions in modern social theory about the role of science, including critiques of epistemological realism and feminist perspectives on phallogocentrism, there are also lesser-known debates about indigenous, local, and traditional ecological knowledge, the geopolitics of knowledge, the need for epistemic decolonization, and cognitive justice. These discussions reveal how the dominance of modern knowledge obscures other forms of knowledge and ways of being and highlight the connections between hegemonic scientific practices and violence and oppression in non-western contexts. And fourth, the belief in the economy, “our future is being conceptualized and shaped by the modern witchcraft called the science of economics” (Nandy, 1987, p. 107). This rise of economics since the late eighteenth century has led to the invention of a separate domain of thought and action known as the economy, connected to the concept of the self-regulating market. Despite continuous financial crises neo-liberal economics continues to hold onto its imaginary concepts of individuals engaging in market transactions, unrestricted production of commodities, limitless growth, accumulation of capital, progress, scarcity, and consumption (Escobar, 2018, pp. 83–89).

This beliefs through the modern onto-epistemic order of rationalism sustain, three fundamental dualisms. Escobar, notes that euro-modernity is sustained by: “the divide between nature and culture, between us and them (or the West and the Rest, the moderns and the nonmoderns, the civilized and the savages, etc.), and between subject and object (or mind/body dualism)” (Escobar, 2018, p. 93).

Escobar then asks, “if not dualism, if life is always in connection, then what? The immediate, obvious answer to disconnection, isolation, and so forth is, of course, to reconnect—with each other, with our bodies, the nonhuman world, the stream of life (e.g., (Macy, 2007))” (Escobar, 2018, p. 100). And proposes that one emerging path to the issue of disconnection/reconnection is relationality. There are various interpretations of relationality. Dualism itself can be seen as a form of relationality, but it assumes the existence of separate entities whose essence is not fundamentally dependent on their relationships with other entities. Network theories attempt to consider the role of interrelations in the formation of things and beings, but they often still assume the existence of independent objects or actors before networking occurs. Despite their move towards topological thinking, they still fall back into Euclidean geometries. Kriti Sharma suggests that a genuine concept of interdependence requires two shifts: considering things in interaction rather than isolation, and

viewing things as mutually constituted, existing only due to their dependence on other things. Is it possible, then, to develop a deeper understanding of relationality in which the relational basis of existence permeates everything? One useful principle is that in a relational ontology, nothing exists before the relations that constitute it. In these ontologies, life is always interrelated and interdependent from the beginning (Sharma, 2015, p. 2). Buddhism encapsulates this notion with the idea of interbeing, stating that nothing exists independently and that everything interexists. Another perspective, from phenomenological biology, suggests that there is an unbroken coincidence between our being, doing, and knowing (Maturana & Varela, 1988, p. 35). Action and experience are deeply connected, creating a circularity in knowledge. This perspective emphasizes that we are immersed in the world alongside other sentient beings, who are also knowers and doers. This aligns with Sharma's insistence on considering all entities as mutually constituted for genuine interdependence. Ecological anthropologists have shown through ethnographic research that many cultures do not base their social life on the nature-culture or human-nonhuman distinction as modern societies do. Instead of separation, there is continuity between different domains. Anthropologists working with indigenous groups have described the models of nature that underlie ontologically vibrant relational worlds ((Restrepo, 1996); (Ulloa et al., 1996); (Ulloa, 2013)). These groups, while influenced by modern imaginaries, sometimes engage in the political activation of relationality for the defense of their territories and uniqueness ((Escobar, 2008), (Escobar, 2014). "In other words, these groups are involved in the political activation of relationality" (Escobar, 2018, pp. 100–102).

Escobar also notes, that the sources of relational thinking are not limited to non-western cultures. There are also important sources in what could be called "alternative wests" or "nondominant modernities," and possibly in the urban areas of the so-called global north where ecological activists are creating new worlds. Biologist Brian Goodwin, for example, talks about a "Goethean" science that recognizes the importance of emotions and feelings in knowledge creation and in healing our fragmented culture (Goodwin, 2007). Scholars and activists are also looking to earlier philosophical and aesthetic traditions in the so-called west, such as the works of Baruch Spinoza, Henri Bergson, Alfred North Whitehead, William James, and John Dewey, as well as the writings on nature by American romantics. In addition, there are nondualist thinkers from other parts of the world, like Jiddu Krishnamurti and Sri Aurobindo from India, who have had an impact in the West. The exploration of nondualism is becoming vast and diverse, reflecting the fact that our stories are being challenged by the reality of the Earth (Bird Rose, 2008, p. 166). Climate change, for example, forces us to acknowledge the limitations of geoengineering and green marketing. The growing visibility of nondualism also shows that no one can be purely cartesian or completely separate from others. We have an inherent desire to connect socially, ecologically, and spiritually, and we express this in various ways, even in our relationships with the natural world or in reaching out to others. However, the question remains: how can we develop personal and collective

practices of interbeing? How can we create postdualist ways of living on the planet that are more harmonious with all sentient beings? How can we engage in the geographies of responsibility that come with our interconnectedness with all living beings? Can these practices be fostered in modern-driven contemporary settings? Can we find sources of the nonself not only in distant lands but also in the neo-liberal territories we inhabit? (Escobar, 2018, pp. 102–103).

The question of whether pointing out the dualisms is in itself sufficient to get rid of the coloniality of the dualisms, is a pending question for Escobar. According to Escobar, in order for this to happen, we must move beyond the purely theoretical realm and engage with some form of experience, such as politics, contemplation, or design. In other words, it is crucial to interact with or contribute to the creation of worlds where it is impossible to separate nature and culture, or at least to acknowledge the separation while also maintaining a relational ontology. Simply put, theorists cannot remain solely in the academic sphere and claim to be bringing about a different world; they must also immerse themselves in a relational world and practice what they preach.

It may be argued that by speaking about relationality, Escobar is introducing a new binary between dualist and nondualist ontologies. To address this, Escobar draws on Deleuze and Guattari's approach, which suggests that we “employ a dualism of models only in order to arrive at a process that challenges all models. Each time, mental correctives are necessary to undo the dualisms we had no wish to construct but through which we pass. . . . [Dualisms are] an entirely necessary enemy, the furniture we are forever rearranging” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, pp. 20–21). Sometimes, these “mental correctives” do not need to be as complex as social theory might suggest; simple reversals with clear caveats may suffice. Escobar wonders why critical theorists are inclined to discuss alternative or multiple modernities but struggle to consider alternative traditions seriously. And, uses a thought-provoking reversal by Ashis Nandy, which should make us pause and contemplate the possibility of alternative traditions. Nandy's caveat is that we must avoid narrow-minded traditionalism that demystifies modernity while remystifying tradition, and instead foster critical dialogue, interaction, and mutual trans-formation among cultures within a genuine intercultural communion. To rephrase, the dangers of interconnectedness have proven to be less harmful than the dangers of disconnection. At least from an ecological standpoint, this appears to be an undeniable statement (Escobar, 2018, pp. 103–104).

Learning is compelled to relational counter-hegemonic practices of studying, through the inseparability of *sentir-pensar-hacer*—feeling-thinking-doing.

Learning as anarchic trans-formation

Learning is compelled and compromised to trans-formation. To reiterate, by trans-formation we follow Gutiérrez Aguilar and Salazar Lohman and Bey as processes and potencies of change through/against/beyond/by/for *form*. As possibilities of imagination and rehearsal, from prefigurative potencies. Trans-formations that allow the emergence and composition of other modes of inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence, not mediated by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial power relations of domination. “Social trans-formation” as “the unfolding of the human capacity to produce and reproduce collective forms of inhabiting the world from a place other than that of domination, exploitation and dispossession” (Gutiérrez Aguilar & Salazar, 2015, p. 19).

Trans-formation is then the inseparability of space and becoming, because “we neither occupy nor have but, rather, *share* spacetime” (Moten, 2017b, p. 6). The inseparability of sociality and spatiality, of the other-*spaces of becomings*, of forms of inhabitation and forms of existence. “For trans is an itch that things are not enough, a project of undoing, be it gender, institutions, the fabric of the social world; trans is a project that cannot be haunted because it never tries to build a house” (Bey, 2022, p. 3). The *space of becoming* is always already more than the body. The space of becoming are bodies intra-acting. So, we mean through trans-formation, the rehearsal and unfolding of potencies to re/produce non-normative, fugitive modalities of inhabiting the world beyond-against and beyond the amalgam, and the rehearsal and unfolding of potencies to *body* non-normative, fugitive modalities for existence. In other words, the trans-formation of *life(s)*. Of *other worlds* that are already here, and *yet to come*. Undeterminate, unrecognizable and unintelligible trans-formations that are always already modes of inhabiting and modes of existence, that rehearse by/for/through the *spaces of becomings*. Not only a *form-of-life*, but *more + less*, form(s)-for-life(s).

Perhaps more than any other anti-capitalist material-discursive-practice, anarchism has constantly questioned the role of educational machines, and has engaged in diverse pre-figurative trans-formations through learning. This is in part because, for anarchists, pedagogy “has never been simply a means to achieve a new social order. It has been, rather, part of the very practice” (Mueller, 2012, p. 14) of anarchist’s principles as: anti-authoritarianism, autonomy, social self-organization, pre-figuration, mutual-aid, internationalism and direct action.

Amongst all the machines of neutralization, the educational machine has a primary role. Anarchists following a genealogy from XIX century social utopianism, have charged against traditional capitalist education given its ideological character: it seeks to show that education at large is dedicated to reproducing the social structure of exploitation and domination by teaching students to occupy their predetermined social places.

Education assumes then a rather great political importance, although duly masked under an apparent “neutrality” (Gallo, 1997a).

These notes are a brief presentation of anarchist learnings. Machines of politization, *collective arrangements* that scape the neo-liberal logistics of desires. As Colin Ward, emphasizes: “There is no such thing as ‘anarchist education.’ There are just different kinds of educational experiments which anarchists have supported and been involved in”¹⁹ (Suissa, 2006, p. 77), then we should refer to anarchist learnings, emphasizing the pluri-versal, hybrid and metabolic condition of abolitionist-anarchic practices. And, recall Kropotkin’s answer to the forms anarchist action might take: “All forms, — indeed, the most varied forms, dictated by circumstances, temperament, and the means at disposal. Sometimes tragic, sometimes humorous, but always daring; sometimes collective, sometimes purely individual, this policy of action will neglect none of the means at hand, no event of public life, in order to keep the spirit alive, to propagate and find expression for dissatisfaction, to excite hatred against exploiters, to ridicule the government and expose its weakness, and above all and always, by actual example, to awaken courage and fan the spirit of revolt” (Kropotkin, 1892).

So what study forms does anarchism take? All forms we might answer. All forms, —indeed, the most varied forms, dictated by circumstances, temperament, and the means at disposal. Sometimes tragic, sometimes humorous, but always daring; sometimes collective, sometimes purely singular, these *modes of study* will neglect none of the means at hand, no event of public life nor matter that inhabits the planet, in order to keep the spirit alive, to propagate and find expression for dissatisfaction, to excite hatred against exploiters, to ridicule the government and expose its weakness, and above all and always, by actual example, to awaken courage, fan the spirit of revolt, seek freedom and emphasize anarchist principles of autonomy, social self-organization, internationalism and direct action (Gallo, 1997a).

Anarchist educational experiments and discourse were first articulated around anarchists, “as Paul Robin and Charles Perron within the First International, claiming for considering education not an accessorial activity, but a major issue in the struggle for social emancipation. Later, active methods inspired by the Swiss educator Johan-Heinrich Pestalozzi, informed Élisée Reclus’s and Kropotkin’s ideas on education in open air, walks and unhampered physical activities as the first way for teaching geography, in opposition with maps and manuals” (Ferretti, 2018, p. 5). Pierre-Joseph Proudhon “began discussing the foundations of an integral education. For the French philosopher, education was supposed to produce *man* as a representation of social relations and was thus the most important function of society and one of the basic conditions for its maintenance and upkeep: ‘All education should produce *man* and citizen: according to a miniature image of society: for the methodical development of the physical, intellectual and moral forces of creatures In other words, education is the creator of habits in the human subject (. ...) Education is the most important function of society” (Gallo, 1997a).

Silvio Gallo affirms, following Proudhon, that “every philosophy of education is necessarily situated under a philosophical anthropology; this is equivalent to the statement that before every attempt at education there is an image of the human being” (Gallo, 1997a), and frames anarchisms around four common principles mentioned in the introduction: individual autonomy, social self-management, internationalism and direct action (Gallo, 1997a).

“Anarchist scholar David Gabbard notes, ‘William Godwin developed the first comprehensive anarchist critique of government schools in his Enquiry Concerning Political Justice in 1793. Godwin viewed freedom of thought as fundamental to political liberty’ (Gabbard, 2010)” in (Kaltfleiter & Nocella II, 2012, p. 205).

According to Ani Pérez Rueda, in *Las falsas alternativas: Pedagogía libertaria y nueva educación*, anarchist learning projects aimed to both combat ignorance and illiteracy among the lower classes, and to foster the formation of people who would contribute to a new free and equal society. These schools sought to teach students about the three obstacles present in society at the time—militarism, clericalism, and capitalism—in order to empower them to fight against all forms of oppression. The goal was not to teach obedience and submission, but rather rebellion and nonconformity in the face of injustice. It was important for students to understand the power dynamics they were subject to and the possibilities for freedom that existed (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 106). “These are not, therefore, unrealizable utopias but, in Trasatti's words, ‘laboratories of change, within which the revolution of personal relationships, economic self-management, direct democracy, anarchist organization of society, an alternative relationship with nature and with culture were already being experienced immediately’ (Trasatti, 2005)” in (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 109).

Anarchism has consistently emphasized the distinction between education and schooling. Anarchist education goes beyond formal educational institutions and encompasses various cultural organizations and practices such as athenaeums, artistic groups, libraries, evening classes, lectures, stage pictures, and militant schools. In the early XX century, anarchists dedicated significant efforts to popular education that focused on providing technical training, basic cultural preparation, and ideological formation to workers, peasants, young workers, women, and militants (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 58).

Learning, through mutual-aid, requires both singular effort and cooperation. The educational action of society in mutual-aid requires both individual initiative and cooperation. This is why anarchist learnings are grounded on diverse values and principles, these include: anti-authoritarianism, freedom, self-management, solidarity, integrality and accompaniment, amongst others (Grupo de Estudios J.D. Gómez Rojas, 2012, p. 9).

Since, there is no such thing as anarchist education, just different anarchic learning experiments through diverse *modes of study*, the following features/characteristics of anarchist learnings are non-exhaustive,

nor final. Some principles of anarchist learnings have already been mentioned, we will have a closer look at four of these: autonomy, self-organization, integrality and accompaniment.

The first feature, autonomy, is imbricated with the anarchist notions of anti-authoritarianism, freedom and mutual-aid. As Gallo, underscores, “anarchist pedagogy is, first of all, an education for freedom and solidarity. It is important that we conceive it in this way, articulating freedom and solidarity, so that it does not lose its dimension of collective endeavor. Anarchist freedom necessarily presupposes the other; it is by no means an individualistic vision of freedom, and it is precisely there that solidarity comes in” (Gallo, 2012, p. 49).

Anarchism encompasses various socio-political propositions that refuse all forms of domination, including state, economic, and religious authority, as well as the power dynamics that arise from such authority. Historically, authority has been justified by the belief that the masses are incapable of self-governance, necessitating rule by leaders to prevent chaos and terror. In contrast, anarchist learnings emphasizes the importance of critical processes to counter the internalization of submissive behaviors and foster autonomy, refusing conventional education and its authoritarianism (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 60).

Capitalism has used social darwinism to justify social inequalities by portraying individualism and competitiveness as necessary for progress. However, anarchists like Kropotkin argue that cooperation and mutual support are crucial for the social unfolding and historical advancement. They believe that repressive systems, not inherent evil, hinder these ideals. Anarchist educational projects prioritize solidarity and mutual-aid, as solidarity is also closely connected to freedom in anarchist thinking, as personal autonomy and collective liberation are seen as intertwined. Therefore, anarchist learnings focus on both freedom and solidarity, emphasizing care, cooperative learning, and mutual learning instead of competition and individualism (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 79).

As kalicabra argues, anarchisms are grounded in a fundamental principle: our equality stems from our differences (Vera Herrera, 2012). Genuine learning arises from a web of interconnected relationships that are not in competition, and these relationships are valuable because of their diversity (Betasamosake Simpson, 2014). However, people are pressured from a young age to conform to societal norms, both in terms of how we learn and what we aspire to achieve. Consequently, the focus shifts from understanding what we are interested in as people with singular interests, but to the accumulation of certificates that validate our learning (kalicabra, 2019, p. 28).

As a second feature, closely related to autonomy, according to Gallo, to remain committed to the socio-political perspective of trans-formation, anarchist learnings sustains self-organization as a political principle. This principle is closely linked to the idea of autonomy: it involves establishing a community (such as a factory, school, or society) where people who make up the community are solely and exclusively responsible for its organization. In other words, self-organization entails creating a society without the State, or at least a

society where the State is not distinct from it as a separate heteronomous political-administrative entity. The principle of self-organization can be applied to various areas, including the organization of a company or rural community, a cooperative for goods and/or services, a trade union, or a neighborhood community association. Learning is among many other activities that can undergo the experience of self-organization, and it is within this sphere that the most comprehensive experiences have been developed (Gallo, 1997b, p. 5).

Learning self-organization involves, both scales of autonomy. At a personal level, the responsibility to share and grasp, and at a collective level the cooperation in the self-organization of study.

Alfredo Bonanno argues that self-organization is first and foremost self-organization of the struggle. Self-organization cannot be limited to being seen only as a technical matter or a characteristic of organizational nature. It should not be reduced to simply figuring out how to run society once the current one is revolutionarily dismantled. This misconception needs to be corrected. Self-organization is primarily about organizing the ongoing struggles that will ultimately dismantle the power of the ruling class and the exploitation of workers. In essence, we cannot rely on a hierarchical organization of these struggles led by a political party or a professional elite to build a future society (Bonanno, 2020, p. 9).

The concept of organization is crucial, for it encompasses various aspects related to the struggle for workers' emancipation and the organization of future society. It is not solely an economic matter, and those who oppose the workers' cause cannot contribute to it. Unlike the state's narrow view of management, anarchists view it as a broader concept that involves raising workers' awareness. Examining the problem of organization helps us understand the future society, anticipate its flaws, and guide current struggles outside of hierarchical systems that claim to be revolutionary but are not (Bonanno, 2020, pp. 18–19).

The worker's creative ability is a fundamental aspect of the revolutionary organization concept. Acquiring the ability to undertake projects today is a way to protect oneself against the potential actions of bosses in the future. Investigating ways to have production controlled by the workers disrupts the bosses' plan, especially when it involves false centralized “management.” Implementing this approach in all possible situations, even during the class struggle, and making it a consistent reference point rather than a last resort (Bonanno, 2020, p. 51).

The first necessity today is the self-organization of the struggle, which is organized by small groups of workers attacking the center of production. This struggle serves as the unified platform for the further development of the conflict, leading to a more detailed acquisition of information and the decision to ultimately expropriate capital, in other words, to bring about a revolution. It is the worker who determines the terms of the relationship between labour activity and the product. Once this is achieved, the worker must abandon any form of organization that serves capitalist power or any other authority, and instead focus on constructing a new system of organization (Bonanno, 2020, pp. 189–191).

In a similar thread to that of Bonanno, Guattari and cuadernos de Negación, who, from different approaches, argue that self-organization is merely reactive if it is limited to the self-organization of capitalism, to the self-management of capital. We could draw a parallel argument to self-construction. We recognize self-construction as an important survival mode of inhabitation. But we cannot fall into the romanticism of self-construction when it is only limited to the self-production of the *architectural world*, when it is limited to re/produce mono-functional, modern-colonial spatiality.

A third feature, of anarchist learnings, as Gallo argues, is the concept of integral education. According to Paul Robin, this concept has evolved over time with contributions from various educators. In the XIX century, these ideas and considerations were finally mature enough to be systematized into an organic theory. The notion of integral education is not a recent development. In fact, Rabelais is believed to be the first author to mention it. In his works, we can read about Ponocrates teaching his pupil natural sciences, mathematics, and physical exercises, as well as taking advantage of rainy days to have him visit offices and engage in practical work (Gallo, 1997b, p. 1).

Judith Suissa in *Anarchism and education: a philosophical perspective*, notes that the notion of integrality, which dissolves the distinction between intellectual and manual training, was important in anarchist schools such as the *Escuela Moderna* in Barcelona and Paul Robin's educational experiments in France. Kropotkin, the main advocate of this idea, described an ideal society where there would be no distinction between 'brain work' and 'manual work.' eliminating the divisions between laboring and educated classes (Suissa, 2006, p. 114).

In political terms, integral learning is based on the equality of people and on the right of everyone to develop their potential. And if we live in an unequal world in which not everyone can develop fully, then integral learning must necessarily assume a position of trans-formation, and not of sustainment of this world (Gallo, 1997b, p. 2).

A fourth feature of anarchist learnings, accompaniment, could be framed though, the problematizations by Pérez Rueda of the rigidity/absolutism of non-directivity, she argues that despite the increasing support for non-directivity in alternative pedagogies, particularly anarchist pedagogies, most anarchists who have studied the issue support the sociopolitical proposal. Suissa argues that this perspective is prevalent in the libertarian movement and explains why educational experiences and their moral content are highly valued. Suissa also criticizes the belief that children are naturally good and will become good adults if left to develop spontaneously, as seen in schools like Summerhill. Similarly, Gallo explains Bakunin's criticism of Rousseau's view that freedom is a natural gift and society should not interfere with it through excessive laws and regulations. Gallo advocates for an individualized educational process that removes children from social coexistence until their natural freedom is consolidated and their character is fully formed, which is known as negative education. This approach contrasts with Rousseau's idea that freedom is a natural characteristic of

humans. Bakunin believes that freedom is a social construction that can only be achieved in society and sees it as the goal of human development, while Rousseau sees it as the starting point and believes that humans gradually freed themselves from natural constraints to build their world and conquer their freedom (Pérez Rueda, 2022, pp. 100–103).

Hence, Pérez Rueda argues that, the idea of non-directivity in education is naive and deceptive. It is impossible for teachers to not have influence over students, so renouncing it only hides how that influence is being exerted. Instead of abolishing authority, self-managing teachers simply replace one form of power with a more hidden and diffuse power. Even though they may remove orders and reproaches from their methods, teachers still have manipulative tactics at their disposal. The term non-directivity is seen as concealing a complex reality, as teachers' presence, attitudes, and even their silence can have a directive and influential impact on the group. The question of silences is also raised, suggesting that a teacher's silence may not be as non-directive as it appears. The systematic silence adopted by supposedly non-directive educators is even seen as more imposing and subtly authoritarian (Pérez Rueda, 2022, pp. 100–103).

Pérez Rueda, then makes a call from non-directivity to accompaniment, and argues that the term used for those involved in anarchist learning experiments, is not “teachers,” “professors,” or “educators.” Instead, they prefer to be called “companions,” as a means of distinguishing themselves from traditional teachers. Their approach to education is no longer classified as “anarchist education,” but rather as “respectful accompaniment,” which focuses more on supporting emotions rather than forming militants. Although companions also prioritize other aspects of education, such as values, the terminology used to describe such work is significant because it influences the meaning assigned to actions and how expectations are modulated. Accompanying, which refers to walking together with someone, only aligns with a non-directive approach. When we accompany someone, it is their decision to determine the path, goal, and purpose. Therefore, moving away from an educational approach means giving up on defining objectives in teaching and suggesting guidance along the way. This implies that in an accompaniment project, there cannot be an explicit curriculum, which contradicts Suissa’s claim that libertarian schools have substantive curricula with clear anarchist messages. In present-day anarchist schools, there is no emphasis on outcomes, but rather on supporting processes (Pérez Rueda, 2022, p. 121).

Learning as anarchic trans-formation, draws from anarchism but it is not limited to the anarchist tradition. Rather, as Bey, works through the work of Samudzi, Anderson, Hartman, Black Rose Federation, Harney and Moten, amongst others, and argues that the “dramatic shift” proposed in the “iteration of Black anarchism is, perhaps more accurately, an anarcho-Blackness in that it is not Black people practicing an anarchism that goes unchanged; it is anarchism as expressed through and necessarily corrupted by the radicality, the lawlessness, the mutinous primordially of Blackness” (Bey, 2020, p. 2). “Anarcho-Blackness expresses what

might be understood as a Black anarchism insofar as it designates a gratuitous disorder that engenders the possibility of living unbounded by law, which is to say unbounded by violence and circumscription” (Bey, 2020, p. 6). Bey, articulates “anarcho-Blackness, first and foremost, as an inhabitable modality of anarchic subjectivity and engagement. This may lead to a discernible Black anarchism. Fine. But the aim is not to arrive at Black anarchism; it is, rather, to engage an anarcho-Blackness that moves toward what might be called a Black anarchism” (Bey, 2020, p. 14). In a reformulation of Moten’s work through Glissant, Bey, argues that “to infuse anarchism with anarcho-Blackness is to push anarchism’s logics further. Many anarchists did not organize on the grounds of difference and differentiation, even as they sought ways to prevent their silencing. Hence, anarcho-Blackness supplements these oversights via an insistence on perhaps *assemblage* or *swarm* or *ensemble*, whereby there is a consensus, or consent, not to be individuated—which is another way to say an affirmation to emanate from difference toward the insistence on collectivity and agential singularity. It is not unanimous we seek to be; it is ensemblic, assemblic, a distinction that manifests in the proliferation of life for those who might queerly emerge when conditions are saturated with the elimination of institutions that curtail such life” (Bey, 2020, p. 17). “A coalitional, collective quotidian choreography of possibility. That is not anarchism understood in the traditional sense; that is not anarchism begotten merely by adherence to what Kropotkin has preached. It is anarchism that is choreographed through the way we move and think about our bodies. Anarchic subjectivity in that we come into being through an anarchy of becoming, a way to exist in the world where our existence is predicated on how we aid each other mutually, refuse the violence of the State, dismantle hierarchies, concede to a non-coerced ethic (not right, with all its judiciary baggage) of opacity” (Bey, 2020, p. 68).

Learning as study

“Black study is a mode of life whose initiatory figures are given as anarchic principles that are formgenerating. Not just the proliferation of form, to which generativity would then submit itself, but proliferative, generative form” (Moten, 2018b, p. 137)

Working through/with the black radical tradition, Moten argues that blackness is a concept “without a master(y)” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 81), as a mode of refusal it escapes a single definition, and notes that “the history of blackness is testament to the fact that objects can and do resist. Blackness—the extended movement of a specific upheaval, an ongoing irruption that anarranges every line—is a strain that pressures the assumption of the equivalence of personhood and subjectivity” (Moten, 2003, p. 1). By way of Édouard Glissant and what Cedric J. Robinson, calls “the ontological totality,” Moten underscores that “consent not to

be a single being, which is the anoriginal, anoriginary constitution of blackness as radical force—as historical, paraontological totality—is for Robinson the existential and logical necessity that turns the history of racial capitalism, which is also to say the Marxist tradition, inside out. What cannot be understood within, or as a function of, the deprivation that is the context of its genesis can only be understood as the ongoing present of a common refusal. This old-new kind of transcendental aesthetic, off and out in its immanence as the scientific productivity such immanence projects, is the unowned, differential, and differentiated thing itself that we hold out to one another, in the bottom, under our skin, for the general kin, at the rendezvous of victory” (Moten, 2018b, p. 236). And notes, that “the emergence and preservation of blackness, as the ontological totality, the revolutionary consciousness that black people hold and pass, is possible only by way of the renunciation of actual being and the ongoing conferral of historical being—the gift of historicity as claimed, performed, dispossession. Blackness, which is to say black radicalism, is not the property of black people. All that [black people] have (and are) is what [black people] hold in outstretched hands. This open collective being is blackness—(racial) difference mobilized against the racist determination it calls into existence in every moment of the ongoing endangerment of ‘actual being,’ of subjects who are supposed to know and own” (Moten, 2018b, p. 236). Through Nahum Chandler’s notion of paraontology, Moten then underscores, that “ultimately, the paraontological force that is transmitted in the long chain of life-and-death performances with which black studies is concerned is horribly misunderstood if it is understood as exclusive. Everyone whom blackness claims, which is to say everyone, can claim blackness. That claim is neither the first nor the last anticipatory reorientation but is, rather, an irreducible element of the differentially repeating plane that intersects and animates the comparativist sphere” (Moten, 2018a, p. 159).

Blackness as a concept “without a master(y)” is for Moten then *more + less*, “enthusiastic social vision, given in non-performed performance, as the surrealization of space and time. Anticipating originary correction with the self-defensive care of division and (re)collection, it goes way back, long before the violent norm, as an impure informality to come. Its open and initiatory counter-pleasures reveal the internal, public resource of our common sense/s, where flavorful touch is all bound up with falling into the general antagonistic embrace. That autonomous song and dance is our intellectual descent; it neither opposes nor follows from dissent but, rather, gives it a chance. Consent to that submergence is terrible and beautiful. Moreover, the apparent (racial) exclusivity of the (under)privilege of claiming this dis/ability serially impairs—though it can never foreclose—the discovery that the priority of sovereign regulation is false. In order to get the plain sense of this you have to use your imagination. The paraontological distinction between blackness and black people is crucial but this is so only insofar as it is the case that blackness cuts the distinction between essence and instance” (Moten, 2018a, p. 241).

Black study which is to say blackness, “is an ongoing and inaugural violence to or indetermination of self” (Moten, 2018a, p. 212). “We owe each other the indeterminate. We owe each other everything” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 27). “Blackness isn’t a people problem; it’s the problematization of the people. Black study—which is to say blackness: the preoccupied breath of the ones who have been taken, who have been made to leave—is the medi(t)ation of things as, breaking and remaking every law, every bond, they shimmer in the absolute disappearance, the absolute nothingness, of their sociality” (Moten, 2017a, p. 202). Blackness, “parallels but also instantiates the simultaneous theorization and deconstruction of the subject. Modern philosophy critiques the subject, operates (within) that dis/enchantment of the subject’s value (the valuative oscillation between exaltation and shame; the operational im/possibility of sovereignty and selfdetermination). Blackness, which is to say black study—the undercommon, underground monastic attitude of the quarters, the field, the refuge, the territory, the church, the joint, the (sound barrier) club—is the refusal, by way of black and fugal operations, of the subject’s long, developmental nightmare” (Moten, 2018a, p. 243). “Black study is a mode of life whose initiatory figures are given as anarchic principles that are formgenerating. Not just the proliferation of form, to which generativity would then submit itself, but proliferative, generative form. [...] Generativity, our ongoing common growth in difference, is also escape in contemplative performance, reanimating the itinerant communal form of the city before as a study hall inside a dance hall” (Moten, 2018b, p. 137).

Together Stefano Harney and Fred Moten note, that just as the undercommons and black study, which is to say blackness, moves “against the mastery of and over the concept as if it were a matter of life and death. But more important, black study means you serve your concepts without a master(y). And this would mean that the rupture of subjection and objection is never closed, healed, settled for plunder and expropriation. This is why those who master concepts hate black study so much, in what appears to be a disproportionately violent response to its service. They can’t stand it because serving something without a master is a totally open form of love” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 81). In the introduction to *The undercommons: fugitive planning & black study*, Jack Halberstam, notes that study is “a mode of thinking with others separate from the thinking that the institution requires of you, prepares us to be embedded in what Harney calls ‘the with and for’ and allows you to spend less time antagonized and antagonizing” (Halberstam, 2013, p. 17). As speculative habits of assembly, of assembling and dis/assembling, “study is what you do with other people. It’s talking and walking around with other people, working, dancing, suffering, some irreducible convergence of all three, held under the name of speculative practice. The notion of a rehearsal—being in a kind of workshop, playing in a band, in a jam session, or old men sitting on a porch, or people working together in a factory—there are these various modes of activity. The point of calling it ‘study’ is to mark that the incessant and irreversible intellectuality of these activities is already present. These activities aren’t ennobled by the fact that we now say, ‘oh, if you did

these things in a certain way, you could be said to be have been studying.’ To do these things is to be involved in a kind of common intellectual practice. What’s important is to recognize that that has been the case—because that recognition allows you to access a whole, varied, alternative history of thought” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 117).

If “blackness, which is to say black study—the undercommon, underground monastic attitude of the quarters, the field, the refuge, the territory, the church, the joint, the (sound barrier) club—is the refusal, by way of black and fugal operations, of the subject’s long, developmental nightmare” (Moten, 2018a, p. 243), Moten underscores and repeats *in as many ways as possible*, that blackness as the *displacement of being and singularity*, is “consent not to be one: not just to be more + less than one but the mobilization of that indiscretion and incompleteness against or ‘otherwise than being’” (Moten, 2018a, p. 242). Through the trilogy of *consent not to be a single being*, Moten attempts “a particular kind of failure, trying hard not to succeed in some final and complete determination either of themselves or of their aim, blackness, which is, but so serially and variously, that it is given nowhere as emphatically as in rituals of renomination, when the given is all but immediately taken away. Such predication is, as Nathaniel Mackey says, “unremitting”—a constant economy and mechanics of fugitive making where the subject is hopelessly troubled by, in being emphatically detached from, the action whose agent it is supposed to be. Indeed, our resistant, relentlessly impossible object is subjectless predication, subjectless escape, escape from subjection, in and through the paralegal flaw that animates and exhausts the language of ontology. Constant escape is an ode to impurity, an obliteration of the last word. We remain to insist upon this errant, interstitial insistence, an activity that is, from the perspective that believes in perspective, at best, occult and, at worst, obscene” (Moten, 2017a, p. vii). Blackness as escape from subjection, as attempts to fail to individuate, to become unfit for subjection, moves, Moten writes, “against the grain of (the) man’s brutal self-projections, which often result in the addictive tendency of his others to settle for the settler’s delusional sovereignty, blackness still has the fugal, fugitive, radically imaginative sociopoetic work of refusal to do. This work takes form in passage, as ill logics and logisticalities of sharing, as a general indebtedness that requires and allows a general corporate liquidation performed by means of what Édouard Glissant calls ‘consent not to be a single being’ (Moten, 2018a, p. 194).

Harney and Moten note, together, as we have already mentioned that “we fall so we can fall again, which is what ascension really means. To fall is to lose one’s place, to lose the place that makes one, to relinquish the locus of being, which is to say of being-single. This radical homelessness—its kinetic indigeneity, its irreducible queerness—is the essence of blackness. This refusal to take place is given in what it is to occur” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 45). Against completion, Harney and Moten note that, “blackness is the meaning of life. Partial, held secret, held out to all but not all there for those who hold, not ours and all we got and here it go, all incomplete” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 166). To embrace incompleteness.

Blackness might be referenced as fugitivity, “a performative against all performances of freedom and unfreedom dependent on the historical dilemma of a lack of meaningful distinction between freedom and slavery” (Moten, 2018a, p. 247). “Black radicalism—the life that moves in the break between the thingly, the animal, and the human—may have been delivered over to ‘sovereign jouissance’ but it is not called into being by exposure to that force. Blackness is present at its own making—it is the autopoeisis of imagined, imagining things. This is to say that the ‘peculiar ‘creativity’ associated with this threshold of law and non-law’ has been subject to a massive historical mislocation. More precisely, the movements and directions of fit within that threshold (which is the constitutive outside of every household, every [moral or political] economy), the common animation in response to the forces that it anticipates and calls into being, are the active and anoriginal refusal, within that borderless border, of the imposition and denial of the regular situation that regulative power would institute. [Moten insists] on a distinction between being delivered over or being exposed to and being called into being by the sovereign power of the state of exception. Extraordinary rendition—by way of whatever point or door of no return and in the interest of whatever protection of whatever particular determination of the proper—might very well be understood as the most extreme example of the state’s interpellative, violently transportive call, but that call is not a call into being. And if this is so, it means that the refusal of that call does not require an escape from being or from the question of its meaning. At stake, rather, is the question and the sociality of being’s escape, its essential fugitivity. This is not just about being excluded from the ‘regular situation’ that one’s irregular presence guarantees; it’s about recognizing that the decision that creates the regular situation must be created and exists only in response to the everyday irruption of imagining things, ‘the anarchic sorcery of the facts,’ that calls it into being and cuts it” (Moten, 2018b, p. 43).

By way of Sora Han, Moten notes that the “incalculable presence of the case of the slave when both the case and the slave are always and emphatically both more and less than singular, more and less than one; and what irrupts into the legal archive—from or as one of those fissure vents, an irruptive flatness disruptive of peaks and valleys—is obscenity, the nonperformance of freedom and unfreedom, consent not to be a single being, and the claiming of an erotics of fugitivity of which the hole, the soloist, is a kind of virtual emanation, an anaperformative effect of social life or, in the impossibility of a better word, blackness, as Han teaches us” (Moten, 2018a, p. 258).

Ultimately, our attention to working through/by/for black study, which is to say blackness, which is to say the black radical tradition, points, as Saidiya Hartman notes, regarding the compositions by Torkwase Dyson that accompany *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America* “attend to the histories of forced migration, captivity, enclosure, and death, while tracing lines of fugitive and stealth movement, dwelling and maroonage, black ecologies of inhabitation [...] always already inhabited and

transformed by blackness, so the lines of confinement and enclosure expand and collapse, as those forced to stay put and those in flight inhabit and negotiate space and time in its manifold dimensions. These compositions offer provisional [insights] as to how we might live; they imagine an existence within and outside the hold [...] for inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence” (Hartman, 2022, p. 489). Beyond-against and beyond the *architectural world*.

Coda – Learning

“Only if we understand the school system as the central myth-making ritual of industrial societies can we explain the deep need for it, the complex myth surrounding it, and the inextricable way in which schooling is tied into the self-image of the contemporary [hu]man” (Illich, 1980, p. 103).

“Making people capable of working is; as Nona Glazer notes, ‘the central goal of schooling, a criterion of successful medical and psychiatric treatment, and an ostensible goal of most welfare policies and unemployment compensation programs’ (Glazer, 1993, p. 33). Helping to make people ‘work ready’ and moving them into jobs are central objectives of social work (Macarov, 1980, p. 12), a common rationale for the prison system, and an important inducement to perform military service. Indeed, enforcing work, as the other side of defending property rights, is a key function of the state (Seidman, 1991, p. 315), and a particular preoccupation of the post-welfare, neo-liberal state” (Weeks, 2011, p. 7).

Education under the current conditions, as we have seen, is more and more vocational and capitalist coaching, bondage training, and consumer schooling focused on the modulation of social roles for the re/production and uni-versalization of the amalgam patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. There is no point in trans-forming education if it continues fueling its vocational purpose, an educational trans-formation without an integral trans-formation, or a labour trans-formation is absurd. Any educational trans-formation should go in hand with a labour trans-formation, situated through the intra-action of modes of doing and modes of learning. The diverse learnings that we have seen, question the neutralization of being by direct action, as praxis the of freedom and abolition, rather than continuing with a vocational view of education.

Learning as modes of *sentir-pensar-hacer*, of co-moving, becoming-together, modes that move outside the schooling apparatuses and rebel against the verticality of schooling, the modulation into social roles, and the individualization and subjectivation by/for the amalgam *patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*. Learnings as a constant rehearsal of imagining the possibility of different worlds, of *rehearsing* other modes of *inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence*. Learnings committed and compelled to facilitate,

accompany, experiment, imagine, rehearse, study and share with and through other modes *for existence*, beyond-against and beyond the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject of white euro-colonial modernity. Learnings that imagine, foster and nurture co-motion, towards autonomous horizons and as many modes of inhabitation as possible and needed.

Horizons, as Raúl Zibechi beautifully notes, that practice “planting as a ritual attitude of life, without the ambition of also being the one who harvests” (Zibechi, 2015a, p. 383).

Doings

Beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract labour

“They talk to me about civilization, I talk about proletarianization and mystification”
(Césaire, 2001, p. 44)

“...torture and death can be placed at the service of ‘life’ or, better, at the service of the production of labor-power, since the goal of capitalist society is to transform life into the capacity to work and ‘dead labor’” (Federici, 2004, p. 17)

“‘Labour’ by its very nature is unfree, unhuman, unsocial activity, determined by private property and creating private property. Hence the abolition of private property will become a reality only when it is conceived as the abolition of ‘labour’” (Marx, 1975, p. 279)

“Yet what all forms of labor share under conditions of capitalism—high- or low-skilled, blue-, white-, or pink-collar, at all stages of development and in every part of the world—is the condition of exploitation for the sake of profit” (Ockman, 2015, p. xxii)

“To work today is to be asked, more and more, to do without thinking, to feel without emotion, to move without friction, to adapt without question, to translate without pause, to desire without purpose, to connect without interruption” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 94)

“We got to keep on living, living on borrowed time” Hallelujah Time - The Wailers

“We work to live and we lose our lives working” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 28). Yet, “capital always continues to grow at the expense of its labour” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 22). The amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination re/produces the constant (*sub*)valorization of life and the reduction of life to an economic existence and labour identity. We do not work because we enjoy it. Fuck the white labour morality! Fuck the capitalist ideology that work dignifies! “The bourgeois ideology that work dignifies, that it makes us human beings and separates us from the beasts is, together with the idea of god, one of the lies that seem to be the most unsustainable but that most benefits our masters” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 16). Fuck the western-calling of architectural labour! We work because we constantly have to economically justify life. We are exhausted of this!

“The critique of labour is not one critique among others, it is the fundamental critique of this world as we suffer it. It is our fragmented, limited and alienated human activity” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 13). “Capital has made labour the most important activity to which everything is subordinated. Normal and normalized our activity is ‘what you do in life,’ which in this society means ‘profession,’ ‘work,’ ‘trade.’ Nothing is more coherent with this than all bourgeois ideologies” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 15).

Labour is “not voluntary but imposed, it is forced labour. Therefore, it is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means to satisfy needs external to work. The foreignness of its nature is clearly shown by the fact that, as soon as there is no longer any physical or other imposition, labour is fled from like a plague. External labour, the labor in which man alienates itself, is a labour of self-sacrifice, of punishment. Finally, the exteriority of labour for the labourer is manifested in that it is not the property of the labourer, but of another; in that it does not belong to the labourer; in that, in labour, the labourer does not belong to itself, but to someone else” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2016, p. 37).

Labour works in convoluted ways. We tend to think labour has always been here. As an ahistorical activity. A natural activity. Most critiques to labour-abolition will make a simple case and try to equate all human activity bound to the sustainment of life, as labour. The crucial reading then, is what is labour under/by/for/from the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination? And, most importantly the urgency to co-move a critique of architectural labour, when architects are so fucked up by the calling, the artist-author false, whiteness, the sustainment of racism, the sexual-racialized division of labour, the manual-intellectual divide, class pact, bourgeois-class aspirations, and most importantly suffer from *work-aphasia* (Deamer, 2020a, p. 23). Most do not even consider themselves as workers! We need to constantly remind ourselves that, first, architecture is labour, and second, that “the creation of labour is the creation of the labourer. It cannot be otherwise: labour cannot be performed if there is no labourer to perform it” (Holloway, 2010, p. 114). This is not meant for architects to identify as workers in order to redeem or dignify through

architectural labour. All this, for architects to identify as labourers in order to recognize the violence of abstract labour and refuse it, and co-move beyond architecture.

Labour as we are subjected today in Abya Yala arrived by boat. It arrived through the violent dispossession of Indigenous and African peoples. Through brutal slavery, dehumanization and subjugation. Through “servitude, captivity, property, and enclosure” (Hartman, 2019, p. 206). Through the violent patriarchal *sexual-racialized division of labour* (Cuero, 2022). Any critique of architectural labour that ignores these colonial conditions is mere white reformism.

As cuadernos de Negación reminds us: there are no labour revolts. There are only revolts against labour! There are no architectural revolts. There are only revolts against architecture! Most labour critiques coincide in claiming that we no longer work to live but live to work, labour has become the means and ends, we are first and foremost workers. If we follow Esteva’s critique of capitalism as a system of social relations fundamentally sustained by everyday life, we should start with an everyday life critique of labour and social relations.

The following are some notes towards an abolitionist critique of labour by way of the *mutually illuminating intra-actions* of autonomous: anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal, black radical tradition, anarchist, sex-gender dissidences and popular material-discursive practices, and how these move beyond-against and beyond the imbricated oppressions of abstract abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. “If production is the religion, labour is the creator god [...] labour is a pitiful fact” (Bonanno, 2020, pp. 124–126).

Labour is the service of humans in bondage

“The slave is the object or the ground that makes possible the existence of the bourgeois subject and, by negation or contradistinction, defines liberty, citizenship, and the enclosures of the social body. As Edmund Morgan has argued, the meaning and the guarantee of (white) equality depended upon the presence of slaves. White men were ‘equal in not being slaves.’ The slave is indisputably outside the normative terms of individuality and to such a degree that the very exercise of agency is seen as a contravention of another’s unlimited rights to the object. (Even labor is not considered agency because it is the property of another, extracted by coercive means, and part of the brute capacities of the black; it simply personifies the power and dominion of the owner)” (Hartman, 2022, p. 104)

“Certainly, the freed came into ‘possession’ of themselves and basic civil rights consequent to the abolition of slavery. However, despite the symbolic bestowal of humanity that accompanied the acquisition of rights, the legacy of freedom was an ambivalent one. If the nascent mantle of sovereign individuality conferred rights and entitlements, it also served to obscure the coercion of ‘free labor,’ the transmutation of bonded labor or involuntary servitude, the invasive forms of discipline that shaped individuality, and the regulatory production of blackness” (Hartman, 2022, p. 209)

What is labour then? We could start from a political economy perspective, through a highly technical definition of labour, but, “we are not devoting our efforts to dealing with the economy as a particularity, or as a discipline, but to the struggle against the economization of life. The critique of the economy stems from the refusal that proletarianized human beings feel towards the categories of capital. [...] This is an intent to put it into words and share it, in order to fight against it” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 1). So, first of all. Labour is neither a natural activity nor ahistorical. Labour as we are subjected today in Abya Yala arrived by boat. It arrived through the violent dispossession of Indigenous and African peoples. Through brutal slavery, dehumanization and subjugation. Through “servitude, captivity, property, and enclosure” (Hartman, 2019, p. 206). Through the violent patriarchal *sexual-racialized division of labour* (Cuero, 2022).

“‘Work’ sounds today to everyone’s ears as the perfect synonym for ‘activity.’ since for most human beings work has become, unfortunately, the totality of their life. And we’re not just talking about how to get money to subsist, everything is experienced as work: housework, artistic creativity, having sex, political militancy, raising a child or going out with friends” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 13).

Here we will refer to labour as abstract-alienating-subordinated-forced activities under capitalist production, *generalized mercantile society*. Activities ruled by the logic of profit and the market. The distinction between work and labour is of little importance. We will use them interchangeably. “Labour is the service of humans in bondage” (Krisis-Group, 1999, p. 19). Under the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, labour is forced compulsory production. Labour “is production enforced by economic or political means, by the carrot or the stick. (The carrot is just the stick by other means.) But not all creation is work. Work is never done for its own sake, it’s done on account of some product or output that the worker (or, more often, somebody else) gets out of it. This is what work necessarily is. To define it is to despise it. But work is usually even worse than its definition decrees. The dynamic of domination intrinsic to work tends over time toward elaboration” (Black, 1986, p. 2).

Labour might take the form of wage-labour. Or not. A situated account of labour, must necessarily problematize the totalization of labour under wage labour, since in Abya Yala, vast majorities of people are not

waged labourers, that is, they do not depend on a direct wage, but are still proletarianized subordinated labourers to capital, and enforced by economic, political or moral means. As cuadernos de Negación, emphasize, we should not “reduce the exploitation to an individual relation between a bourgeois and the workers they exploit, when in fact it’s a matter of a relation between social classes” And, make the case through self-employment or a self-managed factory, in which “it’s not possible to escape the interrelation between the different spheres of production, for which its workers will continue being ‘exploited’ by those capitalists of the commerce and the bank that participate in the profits” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 8). Also, consider the extent to which capitalism relies on unwaged labour, mainly directed towards the sustainment of social reproduction by women and feminized bodies.

For capitalism, labour is a commodity. This means that humans themselves become commodities since they are forced to sell their activity, in the form of a wage or another exchange (Bonanno, 2013, p. 83). As, Kathi Weeks, argues by way of Marx, “production involves the fabrication not just of material goods, but also of relationships, subjectivities, and ideas; cultural forces and forms of consciousness are inseparable from, and thus crucial to, whatever we might delimit as a mode of production. ‘Production thus not only creates an object for the subject’ Marx observes, ‘but also a subject for the object’ (Marx, 1993). Although [Weber and Marx] may have tarried with a different line of emphasis, neither denies that understanding and confronting the contemporary work society requires attention to both its structures and its subjectivities” (Weeks, 2011, p. 40).

After the supposed abolition of slave labour, capitalism had to make labour the highest calling, the route to success in life, the route to personal realization, the most precious desire of the modern individual. And thus, keep bondage, subjection in the form of abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. But, “Freedom through work was never the slave’s cry but we hear it all around us today” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 41).

“The history of the modern age is the history of the enforcement of labour, which brought devastation and horror to the planet in its trail. The imposition to waste the most of one’s lifetime under abstract systemic orders was not always as internalised as today. Rather, it took several centuries of brute force and violence on a large scale to literally torture people into the unconditional service of the labour idol” (Krisis-Group, 1999, p. 20).

“The alienation of labor is a historical notion and, therefore, transitory. To maintain that all human activity is alienation is to put everything in the same bag and to justify the existing mode of production, to present it as insuperable. When we speak of alienation, we refer to the alienation of the proletarian with the products of its labor as well as with its productive activity converted into labor; alienation of any human being who is born dispossessed of the means of subsistence, an alienation that necessarily extends to all spheres of a proletarian's life” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2016, p. 38).

As Krisis Group, argue, “the identity of labour and bondman existence can be shown factually and conceptually. Only a few centuries ago, people were quite aware of the connection between labour and social constraints. In most European languages, the term ‘labour’ originally referred only to the activities carried out by humans in bondage, i.e. bondmen, serfs, and slaves. In Germanic speaking areas, the word described the drudgery of an orphaned child fallen into serfdom. The Latin verb ‘*laborare*’ meant ‘staggering under a heavy burden’ and conveyed the suffering and toil of slaves. The Romance words ‘travail,’ ‘*trabajo*,’ etc., derive from the Latin ‘*tripalium*,’ a kind of yoke used for the torture and punishment of slaves and others in bondage. A hint of that suffering is still discernible in the German idiom ‘to bend under the yoke of labour.’ Thus ‘labour,’ according to its root, is not a synonym for self-determined human activity, but refers to an unfortunate social fate. It is the activity of those who have lost their freedom. The imposition of labour on all members of society is nothing but the generalisation of a life in bondage; and the modern worship of labour is merely the quasi-religious transfiguration of the actual social conditions. For the individuals, however, it was possible to repress the conjunction between labour and bondage successfully and to internalise the social impositions because in the developing commodity-producing system, the generalisation of labour was accompanied by its reification: Most people are no longer under the thumb of a personal master. Human interdependence transformed into a social totality of abstract domination—discernible everywhere, but proving elusive. Where everyone has become a slave, everyone is simultaneously a master, that is to say a slaver of his own person and his very own slave driver and warder. All obey the opaque system idol, the ‘Big Brother’ of capital valorisation, who harnessed them to the ‘*tripalium*’” (Krisis-Group, 1999, p. 19).

Boris Marañón Pimentel in his critique of the colonality of labour (Marañón Pimentel, 2017b, 2017a) draws a path through various authors and historical periods, including Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Locke, Genovese, Smith, and Marx, to understand how the dominant concept of work as wage labour, homogeneous, and abstract came into existence. He argues, that labour as a social category was created to legitimize a specific way of producing wealth required by modern-colonial capitalist power. This specific type of labour, wage labour, is productive labor that exclusively produces surplus value. The production of this social category gave ‘manual’ labor a significance and social recognition that it had never had before colonality-modernity. Throughout history, power relations emerged and with it, domination, exploitation, and conflict. During this time, manual labor involved in agricultural production, which provided basic necessities, was looked down upon by the aristocracy and considered as disgraceful and unworthy. Aristotle was the first western thinker to define manual labor as unworthy because it hindered people from living autonomously and free from the worry of meeting their basic needs. Additionally, Aristotle believed in ‘natural inequality’ among people and classified manual labor as inferior, lacking in reasoning and argumentative ability, physically strong, and destined for obedience and physical work. This concept of ‘natural inequality’ justified slavery in ancient

Greece, allowing a small portion of the population to engage in philosophy and politics as citizens while denying this privilege to slaves.

Christianity and the story of Adam and Eve brought about the belief that manual labor was a punishment from god, as evidenced by the phrase “you shall eat by the sweat of your brow.” This belief persisted throughout the European middle ages until the XV century. As the Catholic church became more institutionalized and aligned with feudal power, this idea became a burden for European peasants who were subordinate and responsible for sustaining the clergy and aristocracy. St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas both supported this classification, drawing on Aristotelian notions of natural inequality among men.

The change in perception of “manual” labour was significantly influenced by Protestant Christians, who emphasized its social importance through the concept of vocation. They believed that through hard work and a simple lifestyle, “manual” laborers could attain salvation. Both Luther and Calvin opposed the hierarchy and corruption within the church, as well as the commercialization of forgiveness. They advocated for equality between believers and god. However, they did not challenge the social divisions and the oppression of peasants that existed during their time, as they considered these issues to be secular matters.

Weeks identifies five antinomies of the work ethic in Weber’s original argument. Drawing from Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. The Protestant work ethic, a result of the Reformation, gave work a new and powerful endorsement. This ethic changed expectations about work and how workers should behave. Protestantism emphasized the moral importance of constant and methodical effort, and failure to adhere to these principles was seen as neglecting one’s duty. Weber’s study explores how this ethic became ingrained in Western European and North American societies alongside capitalism (Weeks, 2011, p. 38).

According to Weeks, Weber’s original argument has five antinomies that “continue to animate the work ethic.” Three of these contradictions arise from the principles of the ethic itself, as it simultaneously promotes both rational and irrational behaviors, values both productivity and consumerism, and supports both individual independence and social dependence. Two more contradictions arise when considering the struggles and application of the ethic: how it has been used to subjugate but also to resist, and how it has functioned as a tool of both exclusion and inclusion. These five pairs of contradictions are seen as antinomies, highlighting the effectiveness of their internal conflicts without assuming they will be resolved dialectically or follow a predetermined path. It remains uncertain whether these dynamics will result in disciplinary measures or methods of resistance, and whether they will lead to progressive historical development or ultimately lead to their own downfall (Weeks, 2011, p. 42).

“At the heart of the Protestant work ethic is the command to approach one’s work as if it were a calling,” underscores Weeks, and notes that here, we encounter the first and most remarkable antinomy in the discourse: the unlikely combination of rationality and irrationality. Weber’s main message is that the work

ethic, despite its irrational origins, is seen as the most rational form of economic conduct. This religious doctrine played a significant role in the rationalization of Western modernity, which Weber finds distinctive. Weber is particularly interested in exploring the irrational element that lies within the concept of a calling. This irrationality is seen in the non-instrumental qualities of disciplined and productive work. However, Weber struggled to fully understand and articulate this irrationality of our commitment to labour. The value and centrality of labour in our lives has become deeply ingrained in our cultural fabric. In order to examine its social and historical significance, we must first challenge and question its familiar and naturalized status. Weber's analysis succeeds in estranging and challenging the common-sense notions about labour. By considering the work ethic in comparison to traditional orientations and secularized perspectives, Weber allows for critical distance and alternative interpretations (Weeks, 2011, p. 42).

As already noted the change in perception of “manual” labour was significantly influenced by Protestant Christians, who emphasized its social importance through the concept of vocation. The concept of “manual” labor evolved between the XVI and XVIII centuries in association with instrumental reason, with the goal of accumulating wealth and power. Initially viewed by protestants as a means to achieve divine grace, manual labor was eventually stripped of all religious and ethical meaning by Adam Smith. Smith defined work as productive, creating both use and exchange value, and abstractly defined wealth as the result of asymmetrical social relations. This eurocentric approach hid the impact of coloniality, and non-europeans were often assigned to non-wage labour, such as slavery and serfdom. Although non-whites eventually gained access to wage labour, they often faced unfavorable conditions and were paid less than white europeans.

The coloniality of labour not only favored wage labour but also ignored historical forms of labour control, such as slavery, serfdom, reciprocity, and small mercantile production. These forms still play a crucial role in the formation and sustainability of global capitalism, as capital exploits them in a hierarchical order to extract surplus labour. Therefore, capital exists alongside these other forms of production (Marañón Pimentel, 2017a, pp. 21–24).

As Weeks highlights, labour is the primary mode in which people are integrated not only into the economic system, but also into social, political, and familial forms of cooperation. It is fundamental to the basic social contract that people should work. Working is considered part of the process that is meant to transform people into independent individual-subjects in the liberal imaginary. Thus, it is seen as a basic duty of citizenship. And labour as a mode of class formation. In this respect, Weeks, argues that according to some perspectives, class and labour are analyzed separately, and Weeks' project focuses on studying labour instead of class analysis and antiwork politics as a replacement for class struggle. However, there is another approach to understanding class that does not create such a sharp contrast with the concept of labour. This alternative viewpoint, which Weeks finds more compelling, sees class as a process rather than a fixed outcome. By viewing

class as a process, it disrupts the traditional view of class formations and highlights the practices and relationships that shape and challenge them. If we consider class as a process of becoming classified, then work, including the struggles over what is considered work, can be seen as a valuable perspective through which to analyze class. Therefore, the fight against work can be seen as a fundamental part of class politics (Weeks, 2011, pp. 8–19).

Today, one of the most pervasive beliefs, as Weeks notes, whereas during the XVII and early XVIII centuries, religion may have required individuals to dedicate their lives to labour. However, by the early XIX century, the concept of social mobility emerged as the main justification for the work ethic. This new industrial work ethic focused on achieving success in this life, rather than in the afterlife. In the mid-XX century, a new element came to the forefront of the work ethic, emphasizing individual self-expression, self-development, and creativity. The Protestant ethic, which served as a transitional belief system between precapitalist and capitalist economies, was eventually replaced by the social rationale of high fordism and the promise of mobility, as well as a more individual justification and the promise of fulfilling and meaningful work. Although the specific goals of the ethic have varied, the prescribed behaviors have remained consistent: a strong commitment to waged work, prioritizing work in life, and viewing work as an end in itself. (Weeks, 2011, p. 49).

Labour is the valorization of life

“For capitalism, work is a commodity, and because it is derived from activity carried out in exchange for a wage, [hu]mans become a commodity.” (Bonanno, 2013, p. 83)

“We will not get rid of the ‘bad’ side of capital (valorisation) while keeping the ‘good’ side (production). Capital accumulates value and fixes it in the form of stored labour, past labour: nearly all present workplaces are geared to labour productivity and labour submission. (Most buildings too, schools particularly)” (Dauvé, 2015, p. 55)

“Labor is not a way of life. But the obligation to sell oneself in order to live” (Tarì, 2016, p. 108)

The struggle beyond-against and beyond the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, is the struggle against the false promise of completion and valorization, to *become uneconomic*.

As mentioned by way of Perlman, labour is not value. “*Value* is the social form of reified (materialized) labor in capitalist society. Under capitalism, social relations are not established directly; they are established

through *value*. Everyday activity is not exchanged directly; it is exchanged in the form of *value*. Consequently, what happens to living activity under capitalism cannot be traced by observing the activity itself, but only by following the metamorphoses of *value*. When the living activity of people takes the form of labor (alienated activity), it acquires the property of exchangeability; it acquires the form of *value*. In other words, the labor can be exchanged for an 'equivalent' quantity of money (wages)" (Perlman, 2018, p. 90).

"That the labour process is subsumed in capital means that capital has made of human activity an activity in function of its own interests: its valorization. As capital has historically appropriated the labour of others, stripping the worker of his means of subsistence and livelihood in this very process, it has modified this activity, it has transformed it in its proper measure. What is specific to the mode of production in general is the transformation of the relations of production and reproduction of society, which makes its definitive entry with the formal subsumption of labor in capital, but which has been developing for many centuries in the forms that prefigure capital and the different determinations of money.

With formal subsumption, even if the means of production in appearance remain exactly the same, they themselves are already opposed to people, they are already split as antagonistic to the producer, they are no longer a means of life for the producer but the inverse. Although commodity fetishism and alienation are more generally associated with real subsumption, it is with formal subsumption, with the separation of the objective conditions of production from the producer, that the most essential reification of social relations is generated and capital becomes the subject of society. The transformation of society, the disruption of all human life in all aspects, the alienation, are found in this separation, although it will obviously deepen and develop. The real subsumption is nothing more than the development of the process of production of capital on that basis" (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2016, p. 9).

"The subsumption of labor under capital is, as we shall see, the way in which capital has made its own even the most recondite aspect of social reproduction.

As capital has historically appropriated the labour of others, separating in this very process the worker from his means of subsistence and production, it has transformed this activity to suit itself. The subsumption of the labour process in the valorization process of capital is the consummation of the subsumption of human activity in capital, erasing all traces of what could remain human in labour.

In many cases the term domination has been used as a synonym of subsumption, not understanding that the former poses things as external, being able to understand, for example, that capital dominates labour and that, therefore, the latter should emancipate itself from the former. But capital not only dominates labour, but includes it in its being and makes it capital! Therefore, it is not a question of appropriating labor and freeing it from capital.

Some comrades maintain that it is incorrect or problematic to use the concept of subsumption with respect to labour and humanity, because, as we were saying, the human being subsumed in capital could only reproduce it. But, for us, such a problem does not exist because both are inseparable statements. If the human being is subsumed, it is as a worker. Who can only emancipate by destroying labour and, therefore, capital.

The proletariat is both a reproducing class and a negating class of capital and, in the class struggle, both poles of proletarian reality are manifested. When we speak of the pole of labour we are speaking only of proletarians as workers, as reproducers of capital. The interest of labour is its best possible sale.

The proletariat can annul itself as a revolutionary force, acting as mere variable capital, defending labour and framing itself in social democracy; or it can fight to overcome labour, as a revolutionary force of society” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2016, p. 8).

“So, everything is value in this capitalist world? The answer is no, but it does not express a less perverse reality. The critique of the valorization of life does not seek to indicate that absolutely everything is commodified in the same way and that all the activities we carry out are labor. It seeks to indicate that production and reproduction of capitalist society as a whole are developed, directly or indirectly, around the production of value. In this society many aspects of our life are not developed in the form of an exchange of equivalents nor are they quantifiable as a quantity of abstract labor. However, this is not outside the logic of value. Different activities of affection and care, as well as other more unpleasant ones, have not been created by value; however, they have been absorbed and even modified by it. And we do not reduce the analysis to interpersonal relationships between acquaintances and close friends, but to society as a whole. We refer to how Capital has been appropriating and integrating into its own dynamics various aspects of social life, modifying them. And that it could not exist without them. Capital could not exist if we only behaved as variable capital in the same way that a company cannot exist if all its employees complied with each and every one of the regulations throughout their entire workday” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 35).

“The foundation of capitalist society is the dictatorship of value in process and the utility of the objects produced is just a means; what we call use–value serves only as a support for exchange–value, of value valorizing itself. [...] It is essential to note that value is not a thing, it is not the price of an individual commodity, it is a social form. [O]bjects do not naturally possess a quality known as value. Rather, this is a consequence of the way in which a society organizes its production. Value and the commodity, just like money and work, are not neutral and transhistorical facts, nor are they natural or eternal. Rather, these are basic categories under capitalism. What is regrettable at this point is that not only the bourgeois reasoning, but also arguments that claim to be revolutionary accept value as a natural fact and others even vindicate the proletariat as ‘those who create all the values of society that some evil bourgeoisie then appropriates’” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 2).

“The work which makes up a value does not matter except as an expenditure of labor, without consideration for the specific form in which it has been spent. Marx called this form of labor, which becomes abstracted from all its concrete forms, «abstract labour.» The values of commodities are then nothing more than ‘crystallizations’ of that «jelly of undifferentiated human labor» (Capital, vol. 1). Value—not to be confused with exchange-value—is a given amount of abstract labor ‘contained’ within a commodity. The commodity then is the union of use-value and of value, just as it is the union of concrete labor and abstract labor that has created it. [...] ‘The abstraction of any tangible quality, of any use-value, is not a mental summary, as when we abstract the different genera of animals to then speak of the ‘animal,’ which nonetheless does not exist as such. The best way to convey this real abstraction is found in a passage in the first edition of Das Kapital (1867), which Marx unfortunately did not reproduce in later editions: «It is as if alongside and external to lions, tigers, rabbits, and all other actual animals, which form when grouped together the various kinds, species, subspecies, families etc. of the animal kingdom, there existed also in addition the animal, the individual incarnation of the entire animal kingdom. Such a particular which contains within itself all really present species of the same entity is a universal (like animal, god, etc.)»” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, pp. 4–5).

“The objectification of labour-time is a consequence of the objectification of the social character of labour, of its quality of being a social link. [...] Money is the sole purpose for production. Nonetheless, money is not the concrete universality of use-values produced, but rather it is the abstract universality of produced value, and consequently, of abstract labour expended” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 5).

“All commodity creating labour is always inevitably abstract and concrete labour and these are two aspects of labour, totally immeasurable and irreplaceable to each other. From an emancipatory perspective it is not a question of reconciling these two parts nor is it possible to choose one for the other, the only possibility is the destruction of both for the overcoming of labour” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 11).

Surplus value and profit are often confused. “While surplus value is the result of surplus labour (from ‘unpaid labour’) and its understanding shows that only variable capital (capital invested in labour force) creates new value; in contrast, profit, the way surplus value is transformed on the surface, is a category that hides this internal reality by showing each component part of capital (variable and constant capital) participating equally in the creation of new value. In effect, it hides the fact that only the part invested in variable capital creates new value, while constant capital only transfers it. Precisely, the rate of profit is calculated in the ratio of profit to global capital while the rate of capital gain is the ratio of capital gain to equity only” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 21).

Labour is abstraction

“We dabble in many things; but the one great real idea of our age, not copied from any other, not pretended, not raised to life by any conjuration, is the Much Making of Things,—not the making of beautiful things, not the joy of spending living energy in creative work; rather the shameless, merciless driving and over-driving, wasting and draining of the last lit of energy, only to produce heaps and heaps of things—things ugly, things harmful, things useless, and at the best largely unnecessary” (De Cleyre, 2019, p. 83)

“The word ‘abstraction’ refers us immediately to thought. It is generally understood as a mental exercise which, in the best of cases, serves to analyze reality.

Thus, the abstract character of work can be interpreted, at most, as a metaphor. Just as abstraction in thought, at the moment of analysis, reduces fundamental components and their relations; isolates it or does so with some of its properties; the particular characteristics of concrete labor are abstracted for value. The only important thing is its quantitative dimension, that is, the amount of labor which commodities embody.

But this is not simply a metaphor, but a reality dominated by the abstract in the most rigorous and literal sense of the term. We suffer more and more deeply from a social dynamic that is characterized by an absolute absence of quality, by a purely quantitative differentiation between our activities and the product of them.

Where does this abstraction come from if not from thought? It arises from our own actions, more specifically from our relations of production based on exchange. Alfred Sohn-Rethel in his book *Intellectual and manual labour*, suggests that abstraction is not a property exclusive to the mind, but that it occurs in the exchange of commodities and that furthermore this was first raised by Marx at the beginning of *Capital*, and even earlier in *Critique of Political Economy* in 1859 where he speaks of abstraction in a different sense than abstraction-thought.

This may sound confusing or contradictory, especially because we access it precisely through the exercise of thought. Sohn-Rethel speaks of value as a real abstraction, which does not mean that it does not exist in thought. It is beyond the traditional dichotomy of being and thinking, for which a thing either exists only in the head, being therefore imaginary—this is the usual meaning of the term abstraction—, or on the contrary it is real, material, empirical. As an abstraction it exists only in thought, but the difference is that this abstraction does not arise from it, nor do we take note of its existence in a rational way.

The importance of the work cited is that it elaborates a critique of the economy at the same time as a critique of science and epistemology, a critique of the separation between manual and intellectual labor with the progressive commodification of life. In other words, the concept of real abstraction also speaks to us about the forms of human knowledge with the development of mercantile exchange, the relationship between being and consciousness under its dominion and generalization, the link between the relations of production that dominate today's society and the perception of its participants about them: «They don't know but they do» (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 10).

“The reified labor of capitalist society, the abstract, homogeneous labor-power which is bought by the capitalist for a price, is crystallized, congealed in commodities which are appropriated by the capitalist and sold on the market. The laborer literally alienates, estranges *his* creative power, *he* sells it. Since creative power refers to an individual's conscious participation in the shaping of *his* material environment, since the power to decide is at the root of creation, it would be more accurate to say that creative power simply does not exist for the hired worker in capitalist society. It is precisely the power to shape *his* circumstances that the laborer sells to the capitalist; it is precisely this power which is appropriated by the capitalist, not only in the form of the homogeneous labor-time which *he* buys for a price, but also in the form of the abstract labor which is congealed in commodities. This reified labor, this abstract labor which is crystallized, congealed in commodities, ‘acquires a given social form’ in capitalist society, namely the form of value” (Perlman, 2018, p. 121)

“The work which makes up a value does not matter except as an expenditure of labor, without consideration for the specific form in which it has been spent. Marx called this form of labor, which becomes abstracted from all its concrete forms, «abstract labor.» The values of commodities are then nothing more than ‘crystallizations’ of that «jelly of undifferentiated human labor» (Marx, 2004). Value — not to be confused with exchange-value — is a given amount of abstract labor “contained” within a commodity. The commodity then is the union of use-value and of value, just as it is the union of concrete labor and abstract labor that has created it” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 4)

“The abstraction of any tangible quality, of any use-value, is not a mental summary, as when we abstract the different genera of animals to then speak of the “animal,” which nonetheless does not exist as such. The best way to convey this real abstraction is found in a passage in the first edition of *Das Kapital* (1867), which Marx unfortunately did not reproduce in later editions: «It is as if alongside and external to lions, tigers, rabbits, and all other actual animals, which form when grouped together the various kinds, species, subspecies, families etc. of the animal kingdom, there existed also in addition the animal, the individual incarnation of the entire animal kingdom. Such a particular which contains within itself all really present species of the same entity is a universal (like animal, god, etc.).»” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 5)

Following *cuadernos de Negación* (*cuadernos de NEGACIÓN*, 2016, pp. 31–33), in order to comprehend the structure of this society and the role of people's creative activities within it, it is crucial to understand alienation, commodity fetishism, and value as elements of this dynamic. To do so, we must first understand the dual nature of both commodities and labour. Previous references have already been made to these concepts, as they are essential for studying and problematizing the mercantile society or the economization of life against which we struggle.

A commodity, in appearance, is a thing suitable for satisfying any human need, whether it comes from the stomach or from the imagination. And it has a dual character: use-value and exchange-value. What constitutes use-value is the concrete character of the commodity itself; consequently, use-value is formed only in the use and consumption of objects. We warn here that we are talking about the commodity on the basis of an analysis of capitalist society, so use-value cannot be taken as something different from value or as its “good side”: use-value is the precondition of value (*cuadernos de NEGACIÓN*, 2016, p. 31). “Exchange value could only have arisen as the proxy of use value, but the victory it eventually won with its own weapons created the preconditions for its establishment as an autonomous power” (Debord, 1994, p. 31).

At first glance, value seems to be the quantitative relationship between the exchange of different use-values, which varies depending on the location and time. The exchange of commodities is characterized by the abstraction from their respective use-values. As exchange values, commodities do not have any use-value or the unique characteristics of the labor they represent. Instead, all types of labour are reduced to the same abstract human labour (*cuadernos de NEGACIÓN*, 2016, p. 32).

A commodity is not defined by the specific labour that created it but by the amount of necessary labour time spent to produce it. For example, goods in a store such as frozen fish, bath flavoring, and cans of tomatoes are produced solely for their exchange value, ignoring the specific work that went into producing them. The concrete aspects of the product, such as the aroma or taste of a tomato, are unimportant as they are only produced for their abstract labour value and the possibility of exchange for profit (*cuadernos de NEGACIÓN*, 2016, p. 33).

So, the dual nature of the commodity is inseparable from the dual nature of labour: concrete labour and abstract labour. Concrete labour refers to the labour that humans engage in to transform nature and obtain a specific object to fulfill their needs. It is evident that different work processes and outcomes occur when creating a spare part for automobiles compared to producing a kilo of tomatoes; each specific type of work is qualitatively distinct and results in different use values. However, disregarding the concrete aspect of labor, what remains is the fact that it involves the expenditure of human labor power. All labour shares the common characteristic of utilizing the human brain, muscles, nerves, and hands; this is what makes it abstract labour. In

this sense, the value of the commodity solely represents the human labour and the expenditure of human labour, in its pure and simple form (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2016, p. 33).

“It must be realized that abstract labor is not a nominal abstraction, nor a convention born (even if unconsciously) in exchange: it is the effective reduction of all activity to a simple expenditure of energy. This reduction is ‘effective’ in the sense that particular activities—and likewise, the individuals who perform them—only become social insofar as they are reduced to such an abstraction” (Jappe, 2014a).

It is not, then, a mental abstraction, but a real abstraction. “It is a state of affairs prevailing at a definite place and lasting a definite time. It is the state of affairs which reigns on the market. There, in the market-place and in shop windows, things stand still. They are under the spell of one activity only; to change owners. They stand there waiting to be sold. While they are there for exchange they are there not for use” (Sohn-Rethel, 2021, p. 25)

Abstraction is not just a whim of capital, but a necessary aspect of a society where production is private and isolated. In order to exchange what is produced, society must socialize its production and eliminate the unique qualities of labor. Instead, it must focus on the expenditure of labour that is equivalent to all labour and can be used to quantify the equivalence of products (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2016, pp. 31–33).

Labour is white patriarchal rule

“...class struggle is not fought only in the factories but also in our bodies, and it is fought not only between labor and capital but also within the proletariat, to the extent that men, especially when waged, have accepted being the state’s representative within the family and the broader community with respect to women.” (Federici, 2021, p. 6)

If as Krisis Group argue, civilization means the voluntary submission to labour: and labour is male, white and western (Krisis-Group, 1999, p. 22). Or such is the claim of modernity as a *form of civilizing totalization of human life*. “The opposite, the non-human, amorphous, and uncivilised nature, is female, coloured and ‘exotic,’ and thus to be kept in bondage. In a word, the ‘universality’ of the labour society is perfectly racist by its origin” (Krisis-Group, 1999, p. 22). Such uni-versality of labour is supported by what Angela Davis calls the convergence of sexism and racism, and a mutually strengthening coupling (Davis, 1983, p. 57,72).

Anti-patriarchal critiques of labour, through various feminisms, as Astrid Cuero argues, have “claimed that both capitalism and patriarchy are two systems of exploitation and domination that are closely related but nevertheless have their own characteristics. It has also made visible that capitalism is not only a system of

production but also of reproduction, in which the sexual division of labour, both in the labour market and in the differentiation that patriarchal capitalist society makes between productive and domestic work, is an integral and fundamental part of capitalist social relations of production (Arango, 1999). However, these theories have ignored or have placed little emphasis on the racialized character” (Cuero, 2022, p. 3)—as we will see further on.

Many anti-patriarchal critiques, have focused on the *sexual-racialized division of labour*, unwaged social reproductive labour and the emancipatory potency anti-capitalist struggles of women, feminized bodies, sex-gender dissidences, and *anybody* that does not comply with white-masculinity. As Cuero argues, these critiques seem to share a fundamental agreement regarding the pivotal significance attributed to the capitalist sexual division of labour in the establishment of hierarchies between the realms of reproduction and production (Cuero, 2022, p. 17).

Through an intricate historical account, Silvia Federici, draws a critique of the sexual division of labour through the violent historical development of patriarchal-colonial-capitalism. Starting with arguing against the conventional tale of capitalism as a natural transition from feudalism, Federici sustains, that capitalism was, rather, a violent counter-revolutionary project to dominate and control anti-feudalism struggles (Federici, 2004, p. 23). By way of this argument, she builds a critique of the invisibilization and devaluation of reproductive and domestic labour, how it had to be first feminized and the violent control over women’s bodies both through the colonization of Abya Yala and Europe, sustaining, against the conventional marxist concept of primitive accumulation, that first it is an ongoing project of dispossession and second that it has focused on both the dispossession of women and nature (Federici, 2004).

Federici, by way of recognizing both the limits-silences and contributions of Marx, shows that “no less than anti-colonial, antiracist critiques of Marx, a feminist perspective also indicates the limits of Marx’s political theory. It shows that it is based on an exclusionary concept of work and revolutionary subjects, that it ignores the strategic importance of domestic work in the process of capitalist accumulation, and that it flattens gender-based differences into a disembodied conception of labor” (Federici, 2021, p. 2). An anti-patriarchal perspective is fundamental, since “it demonstrates that, like racism and ageism, sexism is a structural element of capitalist development, that it is a material force standing in the way of any genuine social transformation, and that it cannot be eliminated (contrary to what Marx and Engels believed) by women entering the factories and working side by side with men” (Federici, 2021, p. 3).

Against the acceptance of the conventional left, of the wage as the dividing line between labour and non-labour, Federici shows how “the enormous amount of wageless work that women perform for capital in the home has escaped their analysis and strategy” (Federici, 2021, p. 9) “The availability of a stable and well-disciplined labor force is an essential condition of production at every stage of capitalist development. This is

why, to this day, in both 'developed' and 'underdeveloped' countries, housework and the family are the pillars of capitalist production" (Federici, 2021, p. 12).

In *Caliban and the Witch* (Federici, 2004), Federici goes beyond traditional marxist feminism, and argues, that the process of original accumulation of capital, as theorized by Marx, not only involved taking the means of production from peasants but also subjugating women's bodies to reproduce the labor force. This led to the proletarianization of the peasantry and colonization, enslavement, and looting of african and indigenous peoples and territories during the XV, XVI, and XVII centuries. Federici examines communal peasant labour and the productive role of women prior to capitalism, as well as the devaluation of their work during the violent imposition from feudalism to capitalism. Witch-hunt was a means of controlling women's bodies, confining them to the domestic sphere as part of the original accumulation process of capital, thereby devaluing and feminizing reproductive labour. Federici argues that this exceptional degradation of women was crucial for the accumulation of capital and has persisted to this day, through economic dependence and the expansion of the family wage, and the formation of what she refers as the patriarchy of the wage (Cuero, 2022, p. 8).

With its limitations, as Davis has showed, Federici has supported the Wages for Housework movement, started by Italian feminists like Mariarosa Dalla Costa. They argued that classifying "domestic work" as actual work and recognizing its importance in sustaining the capitalist economy was a revolutionary political strategy. Federici argues that only when this work is acknowledged as work and not seen as something natural or solely associated with women, can the sexual hierarchy within capitalist society be reconfigured in a fairer way. The moralistic views that biologized domestic work and considered it as an inherent feminine quality rather than a set of skills requiring physical and mental effort were problematic and contributed to the perpetuation of the capitalist system. Federici also discusses how the labor relations of the wage patriarchy were established through the separation of merchandise production from labor force reproduction, which was reinforced during the post-war period with Keynesian policies and the development of the welfare state. Domestic work was regulated through male wages in this context. However, Federici notes that the role of the housewife as the central figure in reproductive services is diminishing due to the restructuring of domestic and reproductive work, particularly through globalization. Domestic work is becoming more "desexualized" and pushed out of the private sphere, as there is a growing trend towards outsourcing domestic services to day care centers, restaurants, and au pair nannies. This shift has also led to an increase in salaried female labor, resulting in a feminization of certain sectors of wage labor. However, this process has also created new divisions among women, particularly along racial lines (Cuero, 2022, p. 9).

Cuero, from an anti-racist and anti-colonial perspective, through her research on domestic labour in southern so-called méxico and the imbricated experience of simultaneous oppressions that racialized women suffer, mobilizes two concepts that are fundamental for understanding the imbricate relation between

coloniality and cis-hetero-patriarchy: *sexual-racialized division of labour*, and *racism of the wage*. Similar to the critique of Cuero to racialized-feminized domestic labour, we could draw a parallel with the building industry. Through three keys, first, through the class division of labour, and the sustained unequal valorization and distinction between manual-intellectual labour, architects as mostly white-mestizos of middle and upper class, are recognized as cognitive workers and builders, mostly racialized and impoverished men of lower classes limited to manual construction. Second, through the racial division of labour, most workers from the building industry come from peripheralized and racialized communities. And third, through the sexual division of labour, still most workers from the building industry are men and women are relegated to the final stages of construction and limited to cleaning tasks.

Labour is racist colonial rule

“Racism, specifically, is the state-sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death” (Gilmore, 2007, p. 28)

“I hear the storm. They talk to me about progress, about ‘achievements,’ diseases cured, improved standards of living I am talking about societies drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, [...] I am talking about millions of men torn from their gods, their land, their habits, their life-from life, from the dance, from wisdom.” (Césaire, 2001, p. 42)

Under the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, labour is racialized forced compulsory production. The re/production of whiteness. As Davis, accounts, labour domination continued after slavery abolition through various modes (Davis, 1983, p. 9). Or, as Hartman, sharply notes, “certainly, the freed came into ‘possession’ of themselves and basic civil rights consequent to the abolition of slavery. However, despite the symbolic bestowal of humanity that accompanied the acquisition of rights, the legacy of freedom was an ambivalent one. If the nascent mantle of sovereign individuality conferred rights and entitlements, it also served to obscure the coercion of ‘free labor,’ the transmutation of bonded labor or involuntary servitude, the invasive forms of discipline that shaped individuality, and the regulatory production of blackness” (Hartman, 2022, p. 209).

As we have seen previously, according to Echeverría, the individual subject emerges through the enlightenment and the negation of the other. He then continues through Weber and argues that, the concept of

“spirit” in Weber’s work refers to the demand placed by society’s economic life on its members for a certain type of behavior. This “spirit of capitalism” requires everyone to adapt to the demands of capitalist life, including work discipline, productivity, and the pursuit of profit. Weber believes that protestant christianity, particularly puritanism, best represents this ethos requested by capitalism. However, Echeverría criticizes Weber’s approach, suggesting that it may involve a form of racism that requires individuals to possess a certain “whiteness” as a condition of modern humanity (Echeverría, 2019, p. 38). The whiteness of production.

Regarding coloniality, we noted in the introduction, Quijano defines four axis of the global pattern of power, the coloniality of power that started with the constitution of both so-called América and Europe in 1492. The first two are fundamental for our current discussion, since according to Quijano the first axis imposed “a new system of social domination, founded on the basic and universal social classification of the world population on the basis of, and around, the idea of ‘race.’ This idea and its effects on power relations produced a racist episteme in the process of globalization of European colonialism since the 18th century. Imposed on the entire population of the world, this system constitutes the first global form of social domination.” The second axis, associated with the first, established “the formation of a structure of control of labour, its resources and products, which articulated all historically known forms (slavery, serfdom, small independent mercantile production, reciprocity and capital), around and under the predominance of the capital-wage relation (hereinafter, capital) and of the world market. Because of the central and dominant place of capital in this structure, this structure admitted, fundamentally, a capitalist character and was imposed on the whole world. In this way, a new pattern of exploitation was constituted: world capitalism. And since it is a structure of control over all forms of labour and thus affects the entire world population, it is also the first global form of social exploitation”(Quijano, 2013, p. 145).

According to Quijano, “slavery in América was not an extension of classical slavery, but a historically and sociologically new phenomenon: it was deliberately established and developed as a commodity, to supply the world market. The same happened with personal servitude” (Quijano, 2013, p. 152).

This is important, because as we will see through Cuero’s work and two fundamental concepts: the sexual-racial division of labor, and wage racism, domestic labour provides an important analysis for understanding the racist and sexist imbrication in the control of labour through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. The subordination of racialized women in domestic labour, and for our argument against architecture we can draw a parallel with, women and men in construction labour, are both examples of how imbricated asymmetric power relations operate through class, race, gender, and sex (Cuero, 2022, p. 12).

Astrid Cuero, by way of anti-racist and black feminists, decolonial, anticolonial and indigenous intellectuals, in Abya Yala, as Sueli Carneiro, argues that today, race still serves as a means to exploit the labour

of racialized people, both men and women. This appropriation and exploitation of their bodies continues to exist, although no longer under the colonial model, but through the pattern of coloniality of power (Quijano, 2014). Racism plays a role in determining the hierarchy of gender, with black and indigenous women being positioned as subordinate to white women, often seen as “domestic servants of liberated women” (Carneiro, 2014). Therefore, the theoretical perspectives of anti-racist feminism, decolonial turn, and decolonial feminism helps understand how for example paid domestic work was established within the framework of power's coloniality. This means that the modern capitalist organization of labour was not only based on class and gender exploitation and domination, but also on race (Cuero, 2022, p. 12).

Although coloniality of power aims to explain how the exploitation and domination of the reproductive and productive worlds are connected through racial classification, Cuero argues that Quijano's understanding of race as a form of domination is correct and non-essentialist, his view on sex and the resulting domination is essentialist and biologicist. By way of Lugones who argues that sex is not solely a biological fact, but also a social construct, similar to skin color and race. She emphasizes that both sex and gender are historical constructions that emerged within colonial relations. Instead of focusing on the coloniality of power, Lugones examines the coloniality of gender. She asserts that gender was a colonial construction, as patriarchal relations and the concept of gender did not exist prior to colonization. The coloniality of gender encompasses not only the hierarchy between males and females in terms of sex and gender, but also the hierarchy between humans and non-humans, where racialized men and women were considered non-human ((Lugones 2011) (Lugones 2008, pp. 81–82)) (Cuero, 2022, p. 13).

Cuero notes that, in a similar vein to Lugones, Brenny Mendoza also critiques Quijano's formulation for its essentialism in how it understands the connection between sex and gender. Mendoza also takes issue with the fact that Quijano's formulation only considers the processes of racialization in defining the division of labour, without taking into account its gender implications. Mendoza argues that the invention of race led to the division of labour between free wage labour, initially reserved for white european men, and unfree labour—such as slavery and servitude—, reserved for racialized men and women—specifically black and indigenous. However, what Quijano does not delve into deeply, but Mendoza clearly demonstrates, is that after european colonialism supposedly ended in Abya Yala and industrial capitalism emerged in england and the so-called united states of america, wage labour became widespread and primarily reserved for white men, even if they were impoverished. This resulted in the establishment of a gendered social agreement between capitalists and workers, granting them citizenship status through wage labor, at the expense of excluding racialized workers from the realm of wage labour (Mendoza, 2010, p. 25). However, racialized men and women continue to face widespread exclusion from wage labour (Cuero, 2022, p. 14). A violent push towards *forced entrepreneurialism*.

According to Cuero, the current effects of the coloniality of power, gender, racism, and the institution of servitude, as proposed by these authors, regarding the global arrangement of paid domestic work in recent years, partly align with Federici's ideas about the restructuring of reproductive work in today's neo-liberal capitalism. Since the process of globalization, a new division of labour has emerged, deepening the hierarchies of sex, class, and race within the global workforce. According to Federici, the so-called third world has become a source of cheap labour, leading to a system of global apartheid where immigration is used to reduce labor costs. Therefore, the perspectives of black, anti-racist, decolonial, and anti-colonial feminists mentioned here, along with Federici's contributions, are crucial in addressing the labour and subjective experiences of indigenous domestic workers (Cuero, 2022, p. 16).

Cuero's contribution to the field of feminist studies, draws, as she synthesizes, from the work of "anti-racist feminist theories, black feminist, decolonial, anticolonial and indigenous intellectuals, paid domestic work is characterized because it is configured in a position of hierarchical inferiority compared to reproductive work that is performed free of charge. This inferiority is both symbolic and material, since it is a form of labor that derives not only from the sexual division of labor, but above all from the racial division of labor imposed by the process of european colonialism in the Americas.

Paid domestic labour is fundamentally racialized labour, performed by women who were animalized, considered beasts of burden and non-human, and who did not carry the status of femininity. The upper- or middle-class white housewife enjoys the status of femininity as a wife and mother. Although exposed to patriarchal controls and exploitation of her labour by her husband or other family members, she may enjoy better material conditions because of her class position and symbolic status in terms of affection and humanity because of her privileges of whiteness. Moreover, as Cumes (Cumes Simón, 2014) points out, paid domestic work reproduces a form of subjective appropriation of indigenous women, which implies that they continue to be treated as servitude, and not as a labour force.

If unpaid reproductive labour, according to hegemonic classical feminist theories, would be defined mainly by the patriarchal system, paid domestic labour would be defined mainly by the intertwining of patriarchal, capitalist and, above all, racist systems. Where the weight of race makes the big difference. Paid domestic service was configured in the relations of colonial servitude imposed on indigenous women and in the processes of enslavement of black women. The contributions of (Davis, 1983); (hooks, 2015); (Cumes Simón, 2014); (Mendoza, 2010); (Lugones 2008), as part of a set of theories that we can name as anti-racist feminism, clearly show that the relationship that links unpaid reproductive labour and paid domestic labour is a relationship of hierarchy, a relationship of inferiority and superiority, a relationship where the sexual division of labour is complicated, and articulated with the racial division of labour. Inspired by these analyses, [Cuero's] contribution to the field of feminist studies is to show that paid domestic work is defined by a *sexual-racialized*

division of labour, which structures the hierarchy between unpaid reproductive labour and paid household labour, and inferiorizes the latter with respect to the former. [Cuero], believes that it still remains to be explored from this anti-racist feminist interpretation, to what extent there is a relationship of continuity between unpaid domestic and unpaid reproductive labour, or whether the latter is an extension of the former. But what [she] maintains is that they respond to different forms of structuring social relations of power and domination both within families and households, as well as in their relationship with productive capitalist wage labour. [...]

Paid domestic labour responds to the historical experience of oppression imbricated around the processes of classification of black and indigenous women, based on race, class, sex and sexuality. This work exceeds the gender subordination that is supposed to define unpaid domestic labour, performed by women with class and racial privileges. Privileged women, who, moreover, can disengage from this labour and even incorporate into wage labour by hiring a racialized woman who does so receiving a payment, but as Davis (Davis, 1983) already pointed out, it is a payment that responds to a racist criterion. If, as (Federici, 2021) points out, unpaid domestic work responds to *wage-patriarchy*, insofar as waged labour was defined as fundamentally masculine, and the free labour of women or housewives is required to sustain it, [Cuero] proposes that paid domestic labour responds to *wage-racism*, because the payment that racialized women receive for doing this labour does not really imply a wage, insofar as it is outside the waged regime. And because it sustains the wage labor not only of men, but also of white women” (Cuero, 2022, pp. 18–19).

No will to work

Abolition of labour

“[Esther] Brown hated to work, the conditions of work as much as the very idea of work. Her reasons for quitting said as much. Housework: Wages too small. Laundry work: Too hard, ran away. General housework: Tired of work. Sewing buttons on shirts: Tired of work. Dishwasher: Tired of work. Housework: Man too cross. Live-in service: I might as well be a slave” (Hartman, 2019, p. 208)

So, why the fuck work? Why, if “we are not concerned with the political problems of those who see unemployment as a danger to democracy and order. We do not feel any nostalgia for lost professionalism. We are even less interested in elaborating libertarian alternatives to grim factory work or intellectual labour, which are unwittingly doing nothing but toe the line of the advanced post-industrial project. Nor are we for the abolition of work or its reduction to the minimum required for a meaningful happy life. Behind all this there is always the hand of those who want to regulate our lives, think for us, or politely suggest that we think as they

do. We are for the destruction of work and, as we will try to demonstrate, that is quite a different matter. But let us proceed in an orderly fashion” (Bonanno, 2013, p. 1).

“We work to live and we lose our lives working” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 28). Yet, “capital always continues to grow at the expense of its labour” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 22). There are two main reasons why we work long and hard. Firstly, we work out of necessity because in a wage-based economy, most people do not have much control over their employment conditions or the choice to not work at all. Secondly, we work because we want to, as it provides not only income but also supposedly satisfaction, purpose, structure, social connections, and recognition, or so they say. However, these explanations alone are not enough. The pressure from the system itself cannot fully explain why there is little resistance to long working hours or the expectations placed upon us at work. Similarly, individual choice cannot explain why work is more appealing than other aspects of life. The reasons for dedicating so much time and energy to work involve a combination of coercion, choice, necessity, desire, habit, and intention. While the structure of society may make long hours necessary, we need a more comprehensive understanding of how and why many of us accept and embrace this requirement. One factor that contributes to this acceptance is, as we have already argued, the work ethic, which encompasses a complex set of beliefs, ideals, and values (Weeks, 2011, p. 37)

We do not work because we enjoy it. Fuck the western labour morality! Fuck the mestizo ideology that work dignifies! Fuck the colonial-calling of architectural labour! We work because we constantly have to economically justify our existences. We are exhausted of this! All these meanderings through education and labour, and learning and doing, in order to refuse, the point of view from which it makes sense the need for architecture and the architect—Illich would say of any disabling profession. To co-move beyond-against and beyond architectural alienation, which is to say how architecture estranges the collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world, and constructs *the architectural world*.

“To abolish labour and exploitation it is fundamental to recognize that capitalist production is based on the production of value, on the constant and ever-increasing valorization of Capital. That is why we are exploited and not simply because of the greed of certain bourgeois. Capital is not simply the sum of particular capitals, it is a subject that has developed historically as the production and reproduction of life has been increasingly separated from direct needs and oriented towards exchange, towards the market. [...] to terminate exploitation and wage labour means to terminate Capital as a subject and social relation, it means to terminate value and exchange” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, pp. 10–11). Hence, “we must break with the capitalist reason and the horizon that capital proposes to us, we must abolish the generalized mercantile society, not administrate and manage it!” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 2).

The abolition of labour, comes with overcoming nation-states, because, “If we reject the State, it is because we reject a whole system of social organization that leads to the State. Its abolition is inseparable from

the abolition of the system of wage labour. [...] The destruction of the State means the destruction of a society that 'needs' the existence of the State" (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 36). In other words, abolition of vocational schooling and abstract labour means the abolition of a society that needs the existence of schooling and labour. The need for an architectural education and architectural labour. The abolition of the need for architectural services.

According to Bonanno, "the alternative to labour is the destruction of labour. But this should not be understood as a change of ethics, from the ethics of work to the ethics of leisure, or, if you will, from the aesthetics of production to the aesthetics of waiting. It should be seen as a transformation of the end of labour within society fed by productivist ideology, in the sense of the liberation of the human being. There is no doubt that this liberation can happen only through a modification of the relation man-work, woman-work and not only through a modification of the relation of production taken in itself as absolute value (or at least taken as the prevailing value in a certain historical situation).

The revolutionary sign is in the liberation from exploitation: this can happen through various tactics, linked to different situations of class conflict; but the problem of the elimination of labour cannot but be placed in a central plane.

[...] We do not consider the concept of 'destruction of labour' as overcoming a historical phase (manufacturing), but only as overcoming (transformation of the productive structure) and refusal of the ideology of production aimed at sustaining the need for the old organization of the economy, even if it has changed in terms of ownership of the means of production. We understand finally, as 'destruction of labour.' even the provisional and partial self-organization, in capitalist regime, carried out in a violent and expropriative way, by the productive nuclei even separated from the general context of the production of a country or an area, so that the struggle is led not in favor of production but to a destruction of labour and a radical transformation of production" (Bonanno, 2020, p. 127).

We struggle then, "to refuse reproducing ourselves and others as workers, as labor power, as commodities" (Federici, 2021, p. 21). Because "we have never belonged to ourselves. We have always belonged to capital every moment of our lives. And it is time that we make capital pay for every moment of it" (Federici, 2021, p. 20).

Against the calling, architectural labour

“...workers are expected to be the architects of their own better exploitation” (Henwood, 1997)

Fuck the calling! Fuck the call of architectural labour! As mentioned previously, “At the heart of the Protestant work ethic is the command to approach one's work as if it were a calling” at the heart of the first antinomy, pointed by Weeks, lies the “irrationality of our commitment to work as if it were a calling. [...] This ‘peculiar idea’ of one's duty in a calling, ‘so familiar to us to-day, but in reality so little a matter of course’ has settled into the cultural fabric, making it difficult to grasp on its own terms” (Weeks, 2011, p. 42). “What characterized the Protestant ethos in particular was the ethical sanction for and the psychological impetus to work; ascetic Protestantism preached the moral import of constant and methodical productive effort on the part of self-disciplined individual subjects. This was no mere practical advice: ‘The infraction of its rules is treated not as foolishness’ Weber maintains, ‘but as forgetfulness of duty’ (Weber, 2001). One should set oneself to a lifetime of ‘organized worldly labour’ as if (and not, as we will see, precisely because) one were called to it by God. Weber's brilliant study of how and to what effect we came to be haunted by the legacy of this Puritan ethic introduces the essential components, fundamental dynamics, and key purposes of the new ethic of work that developed in conjunction with capitalism in Western Europe and North America” (Weeks, 2011, p. 42).

“‘The treatment of labour as a calling became as characteristic of the modern worker as the corresponding attitude toward acquisition of the business man’ (Weber, 2001). Thus, for example, in addition to encouraging workers to accept the primacy of work over the times and spaces of nonwork, the doctrine also taught workers to respond to wage incentives, to recognize and accept a necessary connection between their contribution as social producers and their corresponding rights to individual consumption. The work ethic continues to affirm the legitimacy of this connection: consumption goods are the reward for and sign of one's contributions and status as a producer. As an antinomy rather than an oxymoron, the ‘worldly asceticism’ of the Protestant ethic functions not despite, but because of, the pairing of terms”(Weeks, 2011, p. 49).

Architects are still numbed by the calling, the supposed vocation to design space. At best, recently, there have been commendable efforts made by the architecture industry to coordinate against labour precarization, as the organization of unions, among other related concerns of the struggle for labour. Djalali notes, that just “as Hannes Meyer wanted, architects today are becoming proletarians. But the destiny of the proletarianisation of the architect is not affecting only the ‘class-conscious architect’ as a joyful existential project of liberation from bourgeois morals. On the contrary, it is affecting architects against their will, bringing about the ‘sad passions’ of competition, depression and cynicism” (Djalali, 2015, p. 41).

The question remains then, as to when and how the architect and architecture will commit fully, not to the labour struggle, but to the struggle against labour? In other words, ultimately, the struggle beyond-against and beyond the architect, architecture and the building-speculating industry at large.

There are no labour revolts. There are only revolts against labour. Holloway makes this clear following Marx, that there are essentially two layers of class conflict. Both the abstraction of doing into labour and the exploitation of abstract labour are the foundations of capitalist production. Exploitation is impossible without the abstraction of doing into labour. On the other side, the abstraction of labour is imposed and reimposed through the process of exploitation. The two modes of conflict are separate but also intricately intertwined. The distinction is crucial because, in one instance, we are discussing the revolt against labour, while in the other, we are discussing the revolt of labour against capital. The two perspectives are completely at odds with one another because one views the fight against capitalism as the revolt of labour, while the other views it as the revolt against labour (Holloway, 2010).

In order to engage in the struggle against labour, argue for the abolition of labour, and particularly co-move towards the abolition of architectural labour, we would need first to argue that architects are workers themselves. Since most do not even have a labour consciousness, as Deamer underscores, most architects suffer from labour aphasia and consider themselves some kind of creative genius, not subjected by labour coercion and respond to a higher calling to design beautiful spatial commodities.

As we have seen in chapter four, a situated account of architectural labour in Abya Yala, has to consider the imbricated experience of coloniality, through the violent domination and obliteration of inhabiting and constructive practices. Through the violent homogenization of the uni-versal claims of architecture. Even though, abstract labour in Abya Yala, was imposed through the *sexual-racialized division of labour*, the first architectural workers, disciplined and professionalized architects in Abya Yala, were neither racialized nor impoverished people, they were white cis-hetero mestizo-bourgeois colonial men. That to say that architecture was and continues to be mostly a colonial white-cis-hetero-men dominated labour. Becoming architect is becoming white. But let's not forget as Juan Albalá reminds us, who are those who build the architects whims. Impoverished and racialized, displaced indigenous, black and campesino people.

Recently the discourse on immaterial labour has gained popularity in architecture. This is not the place to fully contest that theoretical shit, as Durito might say. Let's just say that it seems again a way to pursue the struggle of labour and fight against the precarization of immaterial labour, whereas we are here co-moving towards the struggle against labour, that means also the struggle against the manual-intellectual divide. As Juan Albalá would likely say, fuck the immaterial worker!

Let's reiterate that, this is not a claim for architects to identify as workers in order to redeem. But to co-move with architects, to identify as labourers in order to recognize the violence of abstract labour, refuse it and abolish it.

In a similar way that Federici, clarifies the struggle for housework, when we "say that the work we perform in [architecture] is capitalist production is not the expression of a wish to be legitimated as part of the 'productive forces.' Only from the capitalist viewpoint can being productive be considered a moral virtue, not to say a moral imperative. From the point of view of the working class, being productive only means being exploited. 'To be a productive laborer is, therefore, not a piece of luck but a misfortune.' Thus, we derive little 'self-esteem' from it. But when we say that [architecture] is a moment of capitalist production, we clarify our function in the capitalist division of labour and the specific forms that our struggle against it must take. Our power does not come from anyone's recognition of our place in the cycle of production. Not production, but the power to withhold it, has always been the decisive factor in the social distribution of wealth. When we say that we produce capital, we say that we want to destroy it rather than fighting a losing battle to move from one form of exploitation to another" (Federici, 2021, p. 13).

As we've already said, let's make no mistake, we are all neo-liberal architects. These are not *ruthless criticisms* towards architects and architecture in order to dissociate/distance ourselves from architecture, and its responsibility, but problematizations to co-move and recognize ourselves through the violences we sustain as architects and doing architecture. To recognize the overrepresentation of the architect as white-mestizo-bourgeois cis-hetero able men. To recognize ourselves as workers, and thus mobilize the potencies of organization against professionalizing education and alienating labour, beyond the professionalization of our habitat. To mobilize together beyond the forced labour mask and the false promise of the individual subject. In other words, to co-move beyond-against and beyond architecture and the architect. Fuck architecture!

Fugitive deprofessionalization

"Control over work is not a new development. Professionalism is one of many forms that the control over work has taken" (Illich et al., 2000, p. 16)

"Committed professionals cannot confess, even in the privacy of their bedrooms, let alone in the public arena, that all the cures concocted by their profession are far, far more terrible than all the different diseases they profess to heal. Heretics who dare to deprofessionalize themselves must be put to death; or, best yet, either not be studied at all or be studied just enough to merit dismissal with a sound kick in the pants so that

students learn proper obedience and respect for the professions” (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 15)

Co-moving beyond-against and beyond the calling and architectural labour, means first and foremost the deprofessionalization of spatio-territorial doings.²⁰ Deprofessionalization, following Esteva, implies a double struggle, first, an ontological struggle beyond-against and beyond professional identity, in other words the struggle against labour, “we struggle to refuse reproducing ourselves and others as workers, as labor power, as commodities [...] to become ‘uneconomic’” (Federici, 2021, p. 21). We struggle to not finish ourselves, for incompleteness, because “not completing; it’s about allowing subjectivity to be unlawfully overcome by others, a radical passion and passivity such that one becomes unfit for subjection” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 35). And second, a collective struggle beyond-against and beyond professional hierarchization, to stop delegating our autonomy to someone with technical expertise (Bonanno, 2020, p. 21). Deprofessionalization, means then, the refusal of architectural subjectivity, currently the neo-liberal architect, and as we have seen in other chapters, such refusal encompasses, amongst other, the problematization of the uni-versal individual subject, authorship, creative genius, professional authority, the imbrication of race, class and gender oppressions, mono-functional modern space, and colonial impositions of progress at large, that all disabling professions violently promote. And particularly the ethos of the neo-liberal architect, mainly: entrepreneurship, competition, flexibility, resilience, originality, innovation and creativity.

Alicia Carrió, by way of Illich, argues that “unlike yesterday’s liberal professions that provided the ethical backing for highstatus hawkers, the new dominant professions claim control over human needs, tout court. They turn the modern state into a holding corporation of enterprises which facilitates the operation of their self-certified own competences: equal needs are laid on the citizen/client, only to be fulfilled in a zero-sum game. The crisis we experienced in this last economic cycle yields the end of the autonomous professions. In the specific case of architecture, although it applies to other professions, work until very recently was primarily the work of intermediating between: 1 the specific knowledge and construction of habitat; 2 the particular developer’s requirements and the general interest supervised by the State; 3 the needs of the people to inhabit spaces suitable for their development” (Carrió, 2015, p. 173).

In 2014 in a conversation at Dublin, Esteva (Esteva & O’Donovan, 2014) was asked what did he meant by calling himself a deprofessionalized intellectual, in relation to disabling professions and conviviality, to which he answered, building upon Illich’s work, that deprofessionalization, refers to two types of challenges. First, that the most challenging aspect of our learning experience has been the need to un-learn what we have previously learned. It is not about acquiring new knowledge, but rather about undoing the ingrained

professional thinking that has modulated us. This process of un-learning is extremely difficult because it is essentially a process of un-doing ourselves, and in doing so, we feel like we are losing ourselves.

According to Esteva, we must urgently realize how professions modulate us. Each profession has its own unique language, and the words used are the paths that open up the world to us. Depending on the words we use, our perception of the world is shaped accordingly. If we are immersed in professional terminology, our identity becomes intertwined with our profession. Consequently, we no longer see the world through our own eyes, but rather through the lens of a profession. Then, to dismantle oneself is a highly challenging task, especially when we consider reclaiming our existences beyond the constraints and specificities of a specific profession.

Second, the urgent need to engage with the struggle against the oppressive nature of various professions. Essentially, because professions are designed to disable others, as brilliantly articulated by Illich in his article on the *Age of Disabling Professions*. Each profession is crafted to transform any situation into a problem, perpetuating a patriarchal system where only men are deemed suitable professionals. This is the reality we face, where these professionals assert their dominance and dismiss the feelings and experiences of others. They claim to know how we feel, as they position themselves as the experts, dictating our emotions and experiences.

Esteva, then relates the dismantling of professions and education, through some universities in so-called USA, where a new professional has emerged called *bereavement counselor*. They are specifically trained to assist those who have experienced the loss of a loved one and are unsure of how to cope with their emotions. The counselor's role is to guide them in understanding that it is acceptable to feel certain emotions in this situation, while discouraging other feelings. They also help people express their feelings in a specific mode. This type of counseling is a result of previous experiences where people are disabled, and hence have various professionals dictating their actions. This, Esteva argues, exemplifies the perfect education for consumers. Educated to consume everything, including the services of the professionals. When people are educated to rely on professionals for all their needs.

Esteva argues then, for the double struggle, to un-learn our identity as professionals and to challenge the need and domination of all professions, and co-move towards the deprofessionalization of society (Esteva & O'Donovan, 2014).

The deprofessionalization of sociality, beyond the western-liberal notion of society, because as Moten, reminds us, “society is not friendly association with others; it’s friendly association without others, in the absence of the other, in the exhaustion of relational individuality, in consent not to be a single being, which is given in the sharpness of a differentiating touch, in the movement of hands, in *caminhando*.” (Moten, 2017a, p. 282).

And, if we are compelled to a trans-versal and imbricated critique, then professional identities must be questioned through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. For most professional identities, such as the architect, are racist, sexist and classist categorizations, modes to comply, modes of securing the authority complex proper to whiteness. If we hold on to the imbrication of the amalgam, then by imagining deprofessionalization, unlearning the professional identities that sustain abstract labour, then through their abolition we are also rehearsing the end of the overrepresentation by white-cis-hetero-bourgeois-men, in other words we are co-moving beyond-against and beyond class, race and sex-gender domination.

As Bonanno argues, when an architect is hired and commissioned for a design, we are essentially delegating our autonomy to someone with technical expertise (Bonanno, 2020, p. 21), we are delegating our potencies of inhabitation to a technocrat, a watchdog of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. And, as Robert beautifully reminds us, in *El arte de habitar no se deja alfabetizar*, “experts do not know how to write how it is good to live, [...] architects seem to ignore the fact that one lives with neighbors, so inhabiting is living-together [*con-vivir*] [...] Our epoch has no *ars habitandi* that can be prescribed by means of texts. In an epoch that has made description its only light, the art of inhabiting has become clandestine. It thrives in the interstices of norms and in the ambiguities of contradictory legislations. It sleeps or revives in what remains of orality. It is rebellious to the written form: it does not allow itself to be alphabetized” (Robert, 2021, pp. 201–210). Which is to say, autonomous inhabitations do not allow professionalization, they have become clandestine. And clandestinely they spread.

If we understand fugitivity by way of Harney and Moten, as “a performative against all performances of freedom and unfreedom dependent on the historical dilemma of a lack of meaningful distinction between freedom and slavery” (Moten, 2018a, p. 247). “Fugitivity is not only escape, ‘exit’ as Paolo Virno might put it, or ‘exodus’ in the terms offered by Hardt and Negri, fugitivity is being separate from settling. It is a being in motion that has learned that ‘organizations are obstacles to organising ourselves’ (The Invisible Committee in The Coming Insurrection) and that there are spaces and modalities that exist separate from the logical, logistical, the housed and the positioned” (Halberstam, 2013, p. 18). As we have noted, Moten insists in the “distinction between being delivered over or being exposed to and being called into being by the sovereign power of the state of exception. Extraordinary rendition—by way of whatever point or door of no return and in the interest of whatever protection of whatever particular determination of the proper—might very well be understood as the most extreme example of the state’s interpellative, violently transportive call, but that call is not a call into being. And if this is so, it means that the refusal of that call does not require an escape from being or from the question of its meaning. At stake, rather, is the question and the sociality of being’s escape, its essential fugitivity. This is not just about being excluded from the ‘regular situation’ that one’s irregular presence guarantees; it’s about recognizing that the decision that creates the regular situation must be created

and exists only in response to the everyday irruption of imagining things, ‘the anarchic sorcery of the facts,’ that calls it into being and cuts it” (Moten, 2018b, p. 43).

Beyond-against and beyond the white authority complex of architectural profession, *fugitive deprofessionalization* rehearses the refusal of being. When today being is primarily a call to labour, a call to become a labouring being, fugitive deprofessionalization, does not only refuse hegemonic professional identities, as the architect, but all labouring identities that are put at work by/for abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour. A becoming *non-subjects* of abstract labour. Fugitive deprofessionalization as abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour refusal towards *unbecoming* disabling professionals.

Doings

“All commodity creating labor is always inevitably abstract and concrete labor and these are two aspects of labor, totally immeasurable and irreplaceable to each other. From an emancipatory perspective it is not a question of reconciling these two parts nor is it possible to choose one for the other, the only possibility is the destruction of both for the overcoming of labor” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 11)

Doing, co-moves beyond-against and beyond both abstract and concrete labour, against the valorization of life. Doings that are sustained in/for common. As Lucia Linsalata and Huáscar Salazar Lohman, ask the “what for? of the common means, to reflect on the multiple relations of cooperation that men and women weave on a daily basis, in different parts of the world, to reproduce our lives in a satisfactory way; to reflect on the historical forms of these relations, their reasons, their potencies, their limits, their fragilities, their futures. It means reflecting on the possibilities of social emancipation nested in the daily doings of women and men who, from different latitudes of the planet, are struggling to preserve, care for, amplify or reappropriate the material and symbolic conditions necessary to guarantee the dignified reproduction of their lives. It means refocusing our gaze on the colorful and colorful associative wefts along which men and women weave our actions autonomously, recovering—at least in part—the capacity to establish the meanings, rhythms and causes of our practical life. Finally, asking the ‘what for?’ of the common means, for us, asking about the paths of autonomy and autodetermination” (Linsalata & Salazar Lohman, 2015, p. 10).

Through the experience of indigenous and *campesino* peoples, in Abya Yala, Zibechi, argues, the community is sustained through the collaborative effort of creative doings, which continuously re-create and re-affirm the community. These efforts highlight the diverse social relationships in contrast to the dominant ones, and without them, it would be inaccurate to refer to it as a community (Zibechi, 2015c, p. 96). In contrast to

the commons, Zibechi argues, that “the community is not a given, it is made. Every day, through the collective doings of men and women, girls, boys and the elderly, who by doing together make community, make the common. To reduce the community to an institution, made once and for all, instituted, hides the fact that collective work is what gives life, meaning, form and substance to the communal act. We choose, then, to say to make community instead of being community. The common are the bonds that we build to continue being, to make life continue being life; bonds that cannot be limited to an institution or to things (water, land, nature)” (Zibechi, 2015c, p. 76).

Holloway, makes a call towards the revolts of doing against labour. “To try and find a way forward, we go back to that which we have already emphasised as being the core of the crack: ‘a crack is the perfectly ordinary creation of a space or moment in which we assert a different type of doing.’ We start from two antagonistic types of doing: that which we reject and that which we try to create. The cracks are revolts of one type of doing against another type of doing.

‘We shall not do what capital requires, we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable.’ That is the essence of a crack in capitalist domination. ‘We shall not do a, we shall do b.’ But no: this formalisation is completely wrong. The first option (a, what capital requires) is fundamentally different from the second option (b, what we consider necessary or desirable). ‘Do’ in the first case (do what capital requires) is absolutely different from ‘do’ in the second case (do what we consider necessary or desirable). To do something over which we have no control is a completely different experience from doing something that we choose to do.

We really need two different words for the two forms of doing. In English, we have the word ‘labour’ to indicate a doing that is unpleasant or subject to external compulsion or determination. To find an adequate word for activity that is self-determined or at least pushes towards self-determination is more difficult, so we shall retain ‘doing’ as a general term to indicate an activity that is not necessarily subject to alien determination, an activity that is potentially self-determining.

The essence of our crack can be rephrased: ‘We shall not labour under the command of capital, we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable.’ The crack is the revolt of doing against labour.

The revolt of doing against labour is the revolt of one form of activity, which we choose, against another form of activity, which we reject. We reject labour because it is unpleasant to do something as the result of external obligation, and also because we can see that it is labour that creates capital, that creates a world of injustice that is destroying humanity. The doing we choose is more agreeable by virtue of the fact that we choose it, and it is also an attempt to stop creating capitalism and create a different world” (Holloway, 2010, p. 84).

We co-move towards the revolts of spatio-territorial autonomous doings,²¹ other modalities of place-makings beyond-against and beyond architectural labour. Doings that put at their center the potency of

imagination and rehearsal of *other worlds*, other modes of *inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence* (Hartman, 2022, p. 489).

Communal and anti-colonial doings

We can *unlearn* much from/with the *sentir-pensar-hacer* of a loosely knit assemblage of communal and anti-colonial doings as: *minga*, *tequio*, *tequil*, *gozona*, *fajina*, *ka'x k'ol*, *guelaguetza*, *amingáta nendive*, *gauchada*, *ayni*, *mano vuelta*, *córima*, or *komon `a`tel tojolabal*, among many others. As Zibechi notes, “collective works are key pieces, they are the heart of the community and, as the Zapatistas point out, the engine of autonomy. [Zibechi means] that the community cannot be only the collective property, but the property or the common spaces must be sustained by permanent, constant activities, which are the ones that can modify individualistic and egocentric habits and inertias. There were societies that were satisfied with collective or state ownership of the means of production, but did not carry out collective work. The result was the reproduction of values and ways of doing things, that is, the culture of the capitalist system” (Zibechi, 2021, p. 45) (Zibechi, 2022, pp. 13–17). Doings or “collective works (*minga*, *tequio*, *gauchada*, *amingáta nendive*, *guelaguetza*, and the thousand ways of naming them) cannot be reduced to the accepted/institutionalized forms of cooperation in indigenous communities; we find them in urban and rural spaces, among blacks, indigenous people and mestizos, and in the most diverse space-times of social life, present and past, many times in a spontaneous/invisible way. And that they are the substance of social life, which expresses itself in diverse ways, sometimes transfigured, because they needed to camouflage themselves (in festivity, rite or liturgy) to escape the predatory maw of states and markets” (Zibechi, 2015c, p. 76).

Vilma Rocío Almendra Quiguanás—who has her roots in the Earth, daughter of a *Nasa* mother and a *Misak* father, both originally from *Madre de los Bosques*, that is to say, from the *Kauka*, in the south-west of a territory now called Colombia—notes that “*la Minga* is a vital ancestral practice for the existence of the peoples in their territories, which despite the capitalist subjugation against this *tradición-acción*—tradition-action—, is still valid today in the proposals and communitarian political daily life and also in the long term. In *la Minga* everyone converges, regardless of age, to weave:

[...] a collective effort convened for the purpose of achieving a common goal. When a Minga is convened, it takes priority over other activities, which are postponed in order to fulfill the common purpose. The results of the Minga have no owners. The achievements belong to the collective and no one, in particular, can appropriate them. The *Mingas* demonstrate the maturity of the people. Discipline, the capacity to act in community, humility, the contribution of the maximum individual effort for a collective achievement, the

awareness that the common surpasses the particular, but that each particular effort is essential, are elements that highlight the exemplary and exemplary quality of a Minga' (ACIN, 2008b).

The community in general, but also *las, los, los comuneros*—the community members—can call for a *Minga* to plant and harvest food; to build a house, a bridge, a school, an aqueduct and for any type of collective work that benefits a family, a village, a *resguardo*, a *cabildo*. Likewise, there are calls for a *Minga de Pensamiento*, a *Minga por la Vida*, a *Minga de Resistencia*, a *Minga por la defensa del Territorio*, to a *Minga por la Autonomía*—*Minga* of Thought, a *Minga* for Life, a *Minga* of Resistance, a *Minga* for the defense of the Territory, to a *Minga* for Autonomy. So, although it would seem that there are more practical *mingas* that resolve material needs and other more theoretical ones where intellectual knowledge is produced, in reality there is no such separation, because historically what has forged the Nasa people is *el camino de la palabra*—the path of the word—that is expressed in Nasa thought:

La palabra sin acción es vacía.

La acción sin palabra es ciega.

La palabra y la acción por fuera del espíritu de la comunidad: son la muerte

Word without action is empty.

Action without words is blind.

Word and action outside the spirit of the community: are death.

La Minga is always weaving word and action, experiencing the celebration and enjoyment of working for the prolongation of life without the direct mediation of money, because we all know that the existence in the community and the relationship with other peoples and processes depends on the *minga*. So, simultaneously and inseparably from 'producing use values, concrete things' to satisfy material needs, needs that nourish the individual and collective spirit are also satisfied. In a *Minga*, among others, solidarity and reciprocity walk, hence, in addition to work, food, *chicha*, words, joy, sadness, tensions, individual and collective problems, the necessary things to live in community are shared, and at the same time, abstract work overflows, because what is imposed is the collective utility of concrete work and the most valuable retribution is to nourish other relationships and rejoice in a collective fruit" (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, p. 93).

As Fabián Serrano Valero highlights that, "the communitarian tradition of coming together to work towards a common goal, *la Minga*, has been an effective tool that the *pueblos*—peoples—in Colombia have had to confront the abuses committed by people who impose themselves through colonizing practices and who, with various traps, have stolen the territory that they are claiming today" (Serrano Valero, 2020, p. 3). "*La Minga*, beyond being a scenario of dispute between rural communities and the state in search of rights, is also an exercise of communitarian rebellion where, rather than allocating its force of action to this demand, it travels along the path of autonomy, food sovereignty and welfare" (Serrano Valero, 2020, p. 3)

Gladys Tzul Tzul, maya *k'iche'* from *Chuimeq'ena*, and PhD in sociology from BUAP, notes that "*K'ax K'ol* is a *k'iche'* work strategy. Etymologically *k'ax* means pain and *k'ol* means work or service. There are two ways of naming work in the *k'iche'* language: *k'ol* and *chak*. Both are verbs and refer to work; but *k'ol* alludes to communal work, that is, an activity in which men, women, girls and boys work to produce communal welfare, for example, cleaning the cemetery, cleaning the water sources; on the other hand, *chak* means paid work, that is, the work that we all do for our daily family sustenance, for example, *cha'k* is to be a seamstress, weaver, merchant, carpenter, migrant, farmer, etc.

[...] Thus, communal work, which is the social relationship—work force—that enables the production of what we need to live and produce our lives, and which has to be regulated, organized and regulated, here presents a direct interconnection with the assemblies.

The service is not remunerated, it is the obligation that we all have to collaborate for the sustenance of life in common. Therefore, *k'ax k'ol* means taking care of the maintenance of the roads, participating in a march, carrying out procedures in the courts, writing minutes in the assemblies, making purchases for the celebrations, organizing the dance, carrying out Catholic and Protestant religious services, reforesting the forest, digging graves for the dead, etc. In such a way that, one of the means for communal equilibrium is that no one has to live from the service of other people.

If we think from the notion of *k'ax k'ol*, the domestic units (where the world of reproduction is organized) and the political society (where collective life is organized), are not fully separated, if it is even valid to make this distinction; in the communal world, one sustains the other and, at the same time, we feed each other mutually (Tzul Tzul, 2016, pp. 146–147).

In a conversation with Rivera Cusicanqui in so-called *la paz*, Tzul Tzul notes that they “were talking about the connections between work, community and individual trajectories. Silvia said that in the communal form life is not normalized, that plurality is possible and that the fullness of the individual emerges in the communal wefts. [Tzul Tzul believes] that the communal wefts give a floor from which the intimate, personal life is sustained; communal work is a general condition in which we all provide ourselves with that strength to make our personal life.

Hence, the indigenous communal government is the political organization to guarantee the reproduction of life in the communities, where the *k'ax k'ol* is the fundamental base where these systems of communal government rest and are produced and where the full participation of all is at stake. [Tzul Tzul proposes] a classification of communal work to show how all work or can work and that the indigenous communal is not circumscribed in an identity, but in the capacity that all have:

a) Service that produces decision: this includes varied labors and strategies to meet and deliberate collectively. It is a communal work that has its regular cycles and depends on the rhythm of communal relations, so that this work can be carried out by determining the best day and the best time.

b) Service to produce coordination: the strategies to be able to build external alliances with other communities, to create coordination with struggles or parties at national and international level, here the traders and travelers play a fundamental role because they put their knowledge and experience at the service of the government systems, since they can transfer and feed the information. Also those who participate in congresses or indigenous meetings support these coordination tasks.

c) Work to manage the celebrations: planning dates, organizing rituals, imagining the days with the most suitable weather, calculating the food, managing the music groups and other resources for joy.

d) Communal work to contain the pain: that is, all the work force that is mobilized to organize mourning, burials, to make arrangements to rescue bodies in the morgues, to organize the repatriation of migrants who die” (Tzul Tzul, 2015, p. 132).

These are just two examples of many communal and anti-colonial modes of doing. That not only engage with the re/production of life in the present, but as Aguilar Gil, beautifully underscores, “as a bet: the possibility of conjugating our world in future tense” (Aguilar Gil, 2022, p. 60). “Yásnaya has coined the term *tequiología*, tequiology: from tequio (communitarian work) and technology. In the sense of putting techniques at the service of a non-teleological communal cosmovision” (OnA, 2022, p. 60).

Coda – Doings

“It is not for us to measure our value. It is only for us to struggle to get what we want, for us all. Our aim is to be priceless, to price ourselves out of the market, for housework and factory work and office work to become ‘uneconomic’” (Federici, 2021, p. 21)

Halberstam notes that “Fanon, according to Moten, wants not the end of colonialism but the end of the standpoint from which colonialism makes sense. In order to bring colonialism to an end then, one does not speak truth to power, one has to inhabit the crazy, nonsensical, ranting language of the other, the other who has been rendered a nonentity by colonialism. Indeed, blackness, for Moten and Harney by way of Fanon, is the willingness to be in the space that has been abandoned by colonialism, by rule, by order. Moten takes us there, saying of Fanon finally: ‘Eventually, I believe, he comes to believe in the world, which is to say the other world, where we inhabit and maybe even cultivate this absence, this place which shows up here and now, in the

sovereign's space and time, as absence, darkness, death, things which are not (as John Donne would say)'" (Halberstam, 2013, p. 15).

Let's continue iterating the first phrase. If we are committed to *ending this* world. And as Moten and Harney note by way of Ruth Wilson Gilmore, "racism is the state-sanctioned and/or extralegal production and exploitation of group differentiated vulnerabilities to premature (social, civil and/or corporeal) death.' What is the difference between this and slavery? What is, so to speak, the object of abolition? Not so much the abolition of prisons but the abolition of a society that could have prisons, that could have slavery, that could have the wage, and therefore not abolition as the elimination of anything but abolition as the founding of a new society. The object of abolition then would have a resemblance to communism that would be, to return to Spivak, uncanny. The uncanny that disturbs the critical going on above it, the professional going on without it, the uncanny that one can sense in prophecy, the strangely known moment, the gathering content, of a cadence, and the uncanny that one can sense in cooperation, the secret once called solidarity. The uncanny feeling we are left with is that something else is there in the undercommons. It is the prophetic organization that works for the red and black abolition!" (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 49).

That is, we are not promoting the end of labour, but we are co-moving beyond-against and beyond the standpoint from which abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour makes sense. We co-move towards the *abolition* of a *society* that *could have* architects, that *could have* abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour.

It's about a we thing. Let us not forget that co-move, *con-mover* in spanish is, to move-with, like *bailar* with all our stomachs and hearts, and sintonize together. So we come-together, we assemble, we gather, we dream, we imagine, we rehearse, together and apart, other modes of doing that *might yield other forms for existence*, other modes of doing.

Coda

"Perhaps we're too conditioned to a certain idea of the human being and a single type of existence. Perhaps breaking that standard would send our minds into collapse, as if we were being swallowed by an abyss. And who says we can't be? Who can say we haven't already been?" (Krenak, 2020, p. 31)

"The impact of human exploitation of other humans on the imagination has received less attention than its purely economic aspects" (Guattari, 2015, p. 94)

Let the groove enter you. Is autonomy *not a place you enter but a groove that enters you*? The end of *homo educandus* and *homo æconomicus* means also the end of *homo architectonicus*, the end of the neo-liberal architect. The same as there are no labour revolts, but only revolts against labour. There are no architectural revolts but only revolts against architecture. In other words, there is no autonomy of architecture, but only autonomy from architecture. The autonomy of architecture is whiteness' dream.

We are exhausted of *sustaining the unsustainable*! The possibility of proposing viable futures from the standpoint of architecture in the face of the global civilizatory catastrophe imposed by the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination is inconsequential. To confine architecture to imagine sustainable futures under these conditions, supposes the denial and reproduction of its violent destructive forces and effects (Spencer, 2019, p. 174). Fuck architecture and the violent amalgam it constructs/sustains! Fuck the architectural world, and its constant push towards the violent inseparability between the white-totality of being and the white-totality of inhabiting.

“No, we do not want to continue subjecting social life to the demands of the economy, that is, to exploitation and dispossession, to a productivity that is deadly for the planet, to a competition that destroys interpersonal relationships and to the reduction of the human to a quantitative parameter. No!” (Baschet, 2015, p. 42). “The permanence of a social system is based on a strange tautology: it is sustained because it is maintained. That is, also... until it begins to cease to be sustained” (Baschet, 2015, p. 137). It seems “the moment has passed of the overwhelming triumph of the neo-liberal single thought that declared us ‘condemned to live in the world as it is’ (Furet, 2000, p. 502) ” (Baschet, 2015, p. 50). We are neither condemned to live in the world as it is, nor condemned to sustain architecture. Let's stop *sustaining the unsustainable*.²²

We have seen how architecture is imbricated and sustains multiple violences, privileges and asymmetric power relations of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

After moving through the modulation, or impossibility of the uni-versal individual subject, the current neo-liberal conduct of conduct, the re/production of hegemonic social roles through the uni-versity and architectural education, the professional violences of architectural labour and the winding paths beyond-against and beyond vocational education and abstract labour, through learnings and doings, this final notes are meant as a path-opener. We need as many autonomous experiments as there are territories and the multiplicity of modes for existence that inhabits them (Consejo Nocturno, 2018, p. 108). Considering the—conscious—missed-encounter of architecture with emancipatory/autonomous material-discursive practices situated in Abya Yala, we see no hope in architecture, neither the educational system, nor the abstract labour regime.

There are a multiplicity of rebellions that have as its core, the caring and struggle for/of life, that draw from the common as that integral flow of practices, affects, things, and places that re-unite us from the ethics of reciprocity, from solidarity, mutual-aid and the harmonious coexistence of differences, but “we do not want to

simply uphold and venerate difference; we want to destroy that which creates the powers that instruct how we are to hierarchize difference” (Bey, 2022, p. 100). The communal as modes of collaboration, association and cooperation, and the community as associations, configurations and processes in constant trans-formation that arise through intra-actions of doing in common. Rebellions that move beyond-against and beyond the modern paradigms of revolution, development, needs, experts authorities, acceleration, growth, totality, individuality, subjectivity and power.

These rebellions, co-move against not becoming “singular subjects” (Bey, 2022, p. 56), but towards *unbecoming* (Bey, 2022, p. 87). Through “the space cultivated by” Anarcho-Blackness’ “critical praxis,” “where a Black anarchic politics and those subjectivated by an anarcho-Blackness, its attendant Black queer feminist electrical circuitry, show up. Those maroons, subversive intellectuals, fugitives, queers, feminists, anarchists, and rebellious workers meet to conspire together in the undercommons: a non-place where everyone is Black, queer, anarchic, because they are changed by the undercommons, which *is not a place you enter but a groove that enters you*. Critical praxis becomes a radical invitation to not only do but to be done by the undercommon insurgency that makes its own demands. And such an interrogation must suspend the presumption of an end goal. We know from Moten and Harney, and Jack Halberstam, that what we think we want before the crisis that precipitates our insurgency will necessarily shift after we’ve attained the limits of what our coalitional knowledge could compile. It is not because we are insufficient, as if insufficiency is a deficiency rather than a willingness to risk getting at the outer limits of what we dared to think; it is because we cannot, and must not, assume that the logics and rubrics we have when moving within the maelstrom of the hegemonic—radically altered as they may be—can operate to our benefit when we’ve unseated the hegemon. We will need new rubrics and metrics, unrubrics and unmetrics, because a radically other-world requires radically other means to love it, to caress it, to be all the way in it” (Bey, 2020, p. 25). “Think of the blackness [Bey] espouses not as a slathering of the White Witch with melanin; think of it as a kind of ethical, sociopolitical invitation. One in which whiteness as a fictive line of purity is undermined by and refused in service of a radical undertaking of unsovereignty, a blackness understood precisely as opening up an alternate imaginary of the sacred from which also opens up other worlds. Other worlds, yes; trans worlds, transworlds articulable through blackness” (Bey, 2022, p. 96).

If gender is always already a racial and class marker, and the amalgam of capitalism colonial-patriarchy domination is sustained by the *class-sexual-racial* division of labour, in other words labour and all the identities it imposes, from worker to professional identities as the architect. Then co-moving beyond-against and beyond such professional identity as the architect, which is to say: white-cis-hetero-bourgeois-men designer of space, means the *trans-figuration* (Bey, 2021) of other modalities for existence against class-race-sex/gender domination, towards composi(t)ng and rehearsing the *means* and *relations* of ungovernable modes of

inhabitation and existence. Because, as we have noted, the inseparability of modes of inhabitation and modes for existence, means that rehearsing other modalities for existence beyond the architect, entails also imagining and constructing together, spatialities, as modes of inhabitation beyond cis-hetero-mono-functional modern space, all in the image of hegemonic mono-humanism.

Towards these other-worlds, these trans-worlds, we co-move through the negation/refusal of architecture, remembering there are no alternative architectures but alternatives to architecture as Esteva might have framed it. We co-move through and towards the mutually illuminating *intra-action* between: rebellions, prefiguration, autonomy, the production of the common in common, counter-becomings, autonomous inhabitings, trans-formations. As Manuel Rozental says, about politics, regarding autonomic processes, *no cabemos en su política electoral*—we do not fit in your electoral politics. *No cabemos en su arquitectura!* We do not fit in your architecture! Fuck vernacular architecture! Fuck critical regionalism! Fuck participatory architecture! Fuck community architecture! Fuck sustainable architecture! Fuck eco-social architecture! Fuck architecture and all its masks and surnames! Fuck all its inclusive attempts! To repeat, as Said notes: “behind the White Man’s mask of amiable leadership there is always the express willingness to use force, to kill and be killed” (Said, 2003, p. 226).

Ultimately the abolition of both education and abstract-alienating-subordinated-labour and the professional identities it re/produces, as the architect, is an invitation to fall, to lose ourselves and imagine otherwise, beyond-against and beyond life as labour. As mentioned, deprofessionalization, implies a double struggle, first, an ontological struggle beyond-against and beyond professional identity, in other words the struggle against labour, “we struggle to refuse reproducing ourselves and others as workers, as labor power, as commodities [...] to become ‘uneconomic’” (Federici, 2021, p. 21). We struggle to not finish ourselves, for incompleteness, because “not completing; it’s about allowing subjectivity to be unlawfully overcome by others, a radical passion and passivity such that one becomes unfit for subjection” (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 35). And second, a collective struggle beyond-against and beyond professional hierarchization, to stop delegating our autonomy to someone with technical expertise (Bonanno, 2020, p. 21). Deprofessionalization, means then, the refusal of architectural subjectivity, the neo-liberal architect, the current majoritarian modality of architect. Problematizing and refusing the uni-versal individual subject, authorship, creative genius, professional authority, the imbrication of race, class and gender oppressions, mono-functional modern space, and colonial impositions of progress at large, that all disabling professions violently promote. And particularly the ethos of the neo-liberal architect, mainly: entrepreneurship, competition, flexibility, resilience, originality, innovation and creativity.

Who can say we haven’t already been swallowed by an abyss? As we have already said: we must let go. Let go the false promise that we need architects and architecture. We know the anxiety, the un-certainty. We feel as

if we are *losing ourselves* (Esteva & O'Donovan, 2014). But we must lose ourselves, because we owe us the possibility of *un-doing ourselves*, becoming otherwise, of not being modern-individual-subjects, of becoming unfit for professional subjection. Because we must struggle to *become uneconomic* (Federici, 2021, p. 21). As Ailton Krenak invites us “the question we need to ask is: Why are we so afraid of falling when fall is all we’ve ever done?” (Krenak, 2020, p. 33). If “we fall so we can fall again, which is what ascension really means. To fall is to lose one’s place, to lose the place that makes one, to relinquish the locus of being, which is to say of being-single” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 45). Why are we so afraid of becoming incomplete and unfit for subjection? As Moten and Harney potentially invite us. When incomplete is all we’ve ever been. When subjection is not a promise but a violent imposition.

Let’s reiterate, that, most professional identities, as the architect, are racist, sexist and classist categorizations, modes to comply, modes to secure the authority complex proper of whiteness. And, if we are compelled to a trans-versal and imbricated critique, then professional identities must be questioned through the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. Because problematizing architecture is not only about space and form, but most importantly the modes of production that sustain the architectural world, the spatiality and sociality that it re/produces, and by whom. Therefore, if we hold on to the imbrication of the amalgam, then imagining and rehearsing the end of abstract labour, and the professional identities that sustain abstract labour, then through its abolition we are also rehearsing the end of the overrepresentation by white-cis-hetero-bourgeois-men, in other words we are co-moving beyond-against and beyond class, race and sex-gender domination. To reiterate Bey’s words, “being a bad cis subject[—for lack of a better word—]means that we emerge into a willingness not ‘to be’—a critical desubjection” (Bey, 2022, p. 44). A willingness to refuse professional identities.

Because no matter how much architecture wears all the masks of inclusion: racial, sexual or class, a mask it will be. Beneath is whiteness. This is the challenge, the horizon, because it is not only about negating and refusing the authority and labour identity of the white-patriarchitect, but most importantly about *co-moving* towards the possibility and potency of imagining and constructing *other worlds*, *transworlds* (Bey, 2022, p. 96), other modes of *inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence*, that *the* world violently denies us. Anarchic modalities of composi(t)ng the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation. Beyond-against and beyond *the architectural world*, we co-move, dream and rehearse towards anarchic worlds, other modalities of inhabitation as *practices of possibility* (Hartman, 2019, p. 203), ungovernable modalities of inhabitation, *beautiful experiment in how-to-live*, towards collective trans-formations, and *become ungovernable* ((Hartman, 2019, p. 203) (Hartman, 2021, pp. xiii–vi)), towards unforeseen worlds to come.

Outro

by way of in-conclusions: architecture and the collective practices of inhabiting

Es bonita y es bonita, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Bonito como se riega, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Ay, cómo se riega (por el suelo)
Ay, es y es bonita (por el suelo)
Ay, es verdecita (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, yo la sembré (por el suelo)
Ay, yo la sembré (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Ay, yo la ventíé (por el suelo)
Ay, yo la ventíé (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, yo la cerní (por el suelo)
Ay, yo la cerní (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Quién es que dice que yo, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Cocoba te la perdí, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Quién es que dice que yo, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Cocoba te la perdí, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
La perdí porque Dios quiso, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
No porque cobarde fui, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Niño blanco no me olvides, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Tus lindas declaraciones, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Niño blanco no me olvides, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Tus lindas declaraciones, la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Pasaré mis bellos días, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Como copo de algodón, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Ay, cómo se riega (por el suelo)
Ay, es y es bonita (por el suelo)
Ay, es verdecita (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, cómo se riega (por el suelo)
Ay, cómo se riega (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Dale duro a ese tambor, ay la verdolaga, bótalo (por el suelo)
Y acábalo de romper, ay la verdolaga, azúzaló (por el suelo)
Dale duro a ese tambor, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Y acábalo de romper, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Y si el dueño pregunta, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Dile que yo te mandé, ay la verdolaga (por el suelo)

Ay, yo la cerní (por el suelo)
Ay, yo la cerní (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga (por el suelo)
Ay, la verdolaga, por el suelo

La Verdolaga - Totó la Momposina

50 Encuentro por la Liberación de la Madre Tierra: Trans-formación territorial y des/memoria colectiva

50th Meeting for the Liberation of Mother Earth: Territorial Trans-formation and Collective Dis/memory

Translated transcription of the presentation on the sixth day by, the occasional collective, *Asamblea Opaca*—
Opaque Assembly

Arquitectura y las prácticas colectivas de habitar

Architecture and the collective practices of inhabiting

Our participation in this sixth day of dialogues, engages, through an unsolicited collaboration, with the potent work of Mixe linguist Yásnaya Elena Aguilar Gil and Redes Comunes Mixes, who wrote in the 2172, *El arte, la literatura y las estéticas colectivas de la tierra*—Art, literature and the collective aesthetics of the land (Aguilar Gil & Redes Comunes Mixes, 2021). The text explained the distinction between the collective aesthetics of the land, with art and literature as colonial and capitalist manifestations. We dis/appropriate her text and compose a similar argument in order to outline the distinction between the collective practices of inhabiting and architecture as a professional manifestation that spatialized the, now disarticulated, amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

We talk from the liberated territories of *Boiaca*, once named *Boyacá*, what used to be a network of experiments of *socialismo raizal* ((Fals Borda, 2008a) (Fals Borda, 2014)), almost 100 years ago. Although we acknowledge the important work of Orlando Fals Borda, the militant sociologist that lived during the early beginnings of the Capitalist Night, or should we say the Capitalist Afternoon? We know today that we had to co-move beyond the notions of *socialismo raizal* and *federalismo libertario* that aimed to construct *la república regional unitaria* or *segundas repúblicas*. We recognize these were *subversive horizons* for some at some point, but as Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, the anti-colonial and anarchist thinker, used to argue, we co-move towards *worlds* “of regions, not of nations, of river basins, not of states or provinces, of mountain chains, not of value chains, of autonomous communalities, not of social movements” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 33).

It is surprising that, at the beginning of the XXIII century, in the midst of the explosion of what people spontaneously, and in many parts of the world, began to call “collective practices of inhabiting,” we are now returning to talk about architecture. This willingness to forget seems entirely explicable considering the painful relationship that links them to capitalism in times of late colonialism, that period of history, a little more than a

century and a half ago, when human life on this planet became almost unviable. The great havoc that the civilizatory catastrophe wreaked in the different regions of the world and the loss of many lives—in very painful and terribly unjust ways—have had as a consequence that today’s inhabiting manifestations have little or nothing to do with the so-called architecture that was produced at the time when the great debacle originated. When the standpoint from which it made sense the need for architecture and the architect, made no longer sense. When the end of a civilizatory project proved to be incapable of solving the problems it had created. A decadent civilization. An indefensible civilization as the late Martinican poet and intellectual Aimé Césaire once said (Césaire, 2001, p. 31). That things just *went on* *was* the catastrophe (Benjamin, 1985, p. 50).

It is not our intention here to delve on the collapse of neo-liberalism and what has been called the Capitalist Night, nor to debate its name, about which interesting controversies arise from time to time. There are different analyses of that fateful era: Zapatistas, in their fundamental work, published one hundred and twenty years ago, *Auge y caída de la hidra capitalista*, The rise and fall of the capitalist hydra, explained the problems of late capitalism and how we arrived, against all expectations, at this current situation and at this era in which, in their words, “we reached the harmonious balance between humans and *Madre Tierra*” (Comité Clandestino, 2204, p. 36). If this harmonious relationship was already conceived as something natural and was re-established by 2204, when Zapatistas finished their text, to speak now of neo-liberalism, late capitalism and colonialism is often perceived as an exercise of scholars obsessed with a period of evident stupidity in which humanity, for the sake of economic growth conceived on illogical ideas, inexplicably headed towards its own extinction.

Fortunately, new history circles have endeavored to make this period more comprehensive and explain the nuances that prevent us from making the simplistic reading in which, during capitalism and colonialism, all of humanity opted for collective suicide. It is now possible to have access to complex analyses in which we can learn more about that period, the *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, continuous rebellions, and pre-figurative efforts, that marked the beginning of multiple new worlds, transworlds (Bey, 2022, p. 96), *other modes of inhabiting earth* that rehearse(d) *other forms for existence*. As the black-radical writer, Saidiya Hartman once wrote: experiences “devoted to dreaming and rehearsing how we might live otherwise in the present and break with the fatal terms of the given, the brutal imposed order of things” (Hartman, 2021, p. xii), through “beautiful experiments in how-to-live” towards collective trans-formations that *became ungovernable* (Hartman, 2019, p. 203). “Experiment was everywhere” (Hartman, 2019, p. 65).

And how, far from the great metropolises and the elites engrossed in unlimited consumerism on a planet of limited natural resources, the resistance of minuscule social structures, of “beautiful experiments—to make living an art—undertaken by those often described as promiscuous, reckless, wild, and wayward” (Hartman, 2019, p. 7), those modes of existence that were reluctant to let themselves be completely captured

by whiteness, such as that of the so-called indigenous, racialized and impoverished peoples—who had been resisting for centuries—, autonomist and communal r-existence experiments—even composed by the *anti-elite*²³—made it possible to avoid the total debacle and create these present worlds, where the collective practices of inhabiting seem to us the most conventional possible manifestation of that creative impulse of humanity’s inventiveness. The road to collapse seemed traced and inescapable, but small possibilities of life emerged that are now a reality: a balanced coexistence between humanity and nature, a humanity that is now conceived as part of it.

It’s important to remind ourselves through the words of Ailton Krenak, who invited us to think about the end of *this* world, the anthropocentric world, rather the end of the planet. That in 2018 when whiteness was collapsing of anxiety thinking of the end of the world, and Krenak was asked: “What are the Indians going to do in the face of all this?” He answered: “The Indians have been holding out for over five hundred years now. I’m more worried about the whites, and what they’re going to do to get out of this one. We have been able to resist because we expanded our subjectivity, refusing to accept the idea that we’re all the same” (Krenak, 2020, p. 20). And now we have experienced what that radical heterogeneity of becoming could be.

At some point during the Capitalist Night, during the fascist neo-liberal acceleration, the road seemed to be divided between two exits; neo-malthusianism, “that is, the war of annihilation of large populations to achieve the well-being of modern society.” Because, “war was not an irregularity of the machine, it was the ‘regular maintenance’ that ensured its operation and duration” (El Capitán Marcos, 2023); and rebellious degrowth, *decrecer en común*, there were four verbs that anarchist praxis conjugated “when facing the [civilizatory catastrophe] and its challenges: degrowth, deurbanization, detechnologization and decomplexification” ((Taibo, 2015, p. 146, 2018)). But as we have experienced, there were many many exits.

As the uni-versity abolitionist scholar Eli Meyerhoff argued, “anything new in the world emerges from the interplay between forces for change and forces for maintaining the status quo” (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 108). We need to remember again and again, as the late philosopher and autonomist feminist Silvia Federici argued, that capitalism was not the “natural progress” of feudalism. But, a violent counterinsurgent project to dominate the struggles against feudalism (Federici, 2004, p. 23). It is crucial to bear this in mind, because during the Capitalist Night, numerous anti-capitalist struggles and those with sufficient attention managed to discern and resist the counterinsurgency projects that were testing out control methods even more deadly and effective than those of globalitarian capitalism. These experiences rehearsed r-existences against the *hidra* from various standpoints and multifarious forms, thwarting any possibility for a new and more deadly form of hegemonic regime, as the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, to emerge.

As the collective, cuadernos de Negación, in their *cuaderno 11* titled *Against the valorization of life*, underscored, “the destruction of the state means the destruction of a society that ‘needs’ the existence of the

state” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 36). Fred Moten, the cultural theorist and poet, whose work studied the black radical tradition in the early beginnings of the Capitalist Night, regarding the Palestinian struggle against genocide from the fascist ethno-nationalist and Zionist state of Israel, underscored that: “states are effects of racism and colonialism. They have no right to exist and Israel is no exception. States have no rights, and ought not have rights” (Moten, 2018a, p. 219). We know today that the dissolution of the state of Israel, meant the first path towards dismantling the globalitarian inter-national state regime. Because as the anarchist dancer Maia Ramnath argued in *Decolonizing Anarchism: An Antiauthoritarian History of India's Liberation Struggle*, “an area that has fought off colonial rule still exists within the interstate system. If a newly decolonizing area doesn't gain recognition by that system, it has to fear reconquest or incorporation into someone else's nation-state or empire. This has always been the case for places with fuzzy borders or in border marches. Independent statehood was at least a nominal guard against that, even if only to establish external boundaries by the terms of international law. The logical conclusion to this dilemma is that in order for a decolonizing area to truly adopt a ‘no-state solution,’ we would have to dismantle the interstate system as a whole and create anarchism everywhere. There can be no postcolonial anarchism in one country! No doctrine of peaceful coexistence, but continuous world revolution!” (Ramnath, 2012, p. 252).

The *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, continuous rebellions and pre-figurative efforts, that marked the beginning of multiple new worlds, illuminated “the radical imagination and everyday anarchy [...] that animated ordinary lives” (Hartman, 2019, p. 7), and rehearsed what the polyphacetic thinker-writer Iván Illich, already in 1973 called *conviviality*: as “the opposite of industrial productivity. [Illich meant] autonomous and creative intercourse among persons, and the intercourse of persons with their environment; [...] freedom realized in personal interdependence (Illich, 1975, p. 24). Such experiences were multiple, sometimes connected, sometimes diffused, sometimes contradictory, but always interdependent through multiple *intra-actions*, because as Moten underscored: “dispersion is the condition of possibility of knowledge of freedom” (Moten, 2018a, p. 59). Dispersion in which at some point “mere survival was an achievement in a context so brutal” and rehearsed “beautiful, wayward experiments [that] entailed an ‘open rebellion’ against the world” (Hartman, 2019, p. 211).

The *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, had at its core a fundamental problematization and reformulation of the modern western notion of revolution. Gustavo Esteva, already in 2022 in his book *Gustavo Esteva: a critique of development and other essays*, foresaw by way of what he called the *ongoing insurrections*, through his “unwavering commitment to pluri-versal autonomous trans-formations beyond the state, market, and formal democracy” and his “relentless pursuit of the possibility of creating a radical plurality of conviviality between worlds” (Tornel, 2023, p. 1), a pluri-versal path forward. The various rebellions had as its core, the caring and struggle for/of life, that nurtured the common as that integral flow of practices, affects, things, and

places that re-unite us from the ethics of reciprocity, from solidarity, mutual-aid and the harmonious coexistence of differences.

Esteva, revisits the metaphor used by Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos, that illustrates the sinking boat of capitalist modernity, where some, realizing the absurdity of assuming control over a sinking vessel, opt to swim towards different shores in search for other alternatives (Sup Marcos, 2003). These alternatives constituted the *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, not a revolution, but ongoing insurrections, “traits of the new world that [was] beginning to be built,” modes of everyday life rebellion beyond-against and beyond the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. The recovery of verbs was a common denominator of the *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, people started replacing “nouns such as ‘education.’ ‘health.’ or ‘housing.’ so-called ‘needs’ whose satisfaction depend on public or private entities, with verbs such as ‘learn.’ ‘heal.’ or ‘inhabit.’ In this way, they reclaimed personal and collective agency and enable autonomous paths of social trans-formation” (Esteva, 2022, p. 200).

The ongoing insurrections that composed the dispersed experiences of conviviality, were part of the overthrow of what Bolívar Echeverría, noted “the mythical (epic and hermeneutic) figure of revolution as an episode of prime importance among all those that coincide in the decline—a decline that is more than justified—of the whole constellation of myths large and small that accompanied capitalist modernity” (Echeverría, 1995, p. 29). “The myth of revolution as an action capable of re-founding sociality after tearing to the ground the forms of sociality cultivated and transformed by human beings over millennia, of erasing past history and starting again to write it on a blank page, corresponds to the idolatrous anthropocentrism of the modern age. This *hybris*, this exaggerated pretension, which goes beyond measure, [was] characteristic of capitalist modernity. The myth of revolution is precisely the one that tells of the existence of a moment of absolute creation or re-creation, in which human beings tear down everything and re-create everything; in which all forms of sociality are destroyed and new ones are built, starting from nothing” (Echeverría, 1998, p. 68).

The small possibilities of life that emerged and endured during the collapse, and that are now a reality, the balanced coexistence between humanity and nature, a humanity that is now conceived as part of it, were woven through, what the anti-patriarchal anarchist María Galindo Mujeres Creando used to call, *alianzas insólitas*—unusual alliances—, as “the unusual and subversive alliance with which [they] always acted, an alliance that no patriarch can bear, an alliance of *indias*, *putas* and lesbians against all forms of racism and authoritarianism” (Mujeres Creando, 2005, p. 125). Which we could understand as unusual complicities, underscoring what Stefano Harney together with Fred Moten refer to complicity, which “indicates a kind of falling into something and not being able to disentangle what you see as yourself from the institution and its (anti-)sociality [...] To be complicit with others, to be an accomplice, to live in ways that always provoke

conspiracy, a conspiracy without a plot where the conspiracy is the plot [...] This use of complicity emphasizes our incompleteness—when you see us you see something missing, our accomplices, or something more, our conspiracy. It’s all good, it’s just not all there. We don’t make sense on our own. There must be more of us, more to us. On our own we don’t add up. And that is what we are, [...] complicit with others who are not there [...] That kind of complicity can be deepened even as we deepen our place in, as we dig down through [...] We can provoke here not a strategy of within and against, but a way of living that is within and against strategy, not as a position, relation, or politics, but as a contradiction, an embrace of the general antagonism that institutions feed off but deny in the name of strategy, vision, and purpose. Our complicity refuses the purposive as its own reward and the more it grows the more the underlying entanglement of the institution overwhelms its strategy. We will have been violent to, or malignant in, the institution, cutting it together apart into nothingness, as Karen Barad might say. [...] Complicity is the already given give-and-take of incompleteness [...] To feel complicit all by yourself is to be a good employee. It is also to be a good citizen, to vote strategically, to make policy, to feel bad about loving your city. But to feel complicit in all our incompleteness is to be revolutionary—so much so you might even call it otherwise than being. To enter with accomplices, to work with unseen friends, to plan everyday with someone, to be with someone, is so much more than being someone in being less than someone (Moten & Harney, 2021, pp. 124–133).

These disobedient experiments, this other-revolutionary modalities as Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar and Huáscar Salazar Lohman argued, “had nothing to do with transforming things once and for all on the basis of pre-conceived imaginaries, but [became] a revolution by successive distancing or recurrent distortions, that is to say, [alluded] to a process in which the pathos is important and not so much the moment in which everything is converted into another totality” (Gutiérrez Aguilar & Salazar Lohman, 2015, p. 37).

Beyond-against and beyond the monopoly and captivity of existence held through the Capitalist Night. We can look back and understand trans-formation, by way of Gutiérrez Aguilar, Salazar Lohman and Bey, as processes and potencies of change through/against/beyond/by/for *form*. As possibilities of imagination and rehearsal, from prefigurative potencies. Trans-formations that allow the emergence and composition of other modes of inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence, not mediated by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial power relations of domination. Beyond-against and beyond the patriarchal regime of cis-heterosexuality.

Following Black-Trans-Theorist Marquis Bey, we might argue that trans-formation co-moves uncertainty, rather than the colonial anxiety of not knowing, of not having certainty, “transness marks primarily a movement away from an imposed starting point to an undisclosed (non)destination,” (Bey, 2021, p. 44), undoing certainties, un-certainty. *Unbecoming* (Bey, 2022, p. 87). Trans-formations that were compelled to “fucking [that] whole shit up because [that] whole shit [was] fucked up. so what does that look like? in a word,

it is radical trans politics, it is radical black trans feminist politics toward racialized gender abolition” (Bey, 2022, p. 110).

Because, ultimately, trans-formation points to the inseparability of space and becoming, “we neither occupy nor have but, rather, *share* spacetime” (Moten, 2017b, p. 6). The inseparability of sociality and spatiality, of the other-*spaces of becomings*, of forms of inhabitation and forms of existence. “For trans is an itch that things are not enough, a project of undoing, be it gender, institutions, the fabric of the social world; trans is a project that cannot be haunted because it never tries to build a house” (Bey, 2022, p. 3). The *space of becoming* is always already more than the body. The space of becoming are bodies intra-acting. Trans-formation as the rehearsal and unfolding of potencies to re/produce non-normative, fugitive modalities of inhabiting the world beyond-against and beyond the amalgam, and the rehearsal and unfolding of potencies to *body* non-normative, fugitive modalities for existence. In other words, the trans-formation of *life(s)*. Of *other worlds* that are already here, and *yet to come*. Undeterminate, unrecognizable and unintelligible trans-formations that are always already modes of inhabiting and modes of existence, that rehearse by/for/through the *spaces of becomings*. Not only a *form-of-life*, but *more + less*, form(s)-for-life(s).

The rehearsals, experiences, “what *they were* are able to live and narrate, [... was] part of the strategy” (Barbarroja & Tari, 2016, p. 24) that composed the dispersed experiences of conviviality, were able to constitute diverse potencies through territorial trans-formations, that is to say, the change of forms through which experiences composed material and symbolic horizons for sustaining life. None of these worlds promoted universal solutions, on the contrary, as Esteva makes clear, “instead of pro-motion (which operates under the assumption that people are paralyzed or are moving in the wrong direction), those taking initiatives at the grassroots to govern themselves autonomously or democratically speak of co-motion—moving with the people, rather than moving the people. In Spanish, the word *conmover*, *conmoción*, is instructive and strong in its denotation. *Conmoción* means not only to dance with the other the common tune (which does not necessarily define a common conscience). It also denotes moving together with the heart and the stomach, not only with the brain, with rationality. The real plurality of the world is thus manifest in a pluralist attitude, fully respecting both the radical otherness of the other and their own visions and initiatives. Co-motion may thus operate as a vaccine against the corruption of love” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 9).

All these dispersed experiences of co-motion, unraveled through many worlds and a situated engagement with proportion. Regarding size, limits and proportion, Roberto Ochoa, in his book *Muerte al Leviatán: principios para una política desde la gente*, draws from the work initiated by Leopold Kohr and Ernst F. Schumacher, and continued by Iván Illich, as an urgent “revision of modern political theory, which has abandoned the consideration of the human scale as an essential element for political activity” (Ochoa, 2009, p. 2). Ochoa argued, that the work of Leopold Kohr's, published since 1957, was deliberately ignored by

intellectuals, and, of course, politicians since western modernity was dominated by a leviathan mentality, seduced by grandeur and power. Regarding proportion, Elías González Gómez, comments that Ochoa draws from Illich work on music theory and elucidates that when he uses the Greek word *logos*, which can also mean word, balance, definition, or proportion, he talks about proportion. He believes that the appropriateness of a relationship would be the most accurate definition of proportion. (Illich, 1996) (González Gómez, 2022, pp. 123–134).

We feel these observations are related to what Gutiérrez Aguilar calls, *alcance práctico*, practical reach refers to a struggle's collection of characteristics and implications that can be fully understood by paying attention to the struggle action itself, including the struggle's local, regional, national, or international character, its ability to disrupt and suspend capitalism's daily operations, the way it disrupts the given and pre-established times of capital accumulation and political command (Gutiérrez Aguilar, 2017, p. 32). Such practical reach had to engage a certain proportion, with the appropriate relation of struggle, in order to co-move towards autonomous horizons and inhabitings beyond-against and beyond the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, towards other *forms for existence*.

These trans-formations pointed towards the inseparability of composi(t)ng the *means* and *relations* of modes of inhabitation and modes of existence, or what Anne-Marie Willis in 2006, called “the double movement” of ontological designing (Anne-Marie Willis, 2006, p. 70) namely, Arturo Escobar underscores, “that we design our world, and our world designs us back” (Escobar, 2018, p. 4). Or as Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot note: people “and environments are co-produced [...] we dress our interior environments (which in turn dress us)” (Frichot & Runting, 2016, p. 231). Trans-formations that imagined and rehearsed a *transitional approach*, one that as, the black-anarchist, Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin underscored “until we can build an anarchist society, we need to build a transitional approach. Although not perfect, we see examples” through diverse experiences and scales of solidarity (Kom'boa Ervin, 2021, p. 48).

In contrast to the abundant information on the social and economic model that began to crumble more than 150 years ago, little has been said about the relationship between the collective practices of inhabiting and, what used to be called architecture, that was produced during the Capitalist Night. It is possible that this attempt to relate them will bring us fierce criticisms that will not be entirely wrong. What relation can there be between current inhabiting manifestations and the architecture that was functional to the voracious depredation of the environment in times of late capitalism? None, they will answer from different places. Although, with good reason, the Capitalist Night has been so demonized that accusing someone or something of being “capitalist” has become a terrible offense. This idea that floats in the current environment prevents to complexify the diversity of inhabiting manifestations that existed. The current *zeitgeist*, to use a forgotten term, prevents us from seeing that in the midst of late capitalism not everything was capitalistic and not every

inhabiting manifestation was architecture. For this reason, although now the collective practices of inhabiting are so spread and opposed to what was called architecture, we would like to make an exercise of rereading that period to launch a bridge that, on the one hand, allows us to establish a relationship with the current inhabiting modes and, on the other hand, allows us to make a contrast between these and the architecture-based modes of inhabiting of capitalism. What was known as the *architectural world*.

When mentioning current inhabitings, we are referring to autonomous and relational modes of sustaining and constructing life in common. Autonomous modes of compositing the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation. As Hartman would have said: *everyday choreographies of the possible unfolded through the collective movement people longed for another world* (Hartman, 2019, p. 209). Inhabitings that at the time, moved beyond—against and beyond: uni-versalization, deterritorialization, fetishization and commodification of space, the financialization of housing, territorial coloniality, heteronomous and mono-functional modern space, mono-humanism and the professional monopoly of territorial transformation by architecture. Against the violent push towards the inseparability of the white-totality of being and the white-totality of inhabiting. Through experiences as; *wët wët fxi'zenxi* in *Nasayuwe*, or *buenos vivires*—good livings; Zapatista autonomous territories; *Sumak Kawsay* in *Kichway* - *Suma Qamaña* in *Aymara*, or *buen vivir*—good living; Democratic Autonomy, with the Rojava revolution and women's liberation in Kurdistan (Aslan, 2020); the daily struggles and fugitive rehearsals of racialized and impoverished peoples; the temporary autonomies created through constant manifestations against power; the *ollas populares* that shared *comida*, because *¡bajo del cemento crece el alimento!*; the un-gendering modes of existence that rehearsed trans-worlds; the trans-itional rehearsals that questioned the spatial dichotomy between city and countryside; the autonomous cooperative rehearsals through mutual-aid which sought to de-commodify places of living—housing units as they used to call them—; the *Barrio Intercultural Vecinos Sin Techo* which brought together el pueblo Mapuche and urban impoverished peoples; and many many more dispersed experiences of conviviality. Inhabitings as autonomous potencies, and as Jean Robert, the de-professionalized architect called at the time, *Libertad de habitar and Hábitat autogestivo* or what Illich called, *Arte de habitar* (Illich, 2014), the freedom of self-organized inhabitings and the art of inhabiting.

Inhabitation as coming-together, “an assembly, a public thing, that is nothing, finally, if not aesthetic, that is driven by nothing if not the intensity of a whole other payment of attention. Inhabitation, here, is immediately a question of drift. To think those who are outside architecture alongside the ‘strange-looking’ people is to consider the universal exchange of extraordinary lives. The [...] ecology of our down-and-out commonality is the song-like question of the earth that is also, and immediately, the question of [collective aesthetics of the land] to the extent that it is bound not only to the ability to inhabit the differential but irreducible totality but also to deal with the mobile jurisgenerativity of [inhabiting]” (Moten, 2017a, p. 195).

During the Capitalist Night, many fought in order to be included in architecture. In order to include within architecture all inhabiting manifestations, adding all sort of *apellidos* and adjectives as: participatory, vernacular, popular, decolonial, feminist, queer, eco-social, sustainable, even anarchitecture. Many screamed that making the distinction between high and low architecture, or Architecture with a capital A and just architecture, was arrogant discrimination. But, we know today that there is no future in inclusion. Or at least not in being included by/for the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. Because differences matter, but “we do not want to simply uphold and venerate difference; we want to destroy that which creates the powers that instruct how we are to hierarchize difference” (Bey, 2022, p. 100). Specially that “we can’t have tolerance for a society that doesn’t tolerate any other form of sociability which is not its own, the capitalist one. And we’re not expressing it in moral terms, it’s not permitted in material terms!” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020c, p. 29). That is why, hundreds of years ago, through multiple experiments towards deprofessionalization, some took side apart from architecture. As Manuel Rozental used to say about politics, regarding autonomic processes, *no cabemos en su política electoral*, we do not fit in your electoral politics. Some said, *no cabemos en su arquitectura!* We do not fit in your architecture! And screamed to western patriarchal-colonial-capitalist whiteness: keep your architecture!

During the Capitalist Night, all that might have sounded “cynical or pessimistic, but without some larger and fundamental societal change, architecture [remained] in its current position of solving the problems of those who can afford to have their problems [and needs] solved by the profession” (Spencer, 2020, p. 221). Just as we have mentioned that, “the destruction of the state means the destruction of a society that ‘needs’ the existence of the state” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020b, p. 36). We know now, that the destruction of architecture, meant the destruction of a world that needed the existence of architecture. Because, as Jérôme Baschet, argued “the permanence of a social system is based on a strange tautology: it is maintained because it is maintained. That is, also... until it begins to cease to be maintained” (Baschet, 2015, p. 137). We were exhausted of sustaining the unsustainable, the *architectural world*.

Inhabiting manifestations during the Capitalist Night

Let us agree that, during the Capitalist Night, *architecture* was the name intended to encompass all constructive and inhabiting manifestations. Because of the nature of our work, focused in particular on the collective practices of inhabiting, we will focus primarily on the particular manifestations of inhabiting that were called architecture. Due to that particular animosity of our time against everything that is proper to the Capitalist Night, it is unthinkable that today we call architecture to the autonomous manifestations of inhabiting, to cite an example, or that we should call architecture to poetic manifestations of inhabiting. What

is more, the sharp division into sub-disciplines that the architectural system used to propose makes no sense at all. *Architecture* has become indissolubly linked to late capitalism and colonialism, and that relationship explains why it is no longer used to name the aesthetic, constructive and inhabiting manifestations of our times. Just as at one time the monuments that were created in the courts by orders of the monarchs were despised, *architecture* is now understood as aesthetic-constructive spatial manifestations that made the court of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination.

To say that *architecture* is capitalist is, to our contemporary understanding, an obvious pleonasm. It was not always so. One hundred and fifty years ago, it was narrated as uni-versal and timeless, to the extent of qualifying as architecture manifestations that evidently were not, either due to cultural or temporal differences: the *Maloca* by various Amazonian peoples was studied as an architectural manifestation, also the *Tayrona* terraces at *Teyuna*, even if they had been built years before the emergence of the architectural profession, and the colonization of Abya Yala. If we approach with curious and scrutinizing eyes that period we wish to forget, we can see that, beyond these generalizations to which we are so accustomed, the Capitalist Night was not homogeneous: during that time there were structures and movements that questioned and situated the various inhabitings of the time.

These *beautiful experiment in how-to-live* illuminated several paths, first that other inhabitings already existed, other modes of socio-environmental trans-formation, other modes of place-doing, more horizontalizing, supportive, that took care of the earth and the most urgent popular needs. Other modalities of inhabiting, that deserved and claimed their place in the world. We find these modes in diverse practices: situated, ancestral, popular, autonomic, cooperative inhabiting by mutual aid, just to name a few. It took some time, but we learned to listen and walk along with these experiences and encouraged dialogues between them, dialogues that in many cases already occurred, and other were result of unusual complicities. Second, that these collective practices of inhabiting did not seek to uni-versalize themselves, they did not pursue change from the top-down but from the bottom-up, they sought pluri-versal practices, which does not mean an absolute opposition between the uni-versal and the particular, but as Aimé Césaire noted, by the end of his letter to Maurice Thorez, “my conception of the universal is that of a universal enriched by all that is particular, a universal enriched by every particular: the deepening and coexistence of all particulars” (Césaire, 2010, p. 152).

Or as Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos used to say, “as defined by the deeds of the Zapatistas as well as by the words of Marcos, localization is the opposite to both localism and globalization. True, traditional resistance to all kinds of colonizers often implied forms of localism in which people were forced to entrench themselves in their own places. Such entrenchment implied the danger of short-sighted and even fundamentalist localism. In the epoch of economic and technological globalization, people realize that all isolated localisms will be razed to the ground. But instead of abandoning their roots and places, as global forces

push them to do—in order to better gut them in the shapeless space of the market and the State—they affirm themselves in them while at the same time opening their hearts and hands to others like themselves” (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 25).

In an almost forgotten book by Roberto Hornedo, *Spatial Capital: The problem of Architectural Canon Formation* (Hornedo, 2102), it is clearly pointed out that architecture as a discipline and profession began towards the end of the sixteenth century, in what was called Europe with the rise of the white-bourgeoisie, that is, accompanying capitalism, and was a violent technology for the colonial domination of Abya Yala. These critical positions made in the same period have not reached our days with force, but they show that within the same elite culture there were voices that tried to locate architecture as a temporally and culturally situated phenomenon. There were also movements that tried to dynamite the system of creation of the architectural canon, although not with much success. From this point of view, architecture had little to do with the corresponding territorial aesthetic manifestations and collective practices of inhabiting of today. We will now state the differences that, so obvious, apparently have not been stated in a timely manner because the mere comparison offends.

Architecture vs. Collective practices of inhabiting

In order to propose a possible comparison between current inhabiting manifestations and architecture, during the Capitalist Night, we would like to study some fundamental elements of inhabiting, and in particular the housing one, from which to establish the main differences. *Architecture* was totally related to a fundamental process of the capitalist system: the functioning of the market; unlike what happens today, places became products, that is to say, commodities, there was even a “real estate market.” As strange and scandalous as it may seem to us now, places for living known as apartments or houses which a certain person or what was known as families were mass-produced products sold in specialized stores—sold by real estate speculators also known as developers and designed with the complicity of architects—as private property, two concepts that today on their own are extremely difficult to grasp, and even more so when coupled together.

Commodities, commodification, financialization, fetishization, commodity fetishism and alienation are today forgotten terms. But, during the Capitalist Night, these, amongst other, were important conceptual tools in order to understand and tear down the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. For example, living units, as they also called these places of inhabiting, were commodified, this means, that what we know today, beyond the liberal understanding of human rights during the Capitalist Night, but our autonomous collective potency to make our living, was converted into marketable products. Such products were produced through, a violent system, known as wage abstract labour. An abolished, alienating modality of

doing, sustained by a forgotten discipline and profession, as they called certain hierarchical activities, also known as architecture.

Places of inhabiting turned into commodities, were even part of a strategy that was called financialization of housing, by converting places of inhabiting into financial assets. In the nearly forgotten book of Raquel Rolnik, *Urban Warfare: Housing and cities in an age of finance*, there are clear examples of such territorial commodification, spatio-territorial neo-liberalization, through the urban condition of territorial coloniality, at large, speculation and financialization as neo-liberal commodification modalities of housing. Rolnik describes how they lived “under the empire of finance and fictitious capital hegemony, an era of increasing dominance of rent extraction over productive capital. The international literature on political economy of housing has termed this process ‘financialisation,’ that is, ‘the increasing dominance of financial actors, markets, practices, measurements and narratives, at various scales, resulting in a structural transformation of economies, firms (including financial institutions), states and households’ (Aalbers, 2015, p. 3).

The promotion of the ideology of homeownership, already deeply rooted in some societies and [later] introduced in others, [was] a central element of the [such] paradigm of housing. Together with the ‘socialisation of credit,’ it supported a double movement: on one hand, the inclusion of middle and low-income consumers into financial circuits; on the other, the takeover of the housing sector by global finance. This process opened a new frontier for capital accumulation, allowing the free circulation of funds throughout almost all urbanised land” (Raquel Rolnik, 2019, p. 28).

These commodities involved the violent extraction of natural resources—displacement of communities—and were thus incorporated into the capitalist production chain, so much so that there was even a “construction industry.” As Jean Robert, the deprofessionalized architect and *conservative anarchist* that lived during the beginning of the Capitalist Night, reminds us in 2011 in his intervention at CIDECI in San Cristóbal, *El análisis del fetichismo de las mercancías, aportación primordial de Karl Marx*, “capitalism obscured all material civilizations based on the empirical knowledge of the materiality of things” (Robert, 2011, p. 6).

Commodity fetishism, argues Robert through Marx, had “its origin in the very peculiar social character of the labour that produces them” (Robert, 2011, p. 12) reducing the production and exchange of commodities to relations between things, hence obscuring all socio-ecological relations involved in the production process. The fetishization of the territory was such, that buildings, as they also named these inhabitable commodities, were an essential part of commodity fetishism, constructed by concealing diverse modes of exploitation and alienation. Recovering texts from a rudimentary web, known as Internet, we were able to find *Fetichización de la arquitectura: el objeto por encima del sujeto y los procesos*, Fetishization of architecture: the object over the subject and processes, a text by Mariana Ordoñez and Jesica Amescua. As an important historical piece, through

a parallelism with architecture, they remind us that at the time “understanding a building, project or architectural object [was] not understanding what is visible and intelligible [formal, functional, structural and aesthetic qualities], but to know its production processes and the social relations that were generated during those processes. However, in professional practice, architectural production processes [were] kept hidden, thus feeding the illusion of transparency.” And argued that, “the fetishization of architecture entailed a series of social, ethical, political, economic and environmental conflicts” such as: individualization and technocracy, invisibilization and exploitation, fetishization of materials and production of nature, power relations through class and denial of participation, and hegemony in architectural production and representation (Ordoñez & Amescua, 2021).

In a similar line, Douglas Spencer, an architecture critic of the same period as Ordoñez and Amescua, wrote an important account of the complicity between architecture and neo-liberalism in *The architecture of neoliberalism: how contemporary architecture became an instrument of control and compliance*, and argued through Adorno and Marx, that during the Capitalist Night: “conditions of labour [were] concealed so that the products of these can appear in the commodity form, as fetishized objects of consumption. As stages for the mass consumption of cultural production, the architecture of stadiums, concert halls and museums [was] obedient to the same formal laws. Architectural phantasmagoria [was] similarly invested in the ‘occultation of production.’ The work of building [was] of no concern to architects because the real work of architecture, as a commodity, [was] to positively express the abstract structures and concepts of neoliberal capitalism while mystifying its actual conditions of production. This work acquired a special sense in those forms of architecture most closely aligned with the ontology of neo-liberalism. The formal tropes of an architecture of flexibility and adaptability advertise accommodation to the spontaneous order that stands as the truth of the neo-liberal way of the world” (Spencer, 2016, p. 74).

Overall these strategies were part of architectural alienation, in other words, how architecture estranged the collective potency of inhabiting autonomously the world, and constructed *the* architectural world.

As Rivera Cusicanqui, used to assert “there can be no discourse of decolonization, no theory of decolonization, without a decolonizing practice” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2010a, p. 62). Well, we can say now there can be no discourse of autonomy, no theory of autonomy, without autonomous place-doings, without autonomous collective practices of inhabiting.

Today, it seems natural to us that inhabitable places can have a great diversity of physical or virtual supports—many of which pass through construction. These collective and mutual-aid supports have diversified: ephemeral places that are made on clay as sculptures, places that are made with what is at hand, places that have digital supports, places that live in people’s memories, places that can be inhabited through the intra-actions that fungal systems make to keep the elements of a tree colony communicating with each other, places that can

be composed interwoven in the patterns of the music we listen to, places that are formed with crop plantations and, in some cases, places that are constructed permanently in small production through communal practices as: *minga*, *tequio*, *tequil*, *gozona*, *fajina*, *ka'x k'ol*, *guelaguetza*, *amingáta nendive*, *gauchada*, *ayni*, *mano vuelta*, *córima*, or *komon `a`tel tojolabal*, among many others. These are just some of the few options that can be found in the conglomerate of minuscule and multicultural socio-eco-political structures in which the communal life of today is organized.

This almost unimaginable multiplicity of supports of the collective practices of inhabiting prevents the segmentation of functions and uses, so that, manifestations are in constant symbiosis. A place of eating can be at the same time a place of sleeping or learning, depending on the culture that created it. What is now organic to our inhabiting manifestations, during the Capitalist Night was seen as a risky and novel experimentation. In contrast, almost all architecture was manifested in a privileged support, in a single object: the building.

According to Robert, during the Capitalist Night, modernization was spatialization, “modernity could be appropriately defined by its urge to master space and to expose all reality to a shadowless light in a controlled space” (Robert, 2018). As a counterpart places are now sustained by autonomous modes of living, collective practices of inhabiting, autonomous and relational modes of sustaining and constructing life in common, anarchic modalities of composi(t)ng the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation. Through the collective practices of inhabiting, we were able to rehearse our autonomous collective potency to imagine and construct our modes of inhabitation, autonomous practices of inhabiting are no longer clandestine. Because, as Illich noted in *El arte de habitar*, inhabiting “is an activity that lies beyond the reach of the architect [...] the Cartesian, three-dimensional, homogeneous space into which the architect builds, and the vernacular space which dwelling brings into existence, constitute different classes of space. Architects can do nothing but build. Vernacular dwellers generate the axioms of the spaces they inhabit” (Illich, 2014, p. 30).

Following Illich, Robert beautifully reminds us, in *El arte de habitar no se deja alfabetizar*, that during the Capitalist Night “experts [did] not know how to write how it [was] good to live, [...] architects seem to ignore the fact that one lives with neighbors, so inhabiting is living-together [*con-vivir*] [...] [The Capitalist Night] had no *ars habitandi* that [could] be prescribed by means of texts. In an epoch that has made description its only light, the art of inhabiting has become clandestine. It [thrived] in the interstices of norms and in the ambiguities of contradictory legislations. It sleeps or revives in what remains of orality. It is rebellious to the written form: it does not allow itself to be alphabetized” (Robert, 2021, pp. 201–210).

As mentioned above, the mass production of these objects had a clear impact on the environment and was articulated with the logics of the capitalist market. Although the virtual format is an option among the diversity of supports for the creation of inhabiting manifestations of the world and cultures, the enthusiasm shown for the virtual world three hundred years ago seems inexplicable to us now. Somehow they believed that

the materiality of the building would be disrupted by the possibilities of aesthetic experimentation that the virtual world implied, but they lost sight of the fact that digital media also left a carbon footprint and that the technological devices necessary for the existence of the virtual world, mass-produced to feed consumption, required natural inputs whose extraction in open-pit mines threatened the Earth. Although the virtual support for today's aesthetics and inhabiting manifestations is still used, it is done in an organic way and remains only one possibility among many others. At present, and in contrast to what happened in the Capitalist Night, the supports that exist in thousands of peoples and cultures keep a close relationship with the possibilities of the natural resources of each natural environment. These concrete material possibilities of each ecosystem make inhabiting manifestations a complex response to the creative and spiritual needs of each society and culture, not merchandise to be produced for market consumption, nor means of social control.

This connection of the world of aesthetic creation and the collective practices of inhabiting with the immediate natural environment of today's societies and cultures has resulted in several regions of the world being baptized as 'aesthetic practices of the earth,' since the supports used respond to natural ecosystems with which an organic relationship is established that does not threaten life. Let us speak, for example, of the marvelous contemporary Zapatista inhabiting experiences, the well-known and celebrated *Caracoles*, that started about three hundred and twenty years ago.

Let us remind something at the outset, Zapatista autonomy, is a politics of multiplicity. As Jérôme Baschet in *¡Rebeldía, resistencia y autonomía! La experiencia zapatista*, underscores: Zapatista "autonomy is a situated politics, rooted in the singularity of its own territory and in the modes of inhabiting that have been created by those who live there, multiplicity is necessarily a fundamental feature of the politics from below" (Baschet, 2018, p. 147). This is important, because even though the overall Zapatista experience intra-acts as a living territorial-web, with similar organization, from the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno*, the *Caracoles*, to the *Gobierno Autónomo Local* and *Colectivos de Gobiernos Autónomos Zapatistas* "this method of autonomous government was not simply invented by the EZLN, but rather it comes from several centuries of indigenous resistance and from the zapatistas' own experience. It is the self-governance of the communities" (EZLN, 2005). "There is no single form of Zapatista autonomous government. Not only do its modalities change permanently, but they also differ from one municipality to another, from one Caracol to another. The way to resolve the difficulties seeks its way in the very activity of doing, in a manner adapted to the particularity of each situation" (Baschet, 2018, p. 147).

The seven Zapatista principles of autonomous government, or *Mandar Obedeciendo*, Lead by Obeying, were initially: *Servir y No Servirse* (To Serve Others, Not Serve Oneself), *Representar y No Suplantar* (To Represent, Not Supplant), *Construir y No Destruir* (To Construct, Not Destroy), *Obedecer y No Mandar* (To Obey, Not Command), *Proponer y No Imponer* (To Propose, Not Impose), *Convencer y No Vencer* (To

Convince, Not Conquer) and *Bajar y No Subir* (To Work From Below, Not Seek To Rise) (Gutierrez Luna et al., 2014, p. 497).

Zapatistas used the *caracol*, snail, as a symbol of resistance against dominant accelerationism during the Capitalist Night, as it represented a temporary state, and allowed “to understand that we walk slowly but, yes, we advance; we prefer to walk rather than run because we are going very far” (Sup Marcos, 2007). Territorially the Zapatista experience, *caracolea*, it has never followed a straight line of development, but winding paths, *porque hay que buscar el modo* through action-word of *caminar-preguntando* “asking, we walk” (Baschet, 2018, pp. 277–281). Raúl Zibechi, noted early in 2015, in *Descolonizar el pensamiento crítico y las rebeldías. Autonomías y emancipaciones en la era del progresismo*, that caracoles zapatistas “did not prefigure the society of the future. They were, in fact, the other society actually possible. The idea of prefiguring implies a process of gradual approximation to the desired society” (Zibechi, 2015a, p. 39) whereas caracoles were actually the possibility of other worlds. Ahead, now and then.

Between 2003 and 2023, Zapatistas organized through *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* and *Caracoles*. As experiments in collective practices of inhabiting, caracoles initially reproduced many features of architecture, due to the violent experience of territorial coloniality. But slowly, as a *caracol* moves, the imposed spatial modernity through architecture was trans-formed into autonomous collective practices of inhabiting. Each *caracol* through *tequios*, communal doings, imagined and constructed situated places that intra-act with the territory they inhabit and care with love. Since 2023, Zapatistas have been experimenting through diverse iterations of *Gobierno Autónomo Local GAL*, *Colectivos de Gobiernos Autónomos Zapatistas CGAZ*, and *Asambleas de Colectivos de Gobiernos Autónomos Zapatistas ACGAZ*. “The main base, which is not only where autonomy is sustained, also without which the other structures cannot function, is the Local Autonomous Government, LAG [GAL for its acronym in Spanish]. There is a GAL in each community where Zapatista support bases live. The Zapatista GALs are the core of all autonomy. They are coordinated by autonomous agents and commissioners and are subject to the assembly of the town, *ranchería*, community, area, neighborhood, *ejido*, or however each population calls itself. Each GAL controls its autonomous organizational resources and the relationship with neighboring non-Zapatista brother towns. [...] According to their needs, problems and advances, various GALs are convened into Collectives of Zapatista Autonomous Government, ZAG [CGAZ for its acronym in Spanish], and here discussions are held and agreements are made on matters that interest the convening GALs. When they so determine, the Collective of Autonomous Governments calls an assembly of the authorities of each community. Here the plans and needs of Health, Education, Agroecology, Justice, Commerce, and those that are needed are proposed, discussed and approved or rejected. The coordinators of each area are at the CGAZ level. They are not authorities. Their job is to ensure that the work requested by the GAL or that are deemed necessary for community life [...] Next, the Assemblies of

Collectives of Zapatista Autonomous Governments, ACZAG [ACGAZ for its acronym in Spanish]. Which are what were previously known as zones. But they have no authority, and depend on the CGAZ. And the CGAZ depend on the GAL. The ACGAZ convenes and presides over zone assemblies, when necessary according to the requests of GAL and CGAZ. They are based in the caracoles, but move between regions. In other words, they are mobile, according to the towns demands for attention” (Moisés, 2023).

Hay que buscar el modo. This is only one of the thousands of possible manifestations in the various regions of the world that speak of the relationship of each culture and society with its environment.

Another fundamental difference lies in the idea of authorship. During the Capitalist Night, architecture had in the notion of authorship one of its main foundations. Around an inconceivable idea today, that of genius and individual talent, a whole system of recognition and a legal framework was built that regulated the nation states of that period. Prizes, scholarships and incentives, in most cases, were translated into money for specific people who were recognized as the authors of architecture works. Although it is now seen as something surprising, within the legal system there were specific—the “author’s rights”—that regulated the authorship of pieces of art, literature and architecture—and that, if infringed, could lead to very peculiar litigation seen from the eyes of our time. This should not impress us if we think that pieces of architecture were inscribed within the logic of private property, so sacred during the early years of the XXI century, and which made us believe that only individual talent was necessary—as if creation did not depend on collective and historical processes. In this context, it is not surprising that, once an architectural work was finished, it remained registered and, therefore, practically immovable, with very few possibilities for its reinvention. In contrast, in today’s inhabiting manifestations, the idea of authorship has been diluted: the collectivities and singularities that participate in collective practices of inhabiting think of their work as something as organic and necessary as the cultivation of food or autonomous learnings. The same people who dedicate themselves to various tasks necessary for the reproduction of life can intervene in the creation of places, and those who spend more time in this task know that the creative process necessarily needs the collaboration, gaze, attention and intervention of many others. The fact that collective practices of inhabiting have not become commodities also makes it possible for them to be seen as an open corpus. Who can claim authorship of the *Maloca*? It sounds absurd to even raise such question, when different generations have collectively been recreating, adjusting, expanding, imagining and rehearsing such place every time the rituals associated with its creation required it.

The ideas of authorship and individual talent, were sustained through whiteness and the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, which during the Capitalist Night, was particularly modulated by a now forgotten patriarchal, colonial and capitalist institution, the uni-versity. The uni-versity, as Nick Mitchell, the black radical and feminist theorist argued, was “a social institution in which the majority of the work produced was by workers who received no wages in order to work, and conversely were expected to pay in order to work”

(Mitchell, 2023a). These wageless workers, were called students ((Boggs et al., 2019; Mitchell, 2023a, 2023b)). It may be difficult to understand today, but this *collective equipments of normalization* as Félix Guattari, an idea thief, called uni-versities, were articulated through the archaic and violent notion of education for abstract labour, “semiotic subjection machines for the selection, the modelling, of an elite adapted to the semiotics of power, to the style and attitudes of future executives” (Guattari, 2016, p. 67). Uni-versities were almost like factories of whiteness for the re/production or modulation of human labourers, who were promised a subjectivity, a professional mask. All ready to play their social role under/for the re/production of the imbricated amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination. Our current autonomous learnings and doings do not fit in what was called the uni-versity.

The false promise of the uni-versal individual subject was one of the fundamental pillars of capitalist modernity, one that sustained an essential violent division for colonial-capitalist re/production, the nature/culture or subject/object divide. At the same time, such promise, reproduced a false dichotomy between the one and the many, the singular and the collective, the local and the global. Moten, who committed his work to the opposition of identity and difference, between the homo- and the hetero-. In a conversation with Denise Ferreira da Silva, *The Multiplicity Turn: Theories of Identity from Poetry to Mathematics*, that we were able to save from the lost YouTube archives—an Internet video platform—, Moten, highlights the importance, during the Capitalist Night, of refusing the opposition of identity and difference, the opposition between one and many, or identity and multiplicity. And engage in *practices of world un-making* that experiment alternative modalities of life or existence (Moten & da Silva, 2021).

Regarding the false promise of the uni-versal individual subject, Esteva emphasized that, “we can think of ourselves as individuals, experience the world as individuals, put our whole life at the service of that individual we believe ourselves to be—at the service of the salvation of its soul or its accumulation of material wealth or prestige... but we cannot properly be individuals. We are knots of networks of concrete relationships: this defines our existential condition. Each self is a we, even if we do not know it or recognize it” (Esteva et al., 2013, p. 33). As Félix Guattari used to say: *we are all groupuscules!* (Guattari, 2015, p. 362).

The rebellions beyond-against and beyond the uni-versal individual subject, rehearsed what the *barefoot researcher* Marcello Tari once called, recalling the Autonomia experience in so-called Italy as the “de-individualisation and the communisation of existence” (Tari, 2016, p. 137). As Ana Esther Ceceña Martorella noted, in *Subvertir la Modernidad para Vivir Bien (O de las posibles salidas de la crisis civilizatoria)*, these rebellions re-claimed “a non-plundering communitarian territoriality. Recovering traditions and empowering utopian imaginaries that lead to the world in which all worlds fit, it shakes all perceptions of reality and history. The epistemological references placed by modernity as uni-versal are dislocated and interpretations multiply in the search for sustainable, dignified and libertarian future projects” (Ceceña Martorella, 2013, p. 114).

The *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, the continuous rebellions and pre-figurative efforts, that marked the beginning of multiple new worlds, through the inseparability of modes of inhabitation and existence, were first and foremost rehearsals of becoming *non-subjects*. As Yvone Dion-Buffalo and John C. Mohawk, argued, during the Capitalist Night while living under the colonial domination of the decadent nation-state known as Canada, “colonized peoples [had] three choices in response to cultural colonization. They [could] become ‘good subjects’ of the discourse, accepting the rules of law and morals without much question, they [could] be ‘bad subjects’ arguing that they have been subjected to alien rules but always revolting within the precepts of those rules, or they [could] be ‘non-subjects,’ acting and thinking around discourses far removed from and unintelligible to the West” (Dion-Buffalo & Mohawk, 1992, p. 20).

The modalities and practices of becoming non-subjects, of refusing the im/possibility of being a single individual subject, beyond-against and beyond the modern-colonial false promise of the individual subject, modes of living unintelligible to white-patriarchal-capitalism, had multiple approaches and conceptualizations. Such as: *r-existencias*, *ch'ixi*, blackness, black anarchy, *bastardismo*, relational ontologies, non-identity, non-subjects, becomings, un-becomings, transness, singularization, metamodelization, collective assemblages of enunciation, ethico-aesthetic paradigm, amongst other experiments of alternative modalities of living and be/coming with the Earth.

“It was necessary to become others. Some, not a few, succeeded” (Tari, 2016, p. 71). Now we know that those, during the Capitalist Night, that intended to draw strict lines of flight, cartographies of becoming, as self-help guides and manuals, as step-by-step theories, failed in strepitous manners. And, that those, that embraced collectively the practices of uncertainty, experiments of dis/assembling modes of existence and inhabitation, modes of sustaining life, those are the genealogies thanks to which we are here. Those that co-moved through and asked: “What possibility for living a radically different scheme of being?” (Hartman, 2019, p. 245).

Let's briefly review some of these *beautiful experiments* of forms for existence and sociality. Beyond-against and beyond the white-colonial project of *mestizaje*, Rivera Cusicanqui proposed and experimented with/through modalities for existence by way of the notion of *ch'ixi*. “*Ch'ixi*: simply designates in Aymara a type of gray tone. It is a color that looks gray from a distance, but when we get closer we realize that it is made of dots of pure and agonistic color: black and white spots intermingled.” Rivera Cusicanqui “learned the word *ch'ixi* from the mouth of the Aymara sculptor Víctor Zapana, who explained which animals come out of certain stones and why they are powerful animals. He then told her *ch'ixinakax utxiwa*, that there are, emphatically, *ch'ixis* entities, which are powerful because they are indeterminate, because they are neither black nor white, they are both at the same time” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 98). *Ch'ixi* is an explicit challenge to the idea of the *One* (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 78). “To coexist among different while maintaining the radical nature of

difference (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 148). “*Ch'ixi* is a becoming. It is about freeing ourselves from the collective schizophrenia, why we always have to be in the dilemma of one or the other” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 149).

For Rivera Cusicanqui, “the interest in the *ch'ixi* is related to what [was] the official ideology of *mestizaje*, the harmonious confluence of the two poles, the spanish and the indian, which would give rise to that imaginary fusion: the cosmic race (in the case of so-called méxico), or on the contrary, the defeated and degenerated race of Arguedas or Moreno, which would bring together the worst, wouldn't it? In this Manichean operation, the nature of the mixture is eluded; a white dominance is tacitly assumed. The process or the drift of this mixture is always towards *blanqueamiento*—whitening. A reverse process is neither imagined nor tolerated, or perhaps even more despised because it would be a kind of voluntary regression. The second effect of this is that both versions seek to erase the trace of the contradiction that gave rise to the desire for identification with a third party... it is erased. It is a domination that erases its own trace. And that has been the ‘conciliatory’ of the official policy of *mestizaje*, which is also a policy of oblivion, based on the oblivion of contradiction” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 139).

“*Ch'ixi* is like a reverberation. Only from a distance do you think that *ch'ixi* is a third color, but if you get closer, they are opposite colors” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 123). “The *ch'ixi* gesture arises from the recognition of the colonial fissure, of the internal rupture that the colonial double bind signified” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 100). “While the *ch'ixi* is an explicit challenge to the idea of the One, we cannot forget that there is only one pacha, only one planet, there is no spare one. And this planet, our planet earth and its ethereal environment, [was] going through a serious crisis. In view of this, it would not be possible to leave an ethical framework of planetarity under the title of the *ch'ixi*” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 78). “To not seek the tranquility of the One, because it is precisely a Manichean anguish; It is necessary to work within the contradiction, making its polarity the space for creating an intermediate fabric (*taypi*), a plot that is neither one nor the other, but quite the opposite, it is both at the same time” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 102). “The *ch'ixi* does not have a sufficient level of abstraction to be considered a concept, because it is always like a call to overcome the first colonial disjunctive, which is to make words a veil. The first colonial gesture, when the spanish meets the indian, is to make the word a deceptive thing” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 150). The *ch'ixi* weave asks, “how to assume the contradiction between community and individual person on a daily basis? The problem is not how to overcome this contradiction, but how to live with it, how to inhabit it” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 147).

And through the *Pachakuti*, Rivera Cusicanqui notes that, “the micro-political version of *Pachakuti* would then take the form of a *ch'ixi* inhabiting of the *matria-pacha* based on communalities—rural and urban, male, female or mixed, youth, cultural, agro-ecological, etc.—articulated by an ethos based on the recognition

of non-human subjects, in dialogue with the ancestors, in autopoiesis with the species and entities of the environment. In other words, that zone of friction where opposites confront each other, without peace, without calm, in a permanent state of friction and electrification, is what creates the magma that makes historical transformations possible, for better or for worse. But it also makes it possible for cognitive situations to emerge that would [have been] unthinkable from the euro-american logic, such as the idea that the past can be seen as the future” (Rivera Cusicanqui, 2018, p. 103).

Another beautiful experiment of forms for existence and sociality was the loose assemblage of black-radical thinkers during the Capitalist Night, who proposed, imagined, reflected and rehearsed, concepts as: blackness, fugitivity, waywardness, black-anarchy, study and undercommons, amongst other. Through/with the black radical tradition, Moten and Harney argued that blackness is a concept “without a master(y)” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 81), as a mode of refusal it escapes a single definition, and noted that “the history of blackness is testament to the fact that objects can and do resist. Blackness—the extended movement of a specific upheaval, an ongoing irruption that anarranges every line—is a strain that pressures the assumption of the equivalence of personhood and subjectivity” (Moten, 2003, p. 1). By way of Édouard Glissant and what Cedric J. Robinson, called “the ontological totality,” Moten underscored that “consent not to be a single being, which is the anoriginal, anoriginary constitution of blackness as radical force—as historical, paraontological totality—is for Robinson the existential and logical necessity that turns the history of racial capitalism, which is also to say the Marxist tradition, inside out. What cannot be understood within, or as a function of, the deprivation that is the context of its genesis can only be understood as the ongoing present of a common refusal” (Moten, 2018b, p. 236). And notes, that “the emergence and preservation of blackness, as the ontological totality, the revolutionary consciousness that black people hold and pass, is possible only by way of the renunciation of actual being and the ongoing conferral of historical being—the gift of historicity as claimed, performed, dispossession. Blackness, which is to say black radicalism, is not the property of black people” (Moten, 2018b, p. 236).

The notion of anarcho-Blackness by Black-Trans-Theorist Marquis Bey, followed a similar argument by way of Ashanti Omowali Alston (Alston, 2003) and Moten, who observed that “blackness marks a non-homogeneous descriptor of subjectivity. Said subjectivity, however, is not so much skin color, as Alston notes. Blackness does not merely consolidate all those who meet a racial quantum. Such a measure would collapse and monolithize those under its rubric. What Alston advances is not Blackness as people who are Black; he advances an anarcho-Blackness: a conceptualization of Blackness as tied to a politicality and radical penchant for sociality and social arrangement. The implications of this make the Blackness of anarcho-Blackness open to whoever is committed to expressing the liberatory politics it calls for” (Bey, 2020, p. 20). Bey, was mobilizing towards an “assemblic work for those who are impoverished in spirit, who come together, an intimate proximity reached

because we are doing the work not because of an ontologized accident. What [Bey was] asking for is a willingness to move toward becoming subjectivated by an analytical queerness, a radical transitivity, an anoriginal Blackness, where Blackness names a sociopoetic force of subversive irregularity and, as Moten expressed to [Bey] in an email exchange [(rudimentary form of communication during the Capitalist Night)], ‘must be claimed by any and every body’ who seeks to do anarchic work. What is being asked for, what is to be done, is a Blackening that inducts all those who live and be in the undercommons, stealing life so it can steal more life, pilfering resources and asking no permission, taking no responsibility, because the ones who need this stuff might not know they need it, and neither do we” (Bey, 2020, p. 30).

“So if Blackness’s anarchic character defines this, the demand placed upon those who seek an anarchic society is a becoming-Black where Blackness is what happens to you when anarchism takes hold of you. [...] The racialized Blackness one usually understands as Blackness as such is embedded in the logics of the State and property. Thus to be and become unpropertied, to be moved by the anarchic, is to disaggregate Blackness from this relationship and, if we wish for an anarchic society, which is to say an unpropertied and un-States world, Blackness becomes the adhesive for those who refuse the State’s holdings over us” (Bey, 2020, p. 46).

Blackness was referenced also as fugitivity, “a performative against all performances of freedom and unfreedom dependent on the historical dilemma of a lack of meaningful distinction between freedom and slavery” (Moten, 2018a, p. 247). “Black radicalism—the life that moves in the break between the thingly, the animal, and the human—may have been delivered over to ‘sovereign jouissance’ but it is not called into being by exposure to that force. Blackness is present at its own making—it is the autopoiesis of imagined, imagining things. [...] [Moten insists] on a distinction between being delivered over or being exposed to and being called into being by the sovereign power of the state of exception. Extraordinary rendition—by way of whatever point or door of no return and in the interest of whatever protection of whatever particular determination of the proper—might very well be understood as the most extreme example of the state’s interpellative, violently transportive call, but that call is not a call into being. And if this is so, it means that the refusal of that call does not require an escape from being or from the question of its meaning. At stake, rather, is the question and the sociality of being’s escape, its essential fugitivity. This is not just about being excluded from the ‘regular situation’ that one’s irregular presence guarantees; it’s about recognizing that the decision that creates the regular situation must be created and exists only in response to the everyday irruption of imagining things, ‘the anarchic sorcery of the facts,’ that calls it into being and cuts it” (Moten, 2018b, p. 43).

Harney together with Moten argued, as Jack Halberstam noted, that “fugitivity is not only escape, ‘exit’ as Paolo Virno might put it, or ‘exodus’ in the terms offered by Hardt and Negri, fugitivity is being separate from settling. It is a being in motion that has learned that ‘organizations are obstacles to organising

ourselves' (The Invisible Committee in *The Coming Insurrection*) and that there are spaces and modalities that exist separate from the logical, logistical, the housed and the positioned" (Halberstam, 2013, p. 18).

Bey, following Moten and Harney, adds to them, and asked, "why is there no 'end'? To assert this might seem to sidestep what Foucault claims in the *Preface of Anti Oedipus*: to be 'less concerned with why this or that than with how to proceed.' Refusing to bank on the 'end' is, at least in part, how to proceed. 'An abdication of political responsibility?' Moten and Harney write, anticipating the accusation. 'OK. Whatever. We're just anti-politically romantic about actually existing social life.' [Bey] submits that one's concern must be an ethical one that—to supplement an oversight in Moten and Harney—not only sets its sights on social life that 'actually' ([We] shiver at the hubris of this word) exists but, more substantively, fertilizes the conditions of possibility for otherwise and unsung and unknown emergence. There is no 'end' because to know the end is to think one knows the totality of the landscape, a line of thinking that cannot account for that which falls outside the dictates of legibility. There might always be something else just outside, and we cannot close the discussion when we think it is over. Fugitive planning plans for what it cannot plan for by refusing to plan for it. So there is no end in sight because sight is not the only sense available to us. (But there is also no end in touch, smell, feel, or taste—or any other 'sense.') There is no end in sight because our end may only be someone else's beginning or middle. Thus, our critical praxis, our interrogative social enactment, does something precisely when it commits to a political endeavor proliferating life where no life is said to be found" (Bey, 2020, p. 26).

According to Harney and Moten the undercommons and black study, which is to say blackness, as speculative habits of assembly, of assembling and dis/assembling, "study is what you do with other people. It's talking and walking around with other people, working, dancing, suffering, some irreducible convergence of all three, held under the name of speculative practice. The notion of a rehearsal—being in a kind of workshop, playing in a band, in a jam session, or old men sitting on a porch, or people working together in a factory—there are these various modes of activity. The point of calling it 'study' is to mark that the incessant and irreversible intellectuality of these activities is already present. These activities aren't ennobled by the fact that we now say, 'oh, if you did these things in a certain way, you could be said to have been studying.' To do these things is to be involved in a kind of common intellectual practice" (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 117).

Black study which is to say blackness, "is an ongoing and inaugural violence to or indetermination of self" (Moten, 2018a, p. 212). "We owe each other the indeterminate. We owe each other everything" (Moten & Harney, 2013, p. 27). "Blackness isn't a people problem; it's the problematization of the people. Black study—which is to say blackness: the preoccupied breath of the ones who have been taken, who have been made to leave—is the medi(t)ation of things as, breaking and remaking every law, every bond, they shimmer in the absolute disappearance, the absolute nothingness, of their sociality" (Moten, 2017a, p. 202). Blackness, "parallels but also instantiates the simultaneous theorization and deconstruction of the subject. Modern

philosophy critiques the subject, operates (within) that dis/enchantment of the subject's value (the valuative oscillation between exaltation and shame; the operational im/possibility of sovereignty and selfdetermination). Blackness, which is to say black study—the undercommon, underground monastic attitude of the quarters, the field, the refuge, the territory, the church, the joint, the (sound barrier) club—is the refusal, by way of black and fugal operations, of the subject's long, developmental nightmare. [...] To have been refused this traumatic development is, at the same time, to have been drafted into its operations as apparatus. So that to refuse what has been refused is a combination of disavowing, of not wanting, of withholding consent to be a subject and also of refusing the work, of withholding consent to do the work, that is supposed to bring the would-be subject online. It is to prefer not to, in stuttered, melismatic, gestural withdrawal from that subjectivity which is not itself, which is not one, which only shows up as a thwarted desire for itself, as the lurid auto-cathetic lure of an airy fiend that walks beside you in a storefront window. The experience of subjectivity is the would-be subject's thwarted desire for subjectivity, which we must keep on learning not to want, which we have to keep on practicing not wanting, as if in endless preparation for a recital that, insofar as it never comes, is always surreally present. Meanwhile, the subject, which was never here, cannot then disappear; it can only haunt. This is what one might call the unholy ghostliness of liveness and it has to do, paradoxically, with the fact that the body requires but has no soul, that the soul requires but doesn't want a body. This is the incommensurable twoness of the one, which renders it relatively nothing, in contradistinction to the absolute and general nothing-ness that is given in/as blackness" (Moten, 2018a, p. 243). "Black study is a mode of life whose initiatory figures are given as anarchic principles that are formgenerating. Not just the proliferation of form, to which generativity would then submit itself, but proliferative, generative form. [...] Generativity, our ongoing common growth in difference, is also escape in contemplative performance, reanimating the itinerant communal form of the city before as a study hall inside a dance hall" (Moten, 2018b, p. 137).

If "blackness, which is to say black study—the undercommon, underground monastic attitude of the quarters, the field, the refuge, the territory, the church, the joint, the (sound barrier) club—is the refusal, by way of black and fugal operations, of the subject's long, developmental nightmare" (Moten, 2018a, p. 243), Moten underscores and repeated *in as many ways as possible*, that blackness as the *displacement of being and singularity*, is "consent not to be one: not just to be more + less than one but the mobilization of that indiscretion and incompleteness against or 'otherwise than being'" (Moten, 2018a, p. 242). Through the trilogy of *consent not to be a single being*, Moten mobilized "a particular kind of failure, trying hard not to succeed in some final and complete determination either of themselves or of their aim, blackness, which is, but so serially and variously, that it is given nowhere as emphatically as in rituals of renomination, when the given is all but immediately taken away. Such predication is, as Nathaniel Mackey says, 'unremitting'—a constant economy and mechanics of fugitive making where the subject is hopelessly troubled by, in being emphatically detached

from, the action whose agent it is supposed to be. Indeed, our resistant, relentlessly impossible object is subjectless predication, subjectless escape, escape from subjection, in and through the paralegal flaw that animates and exhausts the language of ontology. Constant escape is an ode to impurity, an obliteration of the last word. We remain to insist upon this errant, interstitial insistence, an activity that is, from the perspective that believes in perspective, at best, occult and, at worst, obscene” (Moten, 2017a, p. vii).

Blackness as escape from subjection, as attempts to fail to individuate, to become unfit for subjection, moves, Moten writes, “against the grain of (the) man’s brutal self-projections, which often result in the addictive tendency of his others to settle for the settler’s delusional sovereignty, blackness still has the fugal, fugitive, radically imaginative sociopoetic work of refusal to do. This work takes form in passage, as ill logics and logisticalities of sharing, as a general indebtedness that requires and allows a general corporate liquidation performed by means of what Édouard Glissant calls ‘consent not to be a single being’” (Moten, 2018a, p. 194).

Harney and Moten noted, together, that “we fall so we can fall again, which is what ascension really means. To fall is to lose one’s place, to lose the place that makes one, to relinquish the locus of being, which is to say of being-single. This radical homelessness—its kinetic indigeneity, its irreducible queerness—is the essence of blackness. This refusal to take place is given in what it is to occur” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 45). Against completion, Harney and Moten note that, “blackness is the meaning of life. Partial, held secret, held out to all but not all there for those who hold, not ours and all we got and here it go, all incomplete” (Moten & Harney, 2021, p. 166). To embrace incompleteness.

Bey by way of *black-queer-trans-anarcha-feminisms*, underscores that “because the queer is a figurative specter haunting normativity, and because the trans is a generative disruption that opens into an otherwise realm of possibility, and because the Black is a lawlessness that marks a terrain of ethics because Law ain’t never been ethical, only disciplinary, then what is to be done is a becoming in the illustrious muck of the queerness, the transness, the Blackness of the undercommons. If fugitive planning and Black study is an invitation to be and remain broken, to refuse fixedness and fixity and being fixed, then, to conclude this meditative strain, what is to be done is precisely the kind of study practiced in consciousness raising coalitions by Black feminists and anarcha-feminists. ‘Instead of getting discouraged and isolated now, we should be in our small groups—discussing, planning, creating, and making trouble...we should always be actively engaging in and creating feminist activity, because we all thrive on it.’ Fugitive planning and Black study; planning with and for fugitives, studying the effects of Blackness” (Bey, 2020, p. 31).

“The space cultivated by this critical praxis is where a Black anarchic politics and those [de]subjectivated by an anarcho-Blackness, its attendant Black queer feminist electrical circuitry, show up. Those maroons, subversive intellectuals, fugitives, queers, feminists, anarchists, and rebellious workers meet to conspire together in the undercommons: a non-place where everyone is Black, queer, anarchic, because they are

changed by the undercommons, which is not a place you enter but a groove that enters you. Critical praxis becomes a radical invitation to not only do but to be done by the undercommon insurgency that makes its own demands. And such an interrogation must suspend the presumption of an end goal. We know from Moten and Harney, and Halberstam, that what we think we want before the crisis that precipitates our insurgency will necessarily shift after we've attained the limits of what our coalitional knowledge could compile. It is not because we are insufficient, as if insufficiency is a deficiency rather than a willingness to risk getting at the outer limits of what we dared to think; it is because we cannot, and must not, assume that the logics and rubrics we have when moving within the maelstrom of the hegemonic—radically altered as they may be—can operate to our benefit when we've unseated the hegemon. We will need new rubrics and metrics, unrubrics and unmetrics, because a radically other-world requires radically other means to love it, to caress it, to be all the way in it" (Bey, 2020, p. 25). And Bey, asked: "how, then, to do this? Upon a re-reading of *The Undercommons*, [Bey] was drawn, obsessively, to one phrase, one that struck [they] at first as dangerously wrongheaded. But, then, the revolutionary will always be dangerous. The revolutionary call that Moten and Harney require and that [Bey was] obsessed with is this: they insist that our radical politics, our anarchic world-building must be 'unconditional—the door swings open for refuge even though it may let in police agents and destruction.' As [our] grandmother might quip, what kind of foolishness is this? But it is not foolishness precisely because the only ethical call that could bring about the radical revolutionary overturning we seek is one that does not discriminate or develop criteria for inclusion and, consequently, exclusion" (Bey, 2020, p. 28).

According to Bey, "if we understand capitalism's constitutive racial differentiation and reproduction of [re]productive and disposable humanity rooted in the commodification of Blackened subjects, then anarcho-Blackness comes in to describe the anarchic insurgency that defines the abolition of the State and hierarchization. This is about what Blackness does to and through anarchism, not against it. We need anarchism's musings and movement strategies, so it would be antithetical to radical world transformation to jettison anarchism's gifts. Too, though, anarchism cannot simply do what it has always done (which is itself a multifarious enterprise) as such has been predicated on, in part, an elision of the weight of white (and cis male) supremacy. That is, we cannot just add in racial and gendered perspectives to an already-functioning anarchism; we cannot, also, simply throw out anarchism on the grounds of these elisions. The task is to mobilize the effects of Black feminism and anarchism colliding in harmoniously complex chaos. This mobilization is what [Bey] deemed anarcho-Blackness, an 'anarchaos,' to borrow a beautifully apt lexicon from Christopher R. Williams and Bruce A. Arrigo (Williams & Arrigo, 2001)" (Bey, 2020, p. 18).

Some dispersed experiences of conviviality co-moved trans-versally then, through/with various black anarchists, that wrote during the Capitalist Night on black anarchism, Anarkata, anarcho-Blackness, black in anarchy, the anarchy of blackness, or Black anarchic radicals, as Atticus Bagby-Williams, Nsambu Za Suekama,

Zoé Samudzi, William C. Anderson, Marquis Bey, and Black Rose/Rosa Negra Anarchist Federation, who re/articulated black anarchism by way of Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin Ashanti Alston, Kuwasi Balagoon, Martin Sostre, and Ojore Lutalo, amongst other (William C. Anderson, 2021, p. 66), *by way of them, in their wake, under their influence, protection and against the grain*, when read through the mutually illuminating intra-actions of the black radical tradition as Hartman, Harney and Moten.

Bey, works through the work of Samudzi, Anderson, Hartman, Black Rose Federation, Harney and Moten, amongst others, and argues that the “dramatic shift” proposed in the “iteration of Black anarchism is, perhaps more accurately, an anarcho-Blackness in that it is not Black people practicing an anarchism that goes unchanged; it is anarchism as expressed through and necessarily corrupted by the radicality, the lawlessness, the mutinous primordially of Blackness” (Bey, 2020, p. 2). “Anarcho-Blackness expresses what might be understood as a Black anarchism insofar as it designates a gratuitous disorder that engenders the possibility of living unbounded by law, which is to say unbounded by violence and circumscription” (Bey, 2020, p. 6). Bey, articulates “anarcho-Blackness, first and foremost, as an inhabitable modality of anarchic subjectivity and engagement. This may lead to a discernible Black anarchism. Fine. But the aim is not to arrive at Black anarchism; it is, rather, to engage an anarcho-Blackness that moves toward what might be called a Black anarchism” (Bey, 2020, p. 14). In a reformulation of Moten’s work through Glissant, Bey, argues that “to infuse anarchism with anarcho-Blackness is to push anarchism’s logics further. Many anarchists did not organize on the grounds of difference and differentiation, even as they sought ways to prevent their silencing. Hence, anarcho-Blackness supplements these oversights via an insistence on perhaps *assemblage* or *swarm* or *ensemble*, whereby there is a consensus, or consent, not to be individuated—which is another way to say an affirmation to emanate from difference toward the insistence on collectivity and agential singularity. It is not unanimous we seek to be; it is ensemblic, assemblic, a distinction that manifests in the proliferation of life for those who might queerly emerge when conditions are saturated with the elimination of institutions that curtail such life” (Bey, 2020, p. 17). “A coalitional, collective quotidian choreography of possibility. That is not anarchism understood in the traditional sense; that is not anarchism begotten merely by adherence to what Kropotkin has preached. It is anarchism that is choreographed through the way we move and think about our bodies. Anarchic subjectivity in that we come into being through an anarchy of becoming, a way to exist in the world where our existence is predicated on how we aid each other mutually, refuse the violence of the State, dismantle hierarchies, concede to a non-coerced ethic (not right, with all its judiciary baggage) of opacity” (Bey, 2020, p. 68).

Other dispersed experiences of conviviality co-moved with/through the black radical tradition, particularly how blackness articulates diverse modalities of refusal, negation, rehearsal and praxis towards anarchic forms of inhabitation, *black ecologies of inhabitation* as Hartman would say (Hartman, 2022, p. 489).

Hartman potentially noted in the *Foreword* to William C. Anderson's *The nation on no map: Black anarchism and abolition*, how Anderson and other radical thinkers elaborated the anarchism of Blackness and were "devoted to dreaming and rehearsing how we might live otherwise in the present and break with the fatal terms of the given, the brutal imposed order of things" (Hartman, 2021, p. xiii).

Hartman, in *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Riotous Black Girls, Troublesome Women, and Queer Radicals*, mobilized the notion of *wayward* "as related to the family of words: errant, fugitive, recalcitrant, anarchic, willful, reckless, troublesome, riotous, tumultuous, rebellious and wild. To inhabit the world in ways inimical to those deemed proper and respectable, to be deeply aware of the gulf between where you stayed and how you might live. Waywardness: the avid longing for a world not ruled by master, man or the police. The errant path taken by the leaderless swarm in search of a place better than here. The social poesis that sustains the dispossessed. Wayward: the unregulated movement of drifting and wandering; sojourns without a fixed destination, ambulatory possibility, interminable migrations, rush and flight, black locomotion; the everyday struggle to live free. The attempt to elude capture by never settling. Not the master's tools, but the ex-slave's fugitive gestures, her traveling shoes. Waywardness articulates the paradox of cramped creation, the entanglement of escape and confinement, flight and captivity. Wayward: to wander, to be unmoored, adrift, rambling, roving, cruising, strolling, and seeking. To claim the right to opacity. To strike, to riot, to refuse. To love what is not loved. To be lost to the world. It is the practice of the social otherwise, the insurgent ground that enables new possibilities and new vocabularies; it is the lived experience of enclosure and segregation, assembling and huddling together. It is the directionless search for a free territory; it is a practice of making and relation that enfolds within the policed boundaries of the dark ghetto; it is the mutual aid offered in the open-air prison. It is a queer resource of black survival. It is a beautiful experiment in how-to-live.

Waywardness is a practice of possibility at a time when all roads, except the ones created by smashing out, are foreclosed. It obeys no rules and abides no authorities. It is unrepentant. It traffics in occult visions of other worlds and dreams of a different kind of life" (Hartman, 2019, pp. 203–204).

Anderson, notes that "neither waywardness nor the anarchism of Blackness is reducible to anarchism as an ideology or doctrine. Hartman poetically defines it this way: 'Waywardness is an ongoing exploration of what might be; it is an improvisation with the terms of social existence, when the terms have already been dictated, when there is little room to breathe, when you have already been sentenced to a life of servitude, when the house of bondage looms in whatever direction you move. It is the untiring practice of trying to live when you were never meant to survive' (Hartman, 2019, p. 204). Black people seeking liberation present great potential to counter the system because [black people existed] directly in contradiction to the system" (William C. Anderson, 2021, p. 24).

Ultimately, our attention, today at the *50th Meeting for the Liberation of Mother Earth: Territorial Trans-formation and Collective Dis/memory*, to honoring, remembering, assembling and studying through/by/for blackness, and anarcho-Blackness, which is to say the black radical tradition, points, as Hartman notes, regarding the compositions by Torkwase Dyson that accompany *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*, “attend to the histories of forced migration, captivity, enclosure, and death, while tracing lines of fugitive and stealth movement, dwelling and maroonage, black ecologies of inhabitation [...] always already inhabited and transformed by blackness, so the lines of confinement and enclosure expand and collapse, as those forced to stay put and those in flight inhabit and negotiate space and time in its manifold dimensions. These compositions offer provisional [insights] as to how we might live; they imagine an existence within and outside the hold [...] for inhabiting earth that might yield other forms for existence” (Hartman, 2022, p. 489). Experiences that co-moved beyond-against and beyond *the architectural world*, to dream and rehearse “how we might live otherwise in the present and break with the fatal terms of the given, the brutal imposed order of things [...] The goal [was and still is] transformation, to become ‘ungovernable’ (Hartman, 2021, pp. xiii–vi).

Let’s take another example from the dispersed experiences of conviviality: *Sumak Kawsay* in *Kichway*, *Suma Qamaña* in *Aymara*, *Buen Vivir* in spanish (good living). During the Capitalist Night various communities along the territories of the southern mountain region of Abya Yala, known briefly as Ecuador and Bolivia, mobilized *Buen Vivir*. According to Blanca Chancosa, Kichwa woman, back in 2010, “Sumak Kawsay, from a literal translation, would be life in plenitude, excellence, the best, the beautiful. But interpreted in political terms, it is life itself, a mixture of doings and political wills that mean changes so that people do not lack daily bread, and so that there are no social inequalities between men and women. Sumak Kawsay is the dream not only for indigenous people, but also for all human beings.

When we talk about Sumak Kawsay, it is not about going back to the past, because we cannot say that it has been perfect, but we did have and we did live Sumak Kawsay. Part of this has allowed us to survive these 518 years of marginalization, [—now 831—] discrimination, inequality and racism, because we have lived part of this from the collective and the community. We do not have lands as before, because they have been divided into smallholdings, but somehow there has been that solidarity and reciprocity that has allowed us to survive through struggle and resistance” (Chancoso, 2010, p. 6).

It is important to remember, that as Vilma Rocío Almendra Quiguanás—who had her roots in the Earth, daughter of a *Nasa* mother and a *Misak* father, both originally from *Madre de los Bosques*, that is to say, from the *Kauka*—, in her book *Entre la emancipación y la captura. Memorias y caminos desde la lucha Nasa en Colombia*, notes, “although the meaning and practices of *Buen Vivir* emerges from the heart of Andean communities and are nourished and enriched, among others, with contributions from intellectuals committed

to indigenous struggles that vindicated it, unfortunately some organic intellectuals at the service of the nation-state, mainly in Ecuador, appropriated Buen Vivir as a discourse to legitimize neo-liberal policies. In practice it was an attempt to empty this concept of meaning, while in the discourse they continued to speak of life in plenitude” (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, p. 251).

Sumak Kawsay was able to overcome, that neo-liberal progressive period, and has constantly nourished collective practices of inhabiting, situated in the southern mountain region of Abya Yala, through multiple and at some points changing principles as: reciprocity, solidarity, equality, mutual respect in diversity, mutual-aid in all spaces and moments, complementarity, plurinationality which was once conceptualized as the principle of equality within diversity, living in community, respecting diversity and most importantly Pachamama is life (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, pp. 250–252).

In the same book, Almendra Quiguanás, explains the Nasa *Wët wët fxizenxi*, *buenos vivires*, or *buenos con-vivires*, good livings or good co-livings, and the experiences with the collective practices of inhabiting, and notes, “for the Nasa people the *Plan de Vida*, Life Plan, is the collective Sxa’w (dream) of a historical practical conception that is being named and making its way, it is the permanent search for balance and harmony with Uma Kiwe (Mother Earth), it is ancestral and contemporary as a horizon of territorial struggle; that is, a fundamental part of what in recent years has become known from the indigenous peoples of Ecuador, as the Sumak Kawsay, *Buen Vivir*, Good Living, which [then by] the Nasa people [was] renamed in our *Nasayuwe* as the *Wët wët fxizenxi* (good livings). The *Wët wët fxizenxi* as a horizon of territorial struggle, once again summons and challenges us to rescue and walk the dreams of the elders, which are not only those of yesterday, but also those of today and tomorrow:

‘We say that it is forty-odd years old [—now two hundred twenty-nine—], but it has been brewing for centuries, millennia. Before the conquest we already had a life plan. Life was a very simple, elementary thing. Simply an enjoyment. A matter of eating, drinking, laughing, fishing, sowing, grinding, weaving, chewing, offering. Dawn and dusk and the days, months and years went by. Life consisted of living in contentment and harmony. There was no death, no Indians, no human rights, no State, no democracy, no socialism, no *caudillos*, no mayors, no senators’ (Tejido de Educación ACIN, 2014, p. 6).

The *Plan de Vida* permanently summons and challenges us to retake the horizon of struggle, because at least in the 2000s it was less cloudy and the course was clearer, well, that was what those of us who were from ACIN in continuous dialogue with the communities felt. In reality, what was happening was the revitalization of resistance and autonomy, with the birth of other alternatives based on ancestral principles and guided by our sense of *Wët wët fxizenxi*. Silenced births and alternatives very different and even contrary to the ideals of ‘development.’ ‘welfare’ and ‘progress’ (Benjamin, 2007) that the nation-state has been imposing for decades. For example, all levels of government use the so-called Development Plans, which, as it appears in [old]

dictionaries, [were] ‘a management tool that promotes social development in a given territory. In this way, it lays the foundations to address the unsatisfied needs of the population and to improve the quality of life of all citizens.’ But in Cauca, at least since the mid 1990’s, following the legacy of Álvaro Ulcué Chocué, the communities began to call the *Plan de Vida* (Life Plan)” (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, p. 87).

The guiding principles of *Wët wët fxizenxi* are: “1. *Amor por la Madre Tierra*, Love for Mother Earth and mandate of preservation, protection, because she is SACRED, 2. Economy and material conditions subordinated to life. Life is sacred, not ‘economy.’ not accumulation, 3. Rooted in memory and the past, in remembering and learning from experiences and in the wisdom of elders, as well as commitment to the future. The present is a moment. Re-appropriated and re-elaborated, 4. The collective and the communitarian: community makers, 5. *Vivir Bien*. To have in order to be. The sacred is the enjoyment of life in harmony. Wisdom is the greatest legacy and resource. Living wisdom. To accumulate is not a value, but a mistake, 6. *Mandar obedeciendo*. Authority is in the collective and in the debate. Representation is not delegated. 7. Democratic and participative. Contrary to power. Spheres of debate and collective reflection. Disagreements and differences are welcome. Listening is a privilege, an opportunity. It is not about accumulating knowledge as commodities but about sharing and building it collectively. Disdain for hierarchies and 8. *Amor por la diversidad*. Love for diversity” (Almendra Quiguanás, 2017, p. 252).

As *Proceso de Liberación de la Madre Tierra*, has argued for centuries: “*ser planeta no es cosa fácil*—Being planet is not an easy thing” (Proceso de liberación de la Madre Tierra, 2021, p. 5). And write that, “the force of *planes de vida* enabled us to walk long strides towards autonomy. We were even able to propose an alternative that mobilized and inspired an entire country. For around the same time that we demanded another ‘possible and necessary’ world we put in check-mate the free trade agreement with the United States, the TLC, we stood up for la *Libertad de la Madre Tierra* [the Freedom of Mother Earth], we traveled Colombia to say and listen to how we want it and we visited it again a year later to recover the dignity of the peoples without owners. But that time passed like a sigh. All that was dismantled and since then two agendas have been advancing, the [autonomous] and the communitarian” (Proceso de liberación de la Madre Tierra, 2016, p. 11).

These characteristics are typical of the aesthetic and inhabiting practices of our times, *Wët wët fxizenxi* and *Sumak Kawsay* have always struggled to be as far outside the logic of the market and can be considered examples or precedents to which our many current inhabiting practices are anchored. For this reason, it has been decided to call these contemporary systems not only “inhabiting practices” but also “collective practices of inhabiting.” Although these manifestations are as multiple as cultures and tiny socio-political organizations, they all have in common the characteristics described in this essay: they are collective and closely related to the planet’s ecosystems, which also become support and poetic source.

Collective practices of inhabiting since the Capitalist Night

After having put forward all the above ideas—which emphasize the differences between the collective practices of inhabiting with respect to the architecture of the Capitalist Night—we want to make a wager that at first seems to make no sense. As we said in previous paragraphs, trying to establish this relationship between two systems that seem to deny each other may even be offensive. However, in the light of a more thorough historical approach, aspects are revealed that we believe it is important to name. There is a widespread belief that all inhabiting manifestations during the Capitalist Night were known as *architecture* and that every manifestation of the constructive function of territorial trans-formation was *architecture*. But, as incredible as it may seem to us, it was not so.

We can see now, that there was no architecture beyond capitalism. There were other collective practices of inhabiting not monopolized, captured and *encubiertas* by architecture.

By the end of the Capitalist Night it was clear that, there were no alternative architectures, but alternatives to architecture, that there were no struggles for the autonomy of architecture, but autonomous struggles from architecture. That even if some could imagine or recognize alternative architectural practices, practices committed to socio-environmental justice, equality and change. Still those practices were modulated through the uni-versity dispositif and re/produced architectural abstract labour and the authority complex of whiteness. Those practices did not decolonize anything, all that those practices were doing was sustaining the unsustainable.

That at some point, the complete refusal of architecture, given its *doomed condition* (Deamer, 2016b, p. 122), as re/producer of the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*, was not a fatalist call. But rather a scream to reclaim, collective potencies to determine, imagine and construct autonomously our modes of inhabiting, trans-form the territories we care and nurture. Without experts, without professionals. Because our autonomous collective practices of inhabiting did not, and will never, fit into architecture.

It was evident that, conventional decolonial discourse in architecture aimed at including those spatio-territorial doings, that had been violently dominated and excluded, into the professional and disciplinary realm. Some, screamed: stop making architecture! Others, screamed: fuck decolonization of architecture! Or fuck decolonization of architecture unless it really meant un-doing the architect and architecture, ending architecture and opening paths to other doings, not modulated by the disciplinary and professional frames that sustain the *amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination*. Some even revisited the work of a forgotten italian critic, Manfredo Tafuri, who had clearly argued, in *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, that “the search for an alternative within the structures that condition the very character of architectural design [was] indeed an obvious contradiction of terms” (Tafuri, 1976, p. 181).

We must consider architecture as a violent eurocentric spatial technology with uni-versal claims that sustained, constructed and spatialized the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, and constantly reproduced, during the Capitalist Night, asymmetric power relations of class, race and gender. And, such domination was exerted by the professional hierarchization of the architect, overrepresented through these territories by the now forgotten white-colonial-mestizo-cis-hetero-bourgeois-male.

Now, to repeat ourselves in other words, when we refer to collective practices of inhabiting, we are talking, similarly, about what Robert, calls *La libertad de habitar*, the freedom of inhabiting, that “we are fundamentally capable of shaping our concept of the good life and embodying it in livable places” (Robert, 2021, p. 201). A freedom that, was not the *liberal imagination of freedom* as Hartman would say (Hartman, 2022, p. 201), or the “blackmail called freedom that harbors free competition, freedom to vote, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, freedom of rights and duties, freedoms from being dominated.... But we don't want less than that either. In fact, we want more! We want another freedom, overcoming that terminological ambiguity with the revolutionary reality... We want to free human activity from wage labour, human needs from capital, decision from politics, community from the state, our feelings from every variety of religion, creativity from art, love from cultural impositions, fun from capitalist leisure: that is the freedom we want” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2020a, p. 15).

Inhabiting, through the words of Consejo Nocturno, an *occasional* collective existence, that wrote during the Capitalist Night *Un habitar más fuerte que la metrópoli*, following the paradigm of inhabiting by The Invisible Committee, meant “to become ungovernable, it is the force of bonding and weaving of autonomous relationships. It is the perfection of the joy of contemplating oneself and one's own power to act, which means that outside the connection with this order of things there is not only not that economic hardship that the powers that rule hoist to continue ruling, that ‘war of all against all,’ that chaos that is nothing more than a reflection of imperial despotism, but the possibility of an abundance of shared means, their pooling by people who have learned to live-and-fight together” (Consejo Nocturno, 2018, p. 88).

During the Capitalist Night, millions of people were lured and forced to live in settlements known at some point as cities, monstrous agglomerations of bodies, spaces and commodities, mostly commodities. But, as territorial coloniality urbanized the entire planet, The Invisible Committee, noted, “we've heard enough about the ‘city’ and the ‘country,’ and particularly about the supposed ancient opposition between the two. From up close or from afar, what surrounds us looks nothing like that: it is one single urban cloth, without form or order, a bleak zone, endless and undefined, a global continuum of museum-like hypercenters and natural parks, of enormous suburban housing developments and massive agricultural projects, industrial zones and subdivisions, country inns and trendy bars: the metropolis. Certainly the ancient city existed, as did the cities of medieval and modern times. But there is no such thing as a metropolitan city. All territory is subsumed by the

metropolis. Everything occupies the same space, if not geographically then through the intermeshing of its networks” (The Invisible Committee, 2009, p. 52).

During that scenario of violent metropolization, Consejo Nocturno, argued accurately, that there were *no metropolitan revolts, only revolts against the metropolis*, “considering that the metropolis is the consummate negation of inhabiting, inhabiting must begin by freeing itself from the metropolis. [...] Among the ruins of the disaster of metropolitan life there appears then an inhabiting, a reconquest of presence in the world” (Consejo Nocturno, 2018, p. 90,101). And, underscore that, “to inhabit entails a territorial experiment completely heterogeneous to those about which urban planners and metropolitan managers fantasize: to inhabit a territory is first of all to experience ourselves territorially, that is, within a process of depersonalization that, like the wind, overflows any designation of boundaries and opens up a thousand possibilities. To inhabit cancels, in a certain sense, all cartography, any separate and bureaucratic conception of reality that opposes the sovereign Self and the set of entities over which it operates. There is no management of the real, only of its caricature. [...]

There can be no living in the metropolis, the uninhabitable par excellence, but only ever against the metropolis. When two or more people ally themselves and begin to conspire together, when others begin to love each other on the fringes of the capitalist axiom, when a space acquires an intensity and a form-of-life, the metropolis no longer takes place [*no tiene lugar*], since it no longer superimposes itself over our existences and our territorialities. If the metropolis functions as the consummate negation of inhabitation, the latter begins the moment we free ourselves from it. In this sense, all living is always on the outside. If ‘to inhabit’ means to come into contact with the full range and details of our existence, it is also to become autonomous in the broadest sense of the term” (Consejo Nocturno, 2018, p. 98,96).

To Our Friends, written by the anonymous collective The Invisible Committee during the Capitalist Night, drew a compelling argument to co-move beyond-against and beyond the paradigm of government towards, the paradigm of inhabiting, “not a return to earth but a reinhabiting of earth. [...] Reinhabiting the earth means, to start with, no longer living in ignorance of the conditions of our existence. [...] Fully inhabiting is all that can be set against the paradigm of government. [...] We will take on the secession that capital already practices, therefore, but in our own way. Seceding is not carving a part of the territory out of the national whole, it’s not isolating oneself, cutting off communications with all the rest—that would be certain death. Seceding is not using the scraps of this world to assemble counter-clusters where alternative communities would bask in their imaginary autonomy vis-à-vis the metropolis—that already figures into the plans of the DATAR, which has already foreseen letting them vegetate in their harmless marginality. Seceding means inhabiting a territory, assuming our situated configuration of the world, our way of dwelling there, the form of life and the truths that sustain us, and from there entering into conflict or complicity. So it means linking up strategically with other zones of dissidence, intensifying our circulations with friendly regions, regardless of

borders. To secede is to break not with the national territory but with the existing geography itself. It's to trace out a different, discontinuous geography, an intensive one, in the form of an archipelago—and thus to go encounter places and territories that are close to us, even if there are 10,000 kilometers to cover” (The Invisible Committee, 2015, p. 89,98,164,184).

In *Un comunismo más fuerte que la metrópoli: La Autonomía Italiana en la década de 1970*, Tarì narrated the experience of *Autonomia* during the 1970's throughout what used to be known as Italy, as “communism against the metropolis,” that was “what the existence of diffuse autonomy meant in the Italy of the seventies, [as] one of the strategic elements of ‘the coming insurrection’ (Tarì, 2016, p. 116). During that experience “the question was again, and still is, on the one hand, how to get the new social figures, which were growing within and against development, to reject and destroy not only capital but themselves as part of capital, that is, to refuse to be subjects, thus relocating the whole of the struggles and, on the other hand, fundamental question, how to build an organization of autonomies that could assume the clash against the state apparatuses. It was no longer a question, as workerism wanted, of fighting ‘within and against,’ it was time for the ‘outside and against.’ In 1977 an attempt was made to make that leap” (Tarì, 2016, p. 91).

Tarì, noted, regarding labour absenteeism and a research by Primo Maggio that; “this practice of self-defense always used by the workers had become so widespread and massive that it had become an authentic form of struggle and of life that spoke a new language, which was no longer only that of the subtraction of time from production, but also that of the refusal of the workers’ identity, that of the practices of de-subjection that in all segments of society were shown to be at the center of revolutionary action: separating oneself from the identities that were the fruit of the devices of subjectivation became, from that moment on, a priority of the Movement. ‘*Via dalle linee*’ said a struggle song of those years, and the lines were everywhere in the social factory: no one wanted to stay ‘at its post,’ none wanted to remain a ‘subject,’ all conspired against the state, production and.... metaphysics. To become extinct as working class, as student, as unemployed person, as man, as woman, as intellectual, as homosexual, as pensioner, and even as militant: extinction of all predicates derived from belonging to capitalist civilization. It was the attempt at a mass de-subjection aimed at undermining the foundations of capitalist development, an armed exodus of all identity so that the old bosses’ dialectic became a piece of antiquarianism” (Tarì, 2016, p. 128). Towards the “communization of existence. To discuss everything about oneself, in order to become common singularities” (Tarì, 2016, p. 137).

“The sites of *Autonomia* were, in general, the spatialization of what was the level of insubordination in the urban neighborhoods and small towns, where the Movement did not cease to grow in extension and intensity. Many of the ‘official’ sites of the various autonomous tendencies were not closed in on themselves, but were open to the common use of the many experiences of struggle that were born in the diffuse metropolis, and this collectivization was practiced to the end, assuming even the risks it entailed. Then there were the

collective apartments, great laboratories of struggles, loves and friendships that reinforced the ethical fabric of the Movement. But it will be especially in the squares that the flows of subversion will find their point of densification. Throughout Italy, the squares, especially those located near the universities, became for a time 'liberated territories' and self-defended, within which the various collectives and individuals socialized their desires and their behaviors. Squares where people organized themselves and also where they talked, smiled, fought, where they collectively lived not the dream of another possible world but the reality of a Movement that transformed daily life hour after hour, without waiting for anything or anyone. The metropolitan political topography was completely shaken by this form of mass appropriation. Autonomia therefore also meant autonomy of territories, of places, of spaces. It was another world, yes, but with respect to the deserted, plasticized and hypervigilated squares the European metropolis of the time" (Tarì, 2016, p. 93).

If we only delve into the hegemonic social, political, aesthetic and spatial structures during the Capitalist Night, we will find what was called *architecture*. But if we understand the Capitalist Night as the imposition (never all-encompassing) of a dominant structure—the western one, as it is called in the texts of the time—we can understand that not all societies and not all human cultures took the suicidal route of voracious capitalism. Let's not forget that "no apparatus of capture is a totality; no apparatus of capture can indeed succeed in the entirety of its attempted capture" (Bey, 2023, p. 8). In certain writings of the K'iche' thinker Gladys Tzul Tzul (Tzul Tzul, 2016), written during the second decade of the XXI century, the communal structures in resistance to western capitalism are described as archipelagos that caress the ocean and prevent the world from being covered by its waters. In keeping with this idea, perhaps describing the Capitalist Night as a great tsunami is a more appropriate metaphor: a great wave tried to cover with destructive force the cultural territories of the world's great diversity of cultures and societies in order to destroy them, but, despite the debacle, small territories resisted the constant threat of being devoured by the logics of the market—much of the life on these territories was molded in that fear and resistance. Far from the great Western metropolises—physical and intellectual, of which historical studies are concerned, where elites hitched humanity to a chariot leading to environmental cataclysm, we can find traces of a conglomerate of tiny social islands that existed in veiled or active opposition to the capitalist tsunami. Many of them were made up of; what in those times were called "indigenous peoples;" the wretched of the earth—as the twentieth century militant Afro-Caribbean psychiatrist and philosopher Frantz Fanon would say—; and also of urban nuclei known since the nineteenth century, as anarchists, later to be known just as autonomists. It was there that the process of transformation really began, that against all odds, reversed the terrible effects of climate change, the civilizatory catastrophe, and brought us to this future—which in the eyes of those societies surely seemed too utopian.

It was in these other cognitive and social territories, *social laboratories*, *laboratories for rehearsing how to live free* as Hartman would have said, where, from that time, we can find evidence that inhabiting—and poetic

manifestations in particular—functioned in a similar way as they do now. The traditional inhabitations of many peoples, had practices that did not become a commodity within the logic of the amalgam of patriarchy-capitalism and colonial domination, and refused the imposed *class-sexualized-racialized* division of labour, and the manual/intellectual divide.

With this evidence, which is increasingly being addressed in history circles, we believe that it is necessary to refuse that period and everything that was established during the Capitalist Night, including architecture. We can begin to study the *diverse constellations* of the *dispersed experiences of conviviality*, the pericapitalist ones, that made life possible, and find there paths in which the multiple manifestations that we now call “collective practices of inhabiting” can be recognized, that is to say, to find in those *experiences* the clues of the modes of inhabitation, as ways of composi(t)ng the *means* and *relations* of inhabitation, that were not architecture. Dispersed experiences as horizons, as Zibechi beautifully noted, that practiced “planting as a ritual attitude of life, without the ambition of also being the one who harvests” (Zibechi, 2015a, p. 383). As *Proceso de Liberación de la Madre Tierra* del pueblo Nasa say: “Cosechamos lo que sembraron los que ya no están. Sembramos para quienes no han nacido. Porque la cosa es despacio...—We harvest what those who are no longer here have planted. We plant for those who have not been born. Because things are slow...” (Proceso de liberación de la Madre Tierra, 2019).

Perhaps in those territories of creation, in r-existence to the Capitalist Night, we can find the genealogies to which we can ascribe, with the joy of feeling co-moved, our contemporary autonomous modes of inhabiting, in order to keep in mind, as Gabi Ngcobo, notes that, still, “we are not un/done yet” (Ngcobo, 2018). As the Zapatistas have been saying for more than three centuries, as part of the *caminar preguntando: hay que buscar el modo*, because *el camino no está trazado sino que se hace caminando* (Etcétera, 2263, p. 112).

experiment *is* everywhere

“The air is alive with the possibilities of assembling, gathering, congregating. At any moment, the promise of insurrection, the miracle of upheaval: small groups, people by themselves, and strangers threaten to become an ensemble, to incite treason en masse” (Hartman, 2019, p. 19)

“No, no, you were there, in coalition with others, insurrecting as a mode of sociality, knowing that even if nothing changes, everything, for all of you, will be forever changed” (Bey, 2023, p. 17)

This ~~thesis~~ presentation was not an educational effort “that emerged as a brilliant conclusion of an ideological group, [...] we are not interested in launching a new work into the world because we believe that in this world the only missing work is its destruction” (cuadernos de NEGACIÓN, 2011, p. 4).

Notes

¹ Forever grateful to Astrid Y. Cuero for opening and facilitating the possibility, during march 2023, to study this and other salsa songs together at *El Racismo del Salario. Articulaciones entre Género, Trabajo y Racialización*.

² By *beyond-against and beyond*, we follow the “larger polemic” sustained between Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar and John Holloway, as Gutiérrez Aguilar, observes: “The nodal point of the discrepancy is that if, for the understanding of struggles and their unfolding, we place at the center the multiple and heterogeneous efforts to guarantee the sustainability of life in contexts of growing aggressiveness and capitalist devastation, that is, if the starting point of reflection is the reproduction of life and not the different ‘modes’ of production and accumulation of capital, then we consider it necessary to understand life itself as struggle, in a simultaneously negative and self-affirming key. The daily vital self-affirmation, capable of overflowing that which contains and denies it—a negative moment—has historically, moreover, generally been the affair of women. That moment is the one we are trying to capture with the first ‘beyond.’ The second ‘beyond’ is included to illuminate the politicization processes of such a set of immediate and daily struggles. We not only trace, then, the aspects of the unfolding of antagonism—against and beyond capital—but we inquire into the very conditions of possibility of such unfolding and find them in the immediately antagonistic self-affirmation to capital implied by the multiple doings engaged in the struggle to guarantee the material and symbolic reproduction of life.” For more, see *Horizontes comunitario-populares: Producción de lo común más allá de las políticas estado-céntricas*, (Gutiérrez Aguilar, 2017, p. 88)

³ It is beyond the scope—interest—of this research to problematize fully the meddling between autonomous discourse and architecture. Architecture’s epistemic coloniality operates from north to south. In the last decades two discourses on autonomy have been popular on the architectural discipline, that is in the white colonial north discourse of the built environment. First Peter Eisenman with his capricious formalist autonomy. Which does not deserve more than what Derrida wrote on his 1989 letter:

“My dear Peter:

I would like, and your listeners in Irvine, I imagine, will perhaps like, to hear you speak about the relations between architecture today and poverty. All poverties, the one about which Benjamin speaks and the other; between architecture and capital (the equivalent today of the “economic crisis” occurring in 1930 “in der Tur,” in the “opening of the door”); between architecture and war (the equivalent today of the “shadow” and of what “comes” with it); the scandals surrounding social housing, “housing” in general (not without recalling what we have both said, which is a little too complicated for a letter, of the habitable and the inhabitable in architecture), and the “homeless,” “homelessness” today in the United States and elsewhere” (Derrida, 1990, p. 11). His formalist masturbation has nothing to say of such issues.

Most recently the second discourse on autonomy has been lead by Pier Vittorio Aureli, an architect and follower of italian operaist autonomia. As Douglas Spencer notes, the “issues with Aureli, to crudely summarize these, are twofold. Firstly, that he overestimates the formal capacity of architecture, conceived as its political essence, to act against the economic impact of capitalist urbanization. Secondly, I don’t believe that there is any authentic or true way of being for human subjects. I see his work as premised on the notion that architecture can insulate a certain idea, or ideal, of the self from outside interference, or can sustain certain idealized models of community (Spencer, 2020, p. 216)

We move apart and against these two notions/calls of the autonomy *of* architecture. The autonomy *of* architecture is a white dream. We *co-move* towards the autonomy *from* architecture.

⁴ Emily Anne Parker in *The Human as Double Bind: Sylvia Wynter and the Genre of “Man,”* uses “*bodiment*” instead of *embodiment* because [she] takes the latter to be a hylomorphic term, *em-bodiment*, which suggests that something immaterial has passed into something material (*em-*). In this way the concept of embodiment problematically suggests that a body is divisible into agency as ‘form’ and inertness as ‘matter’” (Parker, 2018, p. 448).

⁵ By mutually illuminating intra-action, we follow bell hooks in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*, who writes that her “pedagogical practices have emerged from the mutually illuminating interplay of anticolonial, critical, and feminist pedagogies” (hooks, 1994, p. 10). And for Karen Barad intra-action “is a key element of agential realist framework. The neologism ‘intra-action’ means “the mutual constitution of entangled agencies [phenomena /

configurations]. That is to say, unlike the usual "interaction," which assumes that there are separate individual agencies that precede their interaction, the notion of intra-action recognizes that the different agencies do not precede, but arise through their intra-action. It is important to note that "different" agencies are only different in a relation to each other, not in an absolute sense, that is, the agencies are only different in relation to their mutual intertwining; they do not exist as individual elements" *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (Barad, 2007, p. 33).

⁶ In Karen Barad's, "agential realist account, discursive practices are specific material (re)configurings of the world through which the determination of boundaries, properties, and meaning is differentially enacted. That is, discursive practices are ongoing agential intra-actions of the world through which specific determinacies (along with complementary indeterminacies) are enacted within the phenomena produced. [...] The point is not merely that there are important material factors in addition to discursive ones; rather, the issue is the conjoined material-discursive nature of constraints, conditions, and practices." See Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (Barad, 2007, pp. 146–153).

⁷ At coopia we have been co-moving, or rehearsing how to co-move, through the *sentir-pensar-hacer* of *abrazar la in-certidumbre*, embracing un-certainty. Particularly through the multi-year project Caribe Mutuo at/with the amphibian territories and communities that inhabit *la ciénaga del Guájaro* in the colombian Caribbean.

⁸ Even though "no apparatus of capture is a totality" Bey, 2023 | 8 | |zu:4992462:TAL7M97H}, "alternative world- making projects tend to become absorbed into the dominant world-making project" (Meyerhoff, 2019, p. 19), and decoloniality has been captured by reactive politics. Decoloniality has been captured by architecture. Already examples of capture, are all the *adjective architectures*: vernacular, feminist, participatory, sustainable, amongst many more. We can see it coming. The wave of decolonial architecture. The next years will be flooded with nonsensical discourse and renderings of decolonial architecture.

⁹ Forever grateful to danie valencia sepúlveda for invoking us to *study*, and to everyone with whom we have sustained through and around the reading, study and research circle on neoliberalism, subjectivity and psychic suffering.

¹⁰ Orlando Fals Borda argues there are four constitutive *pueblos* in the colombian context: "the primary indigenous people, the blacks of the palenques, the poor anti-seigniorial peasant-artisans of hispanic origin, and the settlers and patriarchs of the agricultural hinterland. From them [Fals Borda] derive, respectively, the following fundamental values: solidarity, freedom, dignity and autonomy" (Fals Borda, 2014, p. 39)

¹¹ This was mentioned by Braulio during a conversation at the coopia laboratory: *Contra y más allá del capitalismo: arquitectura del desplazamiento, la profesionalización y el patriarcado* in 2022. It is also addressed in his website in the text: *Hacia una poética arquitectónica: Alternativas contra el desarrollo urbano Proemio* (Hornedo Rocha, 2019)

¹² For more about Hannes Meyer see:

Borra, B. (2013). Hannes Meyer: Co-op Architecture. *San Rocco*, 6(Collaborations), 97–105.

Borra, B. (2014). *The Architecture of Co-operation: A Project for organizing collective creativity* [Doctoral Thesis].

Tu Delft: The Berlage.

Franklin Unkind, R. (1997). *Hannes Meyer in Mexico (1939-49)*. Technion-Israel Institute of Technology.

Franklin Unkind, R. (2012). Los riesgos de la vanguardia: Hannes Meyer, de la precisión matemática a la defensa ideológica. *DC PAPERS: revista de crítica y teoría de la arquitectura*, 23, 23–30.

Franklin Unkind, R. (2013). Experiencias de urbanismo: Los proyectos urbanos de Hannes Meyer en México (1938-1949). *Dearq*, 12, 28–41.

Heynen, H. (2000). *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique*. MIT Press.

Meyer, H., Franklin, R., Aureli, P. V., & Antonas, A. (2015). *Hannes Meyer: Co-op Interieur*. Spector Books.

Möller, W., & Leik, T. (Eds.). (2015). *The co-op principle: Hannes Meyer and the concept of collective design* (R. P. Williams & K. Globke, Trans.; First edition). Spector Books.

Ynzenga, B. (2017). Hannes Meyer: Hacia, en y después de la Bauhaus = Hannes Meyer, a difficult path. *Cuadernos de Proyectos Arquitectónicos*, 7, Article 7.

¹³ For more about *Arquitectura y Autogobierno* see:

- AMADOR. (1977). *La Historia de Arquitectura Autogobierno*.
- Arias Montes, J. V. (2009a). *Pasajes históricos del autogobierno 1975-1984*. Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Arias Montes, J. V. (2009b). *Publicaciones del Autogobierno: Facultad de Arquitectura UNAM 1976-1984* (C. Ríos Garza, Ed.). Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Arias Montes, J. V. (2016). *Arquitectura Autogobierno 40 AÑOS*. *Archipiélago. Revista cultural de nuestra América*, 20(76), Article 76.
- Arias Montes, J. V. (2019). *Una experiencia en la enseñanza-aprendizaje de la arquitectura. El caso del autogobierno en arquitectura de la unam*. UNAM.
- Arias Montes, J. V., Benavides Abril, E., Palavicini Urzáis, H., & Casas Peñalosa, R. (2018). *BASTA! Arquitectura autogobierno Balance y perspectivas 1972-2018*. Comité de Arquitectura en Lucha CAL.
- CAL, C. de A. del A. en L. (1972). *BASTA! Comisión de difusión del Comité de Arquitectura en Lucha*.
- García Tellez, R. M. (1986). *Arquitectura-autogobierno. Una experiencia académico-política en la UNAM*. UNAM.
- Jiménez Muñoz, V. (Ed.). (1976). *Arquitectura autogobierno 1-6* (Vol. 1-6). Escuela Nacional de Arquitectura - Autogobierno UNAM.
- Labastida Zavala, G. L. (1983). *Análisis y evaluación crítica de modelo de enseñanza aprendizaje del autogobierno-arquitectura*. UANM.
- Macías Narro, A. (2010). *El Autogobierno de la Escuela Nacional de Arquitectura-UNAM 1972-1980*.
- ¹⁴ So-called colombia, has some gross architectural dynasties devoted to guard and reproduce their bourgeois class power. Some of these dynasties are: Arias, Bermúdez, Bonilla, Brunner, Castro, Cruz, de Brigard, Esguerra, Gnecco, Hosie, Jiménez, Largacha, Llorente, Manrique, Mazuera, Mazzanti, Obregón, Pizano, Pradilla, Robledo, Samper, Santamaría, Serna, amongst other.
- ¹⁵ *Albañil* in spanish means construction worker, the title of the song would be something like John Mason
- ¹⁶ "Crypto-Jews of the Iberian Peninsula. The term, which is frequently derived from the New Testament phrase "maran atha" ("our Lord hath come"), denotes in Spanish "damned," "accursed," "banned"; also "hog," and in Portuguese it is used as an opprobrious epithet of the Jews because they do not eat pork. The name was applied to the Spanish Jews who, through compulsion or for form's sake, became converted to Christianity in consequence of the cruel persecutions of 1391 and of Vicente Ferrer's missionary sermons. These "conversos" (converts), as they were called in Spain, or "Christãos Novos" (Neo-Christians) in Portugal, or "Chuetas" in the Balearic Isles, or "Anusim" (constrained) in Hebrew, numbered more than 100,000. With them the history of the Pyrenean Peninsula, and indirectly that of the Jews also, enters upon a new phase; for they were the immediate cause both of the introduction of the Inquisition into Spain and of the expulsion of the Jews from that country" (Joseph Jacobs & Kayserling, 1906).
- ¹⁷ According to Prakash and Esteva "A third stage followed Illich's queries into 'the historical circumstances under which the very idea of educational needs can arise' He came to understand education as learning when it takes place under the assumption of scarcity in the means which produce it' (Illich in Hern 1996, be). [...]
- The parting of Freire and Illich is important for grasping this third stage in his philosophical investigations of the substance of education. They met in the early 1960s and became close friends when Illich accepted the tutorship of Dom Helder Camara and was sent by him to talk with Freire. A few years later, Illich had the opportunity to rescue Freire from a Brazilian jail, bring him to Cuernavaca, and publish his first book out of Brazil. Deschooling Society refers to the work of Freire's group with admiration.
- Their parting of ways occurred when Illich moved beyond the criticism of the system of schooling. Clearly grasping what education does to foster the belief that people need help or 'empowerment' (as it is called today) to 'gain insights into reality, and have to be helped to prepare for existence or for living,' Illich warned of the looming threat of today's compulsory adult education:
- 'This became for me the thing I wanted to analyze very critically. Therefore, despite its good and solid tradition, it was I who moved away from the approach for which Paulo has become the outstanding spokesman during the '60s and early '70s not only in Latin America but all over the world ... I remember Paulo with immense affection, but also as

somebody who more and more wanted to save the credibility of educational activities at a time when my main concern had become a questioning of the conditions which shape education in any form, including conscientization or psychoanalysis or whatever it might be' (Illich in Cayley 1992. 206-207).

In 'the pedagogy of the oppressed' Illich saw another turn of the educational screw. Neither interested in improving the educational system nor in shutting down schools, Illich offered evidence that saying 'NO' to education was a matter of decency and courage. Educational alternatives or alternative schools simply cover up the fact that the project of education is fundamentally flawed and indecent—despite its Schindlers and Schindlers' lists (Illich 1996, 258-259)." (Prakash & Esteva, 2008, p. 72).

Esteva, Prakash and Stuchul, in *From a pedagogy for liberation to liberation from pedagogy*, argue, against the conventional grain, of the "well-established image of Freire as a progressive, radical or even revolutionary educator, it may seem preposterous, outrageous or even ridiculous to present him—as [they] do in this essay—as a conservative thinker and practitioner. Even more, on both theoretical and political grounds, we present him as a colonizer" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 1). Their main critique to Freire was, following Illich, that the only people "who can change circumstances—and thus change other *men* and the world—are privileged agents: principally, educated educators" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 4). "The oppressed can neither liberate themselves from oppression, nor can they even perceive fully this oppression. Thus, the mediator must endow the oppressed with both awareness and conscience: the perception of the oppression itself and the characterization of the oppressive system so that its dismantling becomes possible. In both cases, what is supposedly needed is a specific abstract, rational perception, with a specific theory about the oppression and its causes. Such theory takes for granted: 1) that such awareness defines 'true' reality, 2) that the oppressed lack such awareness and conscience, and 3) that such awareness and conscience are preconditions for the required liberation and transformation to occur" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 5). "Freire was particularly unable to perceive the impact of the corruption which occurs when the oppressed are transformed into the objects of service: as clients, beneficiaries, and customers. Having created a radical separation between his oppressed and their educators, Freire was unsuccessful in bringing them together, despite all his attempts to do so through his dialogue, his deep literacy—key words for empowerment and participation. All these pedagogical and curricular tools of education prove themselves repeatedly to be counterproductive: they produce the opposite of what they pretend to create. Instead of liberation, they add to the lives of oppressed clients, more chains and more dependency on the pedagogy and curricula of the mediator" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 8). "Freire's central presupposition: that education is a universal good, part and parcel of the human condition, was never questioned, in spite of the fact that he was personally exposed, for a long time, to an alternative view" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 12). "Freire's pedagogy of liberation, viewed with archeological eyes, is yet another modern tool and technology used against vernacular probity and honor. The universal conscience and the institutional rules guarding it are doomed to colonize, standardize, and tame the wilderness of what still remains vernacular" (Esteva et al., 2005, p. 17).

¹⁸ See the "multiyear collaborative research project" *Radical Pedagogies* "by Beatriz Colomina with the PhD students at Princeton University School of Architecture" www.radical-pedagogies.com and the compilation by Harriet Harriss and Daisy Froud, *Radical Pedagogies: Architectural Education & the British Tradition* (RIBA Publications, 2015).

To emphasize again, through Illich and Esteva, we are not arguing for alternative educations, nor architectures, but alternatives to education and architecture. Beyond-against and beyond pedagogy as the theories, methodologies, and practices of teaching.

¹⁹ Conversation between Colin Ward and Judith Suissa. cited in Suissa 2006

²⁰ Deamer and The Architecture Lobby, promote deprofessionalization differently: "While 'deprofessionalization,' for many, is a negative term, depicting deskilling in the 'learned professions,' it merely alludes to unburdening a group—still competency-certified and still passionately driven—of its ideological hang-ups: aristocratic class identification, specialization that holds us apart from other actors in the AEC industry, the false ideal of superior expertise, ignorance of a complex balance of diverse social forces, unfulfilled notions of autonomy, fictitious ideas of being above business, the expense of elite education" (Deamer, 2020a, p. 103).

²¹With coopia we have co-moving through the notion of the revolts of spatial doings against architectural labour. See “*La mesa, la olla, las hojas: A Conversation on the Revolts of Spatial-Doings Beyond-Against and Beyond Architectural Labor* (coopia, 2024)

²²*Dejar de sostener lo sostenible* (coopia, 2020) was coopia's first protect, first text, first rehearsal, first cooperative experiment into collective *sentir-pensar-hacer* through text.

¡Estamos exhaustas de sostener lo insostenible! La posibilidad de proponer futuros ante la crisis climática desde la arquitectura, es intrascendente.

Nuestro ejercicio reconoce las dimensiones de la catástrofe planetaria como consecuencia de la perpetuación del capitalismo.

El falso dualismo entre sociedad/naturaleza ha legitimado la dominación y la propiedad, se ha sustituido el principio de lo común provocando explotación,

acumulación,

discriminación,

dominación,

especulación,

expulsión

Confinar la arquitectura a imaginar futuros sostenibles bajo estas condiciones, supone la negación y reproducción de sus efectos destructivos.

Proponemos desde la arquitectura, rechazar el capitalismo y producir otros agenciamientos en el presente, buscar espacios de conexión, de manera transdisciplinar, cooperativos y relacionales.

—

We are exhausted of sustaining the unsustainable! The possibility of proposing futures in the face of the climate crisis from the perspective of architecture is inconsequential.

Our exercise recognizes the dimensions of the planetary catastrophe as a consequence of the perpetuation of capitalism.

The false dualism between society/nature has legitimized domination and property, the principle of the common has been substituted, provoking exploitation,

accumulation,

discrimination,

domination,

speculation,

expulsion

To confine architecture to imagine sustainable futures under these conditions, supposes the denial and reproduction of its destructive effects.

We propose, from architecture, to refuse capitalism and to produce other agencies in the present, to look for spaces of connection, in a transdisciplinary, cooperative and relational way.

²³Orlando Fals Borda, proposed the concept of *antiélite* as “that set of people belonging to groups of high prestige in a society, who, for ideological reasons, take a stand against the existing things, seeking to change the order and the dominance of political power” (Fals Borda, 1968, p. 55).

Bibliography and unsolicited collaborations *o como se llamen*

- Aalbers, Manuel B. (2015). Corporate Financialization. In Noel Castree, Michael F. Goodchild, Audrey Kobayashi, Weidong Liu, & Richard A. Marston (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment and Technology*. Wiley.
- Aalbers, Manuel B. (2016). *The financialization of housing: A political economy approach*. Routledge.
- Aalbers, Manuel B. (2017). Financialization. In Noel Castree, Michael F. Goodchild, Audrey Kobayashi, Weidong Liu, & Richard A. Marston (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment and Technology*.
- Aalbers, Manuel B. & Centro COES. (2020, January 20). *Entrevista con Manuel Aalbers | COES*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0SwRDXDkDuk>
- Abeles, Martín, Pérez Caldentey, Esteban, & Valdecantos, Sebastián. (2018). *Estudios sobre financierización en América Latina*. Cepal. <https://repository.eclac.org/handle/11362/43596>
- ACTO. (2022, July 17). *ACTO Escuela de arquitectura*. <https://actoarquitectura.com/>, <https://actoarquitectura.com/>, <https://actoarquitectura.com/>
- Adams, Ross Exo. (2014a). Natura Urbans, Natura Urbanata: Ecological Urbanism, Circulation, and the Immunization of Nature. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32(1), 12–29. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d17012>
- Adams, Ross Exo. (2014b). Notes from the resilient city. *Log*, 32, 126–139.
- Adams, Ross Exo. (2014c). To fill the Earth: Architecture in a spaceless universe. In Nadir Lahiji (Ed.), *Architecture Against the Post-Political: Essays in Reclaiming the Critical Project*.
- Adams, Ross Exo. (2016). Toward a theory of Interior. In Teresa Stoppani, Giorgio Ponzio, & George Themistokleous (Eds.), *This Thing Called Theory*.
- Adeyemo, Dele. (2017). Resilience Strategy. *Real Review*, 5.
- Adler, Gerald. (2016). Pragmatics: Towards a theory of things. In Teresa Stoppani, Giorgio Ponzio, & George Themistokleous (Eds.), *This Thing Called Theory*.
- Adorno, Theodor W. (2004). *Negative dialectics*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Adorno, Theodor W. (2005). *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Routledge.
- Adorno, Theodor W., & Horkheimer, Max. (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Gunzelin Noeri, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Adpprentice. (2021). *Adpprentice Facebook*. <https://www.facebook.com/adpprentice/>
- Adpprentice. (2023). *Adpprentice*. <https://adpprentice.ai/>
- AEI. (2023). *AEI Spaces*. <https://aeispaces.com/>
- Aguilar Gil, Yásnaya E. (2017). Ëëts, atom. Algunos apuntes sobre la identidad indígena. *Revista de La Universidad de México*, 18, 17–23.
- Aguilar Gil, Yásnaya E. (2018). El Estado mexicano como apropiador cultural. *Revista de La Universidad de México*, 7, 130–133.
- Aguilar Gil, Yásnaya E. (2020). *Ää: Manifiestos sobre la diversidad lingüística*. Almadía Ediciones.
- Aguilar Gil, Yásnaya E. (2022a). *Un nosotrxs sin estado* (7th ed.). OnA ediciones.
- Aguilar Gil, Yásnaya E. (2022b). Una Mesoamérica Distópica. In *FUTURO ANCESTRAL* (2nd ed.). OnA ediciones.
- Aguilar Gil, Yásnaya E., & Redes Comunes Mixes. (2021). El arte, la literatura y las estéticas colectivas de la tierra. In Javier Cárdenas & Verónica Gerber Bicecci (Eds.), *En una orilla brumosa: Cinco rutas para repensar los futuros de las artes visuales y la literatura*. Gris tormenta.
- Aguirre Beltrán, Gonzalo. (1984). *La Población negra de México: Estudio etnohistórico*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Albán Achinte, Adolfo. (2013). Pedagogías de la re-existencia. Artistas indígenas y afrocolombianos. In Catherine Walsh (Ed.), *Pedagogías decoloniales. Tomo I: Prácticas insurgentes de resistir, (re)existir y (re)vivir* (1 edition). Editorial Abya-Yala.

- Alberti, Leon Battista. (1988). *De re aedificatoria (On the Art of Building in Ten Books)* (Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach, & Robert Tavernor, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Alcantara, Armando. (2008). Políticas educativas y neoliberalismo en México: 1982-2006. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 48, 147–165. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie480694>
- Alfaro, Yanin. (2016, October 7). *7 consejos para convertirte en el próximo "arquistar."* Obras. <https://obras.expansion.mx/arquitectura/2016/10/07/7-consejos-para-convertirte-en-el-proximo-arquistar>
- Alimonda, Héctor. (2009). Sobre la insostenible colonialidad de la naturaleza latinoamericana. *Ecología Política de La Amazonia. Las Profusas y Difusas Redes de La Gobernanza*, 61–96.
- Alliez, Eric, & Goffey, Andrew (Eds.). (2011). *The Guattari effect*. Continuum.
- Almendra Quiguanás, Vilma Rocío. (2017). *Entre la emancipación y la captura. Memorias y caminos desde la lucha Nasa en Colombia* (1st ed.). Pensaré Cartonéras.
- Alston, Ashanti Omowali. (2003). *Black Anarchism*. Speech at Hunter College, NYC. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/ashanti-omowali-alston-black-anarchism>
- altiplano, estudio de arquitectura. (2018). *Portafolio altiplano*.
- Alva Martínez, Ernesto. (1998). La enseñanza de la arquitectura. *47 al Fondo*, 2.
- AMADOR. (1977). *La Historia de Arquitectura Autogobierno*.
- Amaral, Camilo. (2016). Prince complex: Narcissism and reproduction of the architectural mirror. In Teresa Stoppani, Giorgio Ponzio, & George Themistokleous (Eds.), *This Thing Called Theory*.
- Amin, Ash. (1997). Placing Globalization. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 14(2), 123–137.
- Anderson, Perry. (2001). Historia y lecciones de neoliberalismo. *El otro Davos: globalización de resistencias y de luchas, 2001*, ISBN 84-7884-219-5, págs. 13-30, 13–30. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=582834>
- Anderson, William C. (2021). *The nation on no map: Black anarchism and abolition*. AK Press.
- Andina. (2023). ANDINA (@andina.cc) • Fotos y videos de Instagram. <https://www.instagram.com/andina.cc/>
- Andreotti, Libero. (2016). The Misery of Theory: On Universality, Contingency, and Truth. In Nadir Z. Lahiji (Ed.), *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues On Architecture And The Left*.
- Angola, Valeria. (2021, April 27). La interseccionalidad no lo es todo: Otras propuestas desde lo decolonial. *Malvestida*. <https://malvestida.com/2021/04/criticas-a-la-interseccionalidad-desde-el-feminismo-decolonial/>
- Anstey, Tim. (2007). Architecture and Rhetoric: Persuasion, Context, Action. In Tim Anstey, Katja Grillner, & Rolf Hughes (Eds.), *Architecture and authorship*. Black Dog Publishing.
- Anstey, Tim, Grillner, Katja, & Hughes, Rolf (Eds.). (2007). *Architecture and authorship*. Black Dog Publishing.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1983). Speaking In Tongues: A Letter to 3rd World Women Writers. In Cherrie Moraga (Ed.), *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1987). *Borderlands La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (Vol. 3). Aunt Lute San Francisco.
- Arango Cardinal, Silvia M. (1984). Evolución del pensamiento arquitectónico en Colombia 1934-1984. *13° Anuario de La Arquitectura En Colombia. Bogotá: Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos*.
- Aravena, Felipe, Díez Canedo, Joaquín, & Toti, Alessandro. (2016). Commodifying Architectural Education. In Aaron Cayer, Peggy Deamer, Sben Korsh, Eric Peterson, & Manuel Schwartzberg (Eds.), *Asymmetric Labors: The Economy of Architecture in Theory and Practice*. Architecture Lobby.
- Arboleda Quiñónez, Santiago. (2020). Un programa de liberación universal ekobio-céntrico. In Manuel Zapata Olivella, *La rebelión de los genes. El mestizaje americano en la sociedad futura* (2nd ed.). Universidad del Valle.
- Arellano, Mónica. (2021, June 10). Adpprentice: ¿Las universidades mataron a la arquitectura? *ArchDaily México*. <https://www.archdaily.mx/mx/963196/adpprentice-las-universidades-mataron-a-la-arquitectura>
- Arias Montes, José Victor. (2009). *Pasajes históricos del autogobierno 1975-1984*. Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Arias Montes, José Victor. (2019). *Una experiencia en la enseñanza-aprendizaje de la arquitectura. El caso del autogobierno en arquitectura de la unam*. UNAM.
- Arias Montes, José Victor. (2021, 01). *Conversation with José Víctor Arias Montes* [Personal communication].

- Aristotle. (1984). *Vol 2. The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation* (Jonathan Barnes, Ed.; Vol. 1).
- Ariza, Alberto E. (1980). *El Colegio-Universidad de Santo Tomás de Aquino de Santa Fe de Bogotá, 1580, 13 de junio, 1980*. Editorial Kelly.
- ARQcoaching. (2018, March 6). *9 competencias de arquitecto que te ayudarán a trabajar en el sector*. ARQcoaching. <https://www.coachingarquitectos.com/9-competencias-trabajar-de-arquitecto/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2018a). *Taller de Cartagena – Depto. De Arquitectura – Universidad de los Andes*. <https://cartagena.uniandes.edu.co/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2018b, September 20). *Emprende 1.0: Cómo emprender en arquitectura | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/vol-1/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2019, September 26). *Emprende 2.0: Emprender como arquitecto | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/vol-2/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2020, October 1). *Emprende 3.0: Cómo emprender en arquitectura | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/vol-3/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2021, October 7). *Emprende 4.0: Medio Ambiente Construido | Uniandes [2021]*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/emprende-4-0/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2022, October 6). *Emprende 2022 | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/emprende-2022/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2023a). *Emprende: Industria arquitectónica | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2023b). *Plan de estudios | Pregrado en Arquitectura | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/pregrado/informacion/plan-de-estudios-arq/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2023c). *Resilience and planning | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/workshops/resilience-and-planning/>
- ArqDis, Uniandes. (2023d, October 19). *Emprende 2023 | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/eventos/emprende/emprende-2023/>
- Arroyo, Mónica, & Silveira, María Laura. (2022). Prólogo a la segunda edición en español. In Milton Santos, *Por otra globalización: Del pensamiento único a la conciencia universal*. CLACSO.
- Aschner, Juan Pablo. (2021, February 15). *Educación Creativa: La unión académica entre arquitectura, arte, diseño y oficios afines*. ArchDaily México. <https://www.archdaily.mx/mx/957032/educacion-creativa-la-union-academica-entre-arquitectura-arte-diseno-y-oficios-afines>
- Aslan, Azize. (2020). Repensar la Revolución Desde La Autonomía Democrática de Rojava: La Nación Democrática y La Liberación de Las Mujeres. In *Estrategias Descoloniales en Comunidades Sin Estado*.
- Augusto, Acácio, & Passetti, Edson. (2010). Educação e anarquia: Abolir a escola 1. (Originally Published as “Desobediências e Disciplinas”, in *Anarquismos & Educação*. Belo Horizonte: Editora Autêntica, 2008.).
- Aureli, Pier Vittorio. (2004). Architecture and Content: Who’s Afraid Of the Form-Object? *Log*, 3, 29–36.
- Avermaete, Tom, Grafe, Christoph, & Holtrop, Anne. (2007). Redactioneel: Architectuur en momenten van inventie / Editorial: Architecture and moments of invention. *Oase: Journal for Architecture*, 74.
- Aviles, Karina. (2003, April 28). La primera generación neoliberal cambió sus valores: Estudio de la UNAM. *La Jornada*.
- Babson Academy. (2023, April 13). *Babson Collaborative Announces 2023 Award Winners*. Babson Thought & Action. <https://entrepreneurship.babson.edu/babson-collaborative-awards-2023/>
- Balibar, Etienne. (2016). *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy Before and After Marx* (James Swenson, Trans.).
- Barad, Karen. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press.
- Barba, José Bonifacio. (2019). Artículo tercero Constitucional. Génesis, transformación y axiología. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 24(80), 287–316.

- Barbarroja, Vicente, & Tarì, Marcello. (2016). Azufre rojo. El retorno de la Autonomía como estrategia. Introducción a la edición en castellano. In Vicente Barbarroja (Trans.), *Un comunismo más fuerte que la metrópoli: La Autonomía Italiana en la década de 1970*.
- Baronnet, Bruno. (2021). Autonomía zapatista y escuelas en resistencia: Ser educador en los municipios autónomos de Chiapas. In Alicia Hopkins & César Enrique Pineda (Eds.), *Pensar las autonomías. Experiencias de autogestión, poder popular y autonomía*. Bajo Tierra Ediciones.
- Barriandos, Joaquín. (2011). La colonialidad del ver: Hacia un nuevo diálogo visual interepistémico. *Nómadas*, 35, 13–29.
- Barthes, Roland. (1977). The Death of the Author. In *Image Music Text*. Fontana Press.
- Baschet, Jérôme. (2015a). *Adiós al capitalismo: Autonomía, sociedad del buen vivir y multiplicidad de mundos*. Ned ediciones.
- Baschet, Jérôme. (2015b). La Escuelita zapatista y el contagio con la autonomía. In Pensaré Cartoneras (Ed.), *Aprender escuchando: Autonomía, educación y guerrilla en Chiapas y Kurdistan*. Pensaré Cartoneras.
- Baschet, Jérôme. (2018). *¡Rebeldía, resistencia y autonomía! La experiencia zapatista*. Ediciones y Gráficos Eón.
- Basole, Amit. (2009). Eurocentrism, the university, and multiple Sites of Knowledge Production. In The Edu-factory Collective (Ed.), *Toward a Global Autonomous University: Cognitive Labor, The Production of Knowledge, and Exodus from the Education Factory* (First edition, pp. 32–38). Autonomedia.
- Beas Torres, Carlos. (2021). *Contra la historia del poder: Las historias de los otros y las otras*. Ce-Acatl.
- Beas Torres, Carlos. (2023). Comunalidad y Resistencia Indígena en las Raíces del Comunismo Libertario. *La Grieta. Voces Anarquistas*, 6.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. (2015). *The Second Sex*. Random House.
- Becker, Gary S. (1994). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, 3rd Edition.
- Bee, Michele, & Desmarais-Tremblay, Maxime. (2023). The Birth of Homo CEconomicus: The methodological debate on the Economic Agent from J. S. Mill to V. Pareto. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 45(1), 1–26.
- Benavides Abril, Eduardo. (2021, 28). *Conversation with Eduardo Benavides Abril* [Personal communication].
- Benjamin, Walter. (1979a). Doctrine of the Similar (1933) (Knut Tarnowski, Trans.). *New German Critique*, 17, 65–69.
- Benjamin, Walter. (1979b). On the Mimetic Faculty. In Walter Benjamin, *One-way Street and Other Writings*. NLB.
- Benjamin, Walter. (1985). Central Park (Lloyd Spencer & Mark Harrington, Trans.). *New German Critique*, 34, 32–58.
- Benjamin, Walter. (2007). *Conceptos de filosofía de la historia*. Terramar.
- Bensi, Negar Sanaan, & Marullo, Francesco. (2018). The architecture of logistics: Trajectories across the dismembered body of the metropolis: Introduction. *Footprint*, 12(2# 23).
- Berlin, Isaiah. (1981). *Quatro ensaios sobre a Liberdade*. Editora Universidade de Brasília.
- Bernal de Rojas, Aura Elena. (2010). La Universidad Colombiana. Desarrollo histórico. *Paideia Surcolombiana*, 15, Article 15. <https://doi.org/10.25054/01240307.1089>
- Betasamosake Simpson, Leanne. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(3).
- Bey, Marquis. (2019). *Them Goon Rules: Fugitive Essays on Radical Black Feminism*. University of Arizona Press.
- Bey, Marquis. (2020). *Anarcho-blackness: Notes toward a black anarchism*. AK Press.
- Bey, Marquis. (2021). *Black Trans Feminism*. Duke University Press.
- Bey, Marquis. (2022). *Cistem Failure: Essays on Blackness and Cisgender*. Duke University Press.
- Bey, Marquis. (2023, April 18). *Impossible Life: A Meditation on Paraontology*. Ill Will. <https://illwill.com/impossible-life>
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1986). Foreword: Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition. In Charles Lam Markmann (Trans.), *Black skin, white masks*. Pluto Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1990). *Nation and Narration*. Psychology Press.
- Bird Rose, Deborah. (2008). On history, trees, and ethical proximity. *Postcolonial Studies*, 11(2), 157–167.
- Black, Bob. (1986). *The Abolition of Work and Other Essays*. Loompanics.
<http://archive.org/details/BlackTheAbolitionOfWorkAndOtherEssays>

- Boggs, Abigail, Meyerhoff, Eli, Mitchell, Nick, & Schwartz-Weinstein, Zach. (2019). *Abolitionist University Studies: An Invitation*.
- Bonanno, Alfredo M. (2013). *Let's Destroy Work, Let's Destroy the Economy*. Elephant Editions.
- Bonanno, Alfredo M. (2020). *Autogestión* (1st ed.). Proyecto Espartaco.
- Brenner, Neil, Peck, Jamie, & Theodore, Nik. (2010). Variegated neoliberalization: Geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks*, 10(2), 182–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0374.2009.00277.x>
- Brenner, Neil, Peck, Jamie, & Theodore, Nik. (2013). After neoliberalization? In *Global Ideologies and Urban Landscapes* (pp. 9–27). Routledge.
- Brenner, Neil, & Theodore, Nik. (2002). Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism.” *Antipode*, 34(3), 349–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00246>
- Briggs, Martin S. (1927). *The architect in history*. Clarendon.
- Brighenti, Maura, & Gago, Verónica. (2017). *La hipótesis del mestizaje en América Latina: Del multiculturalismo neoliberal a las formas contenciosas de la diferencia*. <https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/75740>
- Brown, Wendy. (2015). *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. MIT Press.
- Bruiger, Dan. (2006). *Second nature: The man-made world of idealism, technology and power*. <https://philpapers.org/rec/BRUSNT>
- Bryson, Mary, & de Castell, Suzanne. (1993). Queer Pedagogy: Praxis Makes Im/Perfect. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, 18(3), 285–305. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1495388>
- Buitrago Restrepo, F., & Duque Márquez, Iván. (2013). *The orange economy: An infinite opportunity*.
- Burbano, Mat [@matburbano]. (2023, January 11). *Tendencias en la arquitectura para el 2023*. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/CnRw7JoO_hcl
- Burke, Seán. (2019). *Authorship: From Plato to the postmodern: a reader*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Cadava, Eduardo, Connor, Peter, & Nancy, Jean-Luc (Eds.). (1991). *Who comes after the subject?* Routledge.
- Cajigas-Rotundo, Juan Camilo. (2007). Anotaciones sobre la biocolonialidad del poder. *Pensamiento Jurídico*, 18.
- CAM•SAM. (2023). Identidad CAM•SAM. *Colegio de Arquitectos de la Ciudad de México*. <https://www.colegiodearquitectoscdmx.org/identidad/>
- Cappelletti, Angel J. (1980). *Francisco Ferrer y la pedagogía libertaria*. <https://philpapers.org/rec/CAPFFY>
- Carneiro, Sueli. (2014). Ennegrecer el feminismo. *Más Allá Del Decenio de Los Pueblos Afrodescendientes*, 109. <https://www.torrossa.com/gs/resourceProxy?an=5466873&publisher=FZP877#page=110>
- Carnoy, Martin. (1977). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York : Longman. <http://archive.org/details/educationascultu00carn>
- Carpio Cortes, Carlos, Pérez Román, Mayra Patricia, & San Martín Gamboa, María del Rosario. (2021). Política educativa en México: El Neoliberalismo como Eje Rector del Diseño. In *Estudios sobre cultura y desigualdad en las regiones: Vol. IV*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Asociación Mexicana de Ciencias para el Desarrollo Regional. <http://ru.iiec.unam.mx/5593/>
- Carmo, Mario. (2011). *The alphabet and the algorithm*. Mit Press.
- Carrera Stampa, Manuel. (1954). *Los gremios mexicanos: La organización gremial en Nueva España 1521-1861*. EDIAPSA.
- Carrillo Trueba, César. (2016). *El racismo en México*. Publicaciones Santa Lucía. <https://revistas.unam.mx/index.php/cns/article/download/22903/21734/39169>
- Carrió, Alicia. (2015). The hunger games: Architects in danger. In Peggy Deamer (Ed.), *The architect as worker: Immaterial labor, the creative class, and the politics of design*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Castelao-Huerta, Isaura. (2021). Investigaciones sobre los efectos de la neoliberalización de la educación superior pública en América Latina. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 47, e232882. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1678-4634202147232882>
- Castellanos, Rosario. (1988). *A Rosario Castellanos Reader: An Anthology of Her Poetry, Short Fiction, Essays and Drama* (Maureen Ahern, Ed.).
- Castillo, Luis Carlos. (2020). Aproximación a El hombre colombiano de Manuel Zapata Olivella. In Manuel Zapata Olivella, *El hombre colombiano* (2nd ed.). Universidad del Valle.

- Castro Gómez, Santiago. (2015). *Historia de la gubernamentalidad I: Razón de Estado, liberalismo y neoliberalismo en Michel Foucault* (Vol. 2). Siglo del hombre editores.
- Castro-Gómez, Santiago. (2007). Decolonizar La Universidad: La Hybris Del Punto Cero Y El Diálogo De Saberes. In Santiago Castro-Gómez & Ramón Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 79–91). Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Castro-Gómez, Santiago. (2010). Prefacio. In Jorge Eliécer Martínez Posada, *La universidad productora de productores: Entre biopolítica y subjetividad*. Universida de la Salle.
- Ceceña Martorella, Ana Esther. (2013). Subvertir la Modernidad para Vivir Bien (O de las posibles salidas de la crisis civilizatoria). In Raúl Ornelas Bernal (Ed.), *Crisis civilizatoria y superación del capitalismo*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas.
- Césaire, Aimé. (2001). *Discourse on Colonialism* (Joan Pinkham, Trans.).
- Césaire, Aimé. (2010). Letter to Maurice Thorez. *Social Text*, 28(2), 145–152. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-2009-072>
- Cevallos Osorio, Jaime. (1967). Introducción. In *Los recursos humanos en la rama de la construcción. La educación, los profesionistas y su mercado de trabajo y la industria de la construcción*. ENA-UNAM.
- Chancoso, Blanca. (2010). El Sumak Kawsay desde la visión de la mujer. *América Latina En Movimiento*, 453, 6–9.
- Chandler, David, & Reid, Julian. (2016). *The Neoliberal Subject*. Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Cohen, Cathy J. (2001). Punks, bulldaggers, and welfare queens: The radical potential of queer politics? *Sexual Identities, Queer Politics*, 200–227.
- Collins, Peter. (1979). The Eighteenth Century origins of our system of full-time architectural schooling. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 33(2), 2–6.
- Comaroff, John. (2011). The End of Neoliberalism?: What Is Left of the Left. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 637(1), 141–147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716211406846>
- Comité Clandestino, Zapatista. (2204). *Auge y caída de la hidra capitalista*. Enlace Zapatista.
- Ley 30 de 1992. Por la cual se organiza el servicio público de la Educación Superior, Pub. L. No. 30 (1992). http://www.legal.unal.edu.co/rlunal/home/doc.jsp?d_i=34632
- Ley 1014 de 2006. De fomento a la cultura del emprendimiento, Pub. L. No. 1014 (2006). <http://www.suin-juriscol.gov.co/viewDocument.asp?ruta=Leyes/1672727>
- Consejo Nocturno. (2018). *Un habitar más fuerte que la metrópoli*. Pepitas de Calabaza SL.
- Contexto Urbano. (2023). *Contexto Urbano*. Contexto Urbano. <https://www.contextourbano.com.co>
- Contranarrativas, & Villegas, Fabian. (2023, May 3). *Esto es un simulacro*. Instagram. <https://www.instagram.com/p/CryeUz0uNjq/>
- Cooper, David. (1984). Introduction. In Rosemary Sheed (Trans.), *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics* (Reprint edition). Penguin.
- coopia. (2020). *Dejar de sostener lo insostenible*. coopia.
- coopia. (2024). La mesa, la olla, las hojas: A Conversation on the Revolts of Spatial-Doings Beyond-Against and Beyond Architectural Labor. In Marcelo López-Dinardi (Ed.), *Architecture from Public to Commons* (pp. 113–136). Routledge.
- Corner, James. (2006). Terra Fluxus. In Charles Waldheim (Ed.), *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*. Princeton architectural Press.
- Corradine Angulo, Alberto. (1989). *Historia de la arquitectura colombiana: Colonia 1538-1850*. Escala.
- Cox, Robert, & Schechter, Michael G. (2003). *The political economy of a plural world: Critical reflections on power, morals and civilisation*. Routledge. <https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/books/mono/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9780203116036&type=googlepdf>
- cuadernos de NEGACIÓN. (2011). *Cuadernos de NEGACIÓN 1: Trabajo—Comunidad—Política—Guerra* (3rd ed.). Cuadernos de Negación.

- cuadernos de NEGACIÓN. (2016). *cuadernos de NEGACIÓN 10: Contra la enajenación de la vida* (1st ed.). Cuadernos de Negación.
- cuadernos de NEGACIÓN. (2020a). *cuadernos de NEGACIÓN 3: Contra la sociedad mercantil generalizada* (2nd ed.). Cuadernos de Negación.
- cuadernos de NEGACIÓN. (2020b). *cuadernos de NEGACIÓN 11: Against the valorization of life* (Malcontent & Ediciones Inéditos, Trans.; 1st ed.). Cuadernos de Negación.
- cuadernos de NEGACIÓN. (2020c). *cuadernos de NEGACIÓN 12: Critique of self-management* (Malcontent, Trans.; 1st ed.). Cuadernos de Negación.
- cuadernos de NEGACIÓN. (2020d). *cuadernos de NEGACIÓN 14: Notas sobre trabajo doméstico* (1st ed.). Cuadernos de Negación.
- Cubberley, Ellwood Patterson. (2005). *The History of Education Educational Practice and Progress Considered as a Phase of the Development and Spread of Western Civilization*. <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/7521>
- Cuero, Astrid Yulieth. (2022). *¿Más allá del Marxismo? Aproximaciones y aportes para la constitución de una teoría feminista antirracista del trabajo doméstico remunerado*. 6.
- Cuff, Dana. (1991). *Architecture: The Story of Practice*. MIT Press.
- Cumes Simón, Aura Estela. (2014). *La “india” como “sirvienta”. Servidumbre doméstica, colonialismo y patriarcado en Guatemala*. <http://repositorio.ciesas.edu.mx/handle/123456789/283>
- Cumes Simón, Aura Estela. (2019, October 22). *El mundo de uno: Colonizar para existir y vigencia de las epistemologías milenarias*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=guB0nCEDHeQ>
- Cunningham, David. (2020). Foreword. In Douglas Spencer, *Critique of Architecture: Essays on Theory, Autonomy, and Political Economy*.
- Curiel Pichardo, Ochy. (2007). Crítica poscolonial desde las prácticas políticas del feminismo antirracista. *Nómadas*, 26, 92–101.
- Curiel Pichardo, Ochy. (2011). El régimen heterosexual y la nación. Aportes del lesbianismo feminista a la Antropología. *La Manzana de La Discordia*, 6(1), 25–46.
- Curiel Pichardo, Ochy. (2014). Hemos pasado a un multiculturalismo neoliberal. *Periódico Diagonal*. <https://www.diagonalperiodico.net/saberes/23386-hemos-pasado-multiculturalismo-neoliberal.html>
- da Silva, Viníciux. (2022a). *Fragmentos do porvir (Coleção X, coordenação de Rafael Haddock-Lobo)*. Ape’Ku.
- da Silva, Viníciux. (2022b). Nas encruzilhadas da imaginação radical preta e travesti. *Aguarrás*, 9(39).
- da Silva, Viníciux. (2022c, January 1). *Learning and Unlearning at the End of the World: Toward a Trans Black Radical Imagination Against Pedagogical Colonialism*. Interdisciplinary Centre for Research in Curriculum as a Social Practice, Ontario.
- Dardot, Pierre, & Laval, Christian. (2013). *The new way of the world: On neoliberal society*. Verso.
- Dauvé, Gilles. (2015). *Eclipse and re-emergence of the communist movement*. PM.
- Davis, Angela Y. (1983). *Women, race & class*. Vintage.
- de Armas, Ramón. (1970). La burguesía latinoamericana. Aspectos de su evolución. *Pensamiento Crítico*, 36.
- De Cleyre, Voltairine. (2019). The dominant idea. In Freedom Press (Ed.), *Why work? Arguments for the leisure society*. PM Press ; Freedom Press.
- de Francisco Vela, Santiago, & Latorre, Azalya. (2020, July 26). *Design Toolkits: ¿qué son? | Uniandes*. Facultad de Arquitectura y Diseño. <https://arqdis.uniandes.edu.co/notas/top-10-design-toolkits/>
- de Ita, Ana. (2019). Las reformas agrarias neoliberales en México. *El Cotidiano*, 214.
- de La Cruz, Silvia. (2012). La mercantilización de la educación en el contexto universitario. *Revista Electrónica de Psicología Política, San Luis*, 9(28), 48–54.
- de L’Orme, Philibert. (1568). *Le premier tome de l’Architecture*. <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k854656s>
- de Queiroz Ribeiro, Luiz Cesar, & dos Santos Junior, Orlando Alves. (2022). La ciudad en la inflexión ultraliberal latinoamericana: Reflexiones a partir del caso de Río de Janeiro. In Emilio Pradilla Cobos (Ed.), *La producción de la ciudad latinoamericana durante el neoliberalismo*. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.

- de Queiroz Ribeiro, Luiz Cesar, & Rodríguez Mancilla, Marcelo. (2022). Urbanización del capital y difusión de ideologías urbanas en América Latina: La ciudad como máquina de crecimiento económico. In Emilio Pradilla Cobos (Ed.), *La producción de la ciudad latinoamericana durante el neoliberalismo*. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2011). Practicing Practice. *Perspecta* 44: Domain, 160–203.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2014). *Architecture and capitalism: 1845 to the present*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Deamer, Peggy (Ed.). (2015a). *The architect as worker: Immaterial labor, the creative class, and the politics of design*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2015b). 'The Guggenheim Helsinki Competition: What Is the Value Proposition?'. *Avery Review*, 8, 1–5.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2016a). Architects, Really. In Nadir Z. Lahiji (Ed.), *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues On Architecture And The Left*.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2016b). Architecture/Agency/Emancipation. In Nadir Z. Lahiji (Ed.), *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues On Architecture And The Left*.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2020a). *Architecture and Labor* (1st edition). Routledge.
- Deamer, Peggy. (2020b). In *Conversation: Peggy Deamer and Keefer Dunn*. 10.
- Deamer, Peggy, & Bernstein, Phillip (Eds.). (2010). *Building (in) the future: Recasting labor in architecture*. Yale School of Architecture ; Princeton Architectural Press.
- Dean, Mitchell. (2014). Rethinking neoliberalism. *Journal of Sociology*, 50(2), 150–163.
- Debord, Guy. (1994). *The society of the spectacle*. Zone Books.
- Deininger, Klaus, & Lavadenz, Isabel. (2001). Mexico's "second agrarian reform": Implementation and impact. World Bank, University of Maryland, Secretaría de Reforma Agraria.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (1991). A philosophical concept.... In Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor, & Jean-Luc Nancy (Eds.), *Who comes after the subject?* (pp. 94–95). Routledge.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Columbia Univ. Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (1999). Post-scriptum sobre las sociedades de control. *Valencia: Pre-Textos*.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (2015). Preface: Three Group-Related Problems. In Felix Guattari, *Psychoanalysis and Transversality: Texts and Interviews 1955-1971*.
- Deleuze, Gilles, & Guattari, Felix. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*.
- Delgadillo Polanco, Víctor Manuel. (2021). Financiarización de la vivienda y de la (re)producción del espacio urbano. *Revista INVI*, 36(103), 1–18.
- Derrida, Jacques. (1990). A Letter to Peter Eisenman (Hilary P. Hanel, Trans.). *Assemblage*, 12, 7–13.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3171113>
- Díaz Londoño, Jorge Andrés. (2011). *Estado poder y neoliberalismo en Colombia: Análisis sociológico a finales del siglo XX*. Universidad de Caldas.
<http://ezproxy.unal.edu.co/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cac02704a&AN=unc.000433277&lang=es&site=eds-live>
- Dicken, Peter, Peck, Jamie A., & Tickell, Adam. (1997). Unpacking the global. In Roger Lee & Jane Wills (Eds.), *Geographies of economies* (pp. 158–166). Arnold.
- Diller, Elizabeth, & Vidler, Anthony. (2013). Architecture is a technology that has not yet discovered its agency. *Log*, 28, 21–26.
- Dion-Buffalo, Yvonne, & Mohawk, John C. (1992). Thoughts from an Autochthonous Center: Postmodernism and Cultural Studies. *Akwe:Kon Journal*, 9(4), 16–21.
- Djalali, Amir. (2015). The Architect as Producer: Hannes Meyer and the Proletarianisation of the Western Architect. *FOOTPRINT*, 9(2), 27–46. <https://doi.org/10.7480/footprint.9.2.859>
- Reforma al artículo tercero. (2013). https://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/ref/dof/CPEUM_ref_206_26feb13.pdf
- Domestika. (2023). *Domestika*. Domestika. <https://www.domestika.org/es/about>
- Douglas, Mary, & Ney, Steven. (1998). *Missing Persons: A Critique of the Personhood in the Social Sciences*.

- Draper, Joan. (1986). The Ecole des Beaux-Arts and the Architectural Profession in the United States: The Case of John Galen Howard. In Spiro Kostof (Ed.), *The Architect: Chapters in the history of the profession*. Oxford University Press.
- Du Bois, William E. B. (1999). *Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil*. Courier Corporation.
- Duffield, Mark. (2007). Development, security and war: Governing the world of peoples. *Cambridge: Polity*.
- Duménil, Gérard, & Lévy, Dominique. (2004). *Capital resurgent: Roots of the neoliberal revolution*. Harvard University Press.
- Duque Daza, Javier. (2015). *La Ciencia Política en Colombia, la construcción de una comunidad académica*. Universidad del Valle.
- Durand, Serge. (1989). ¿Debe desaparecer el taller de la facultad de arquitectura? Ponencia durante IV Encuentro Nacional de ACFA: Resúmenes y Conclusiones. *Revista Hito*, 2(18).
- Dussel, Enrique. (1995). *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the Other" and the Myth of Modernity* (Michael D. Barber, Trans.). Continuum.
- Dussel, Enrique. (1996). *The underside of modernity: Apel, Ricoeur, Rorty, Taylor, and the philosophy of liberation* (Eduardo Mendieta, Trans.). Humanities Press.
- Eagleton-Pierce, Matthew. (2016). Historicizing the neoliberal spirit of capitalism. In Simon Springer, Kean Birch, & Julie MacLeavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Echeverría, Bolívar. (1995). *Las ilusiones de la modernidad: Ensayos*. UNAM : Eds. del Equilibrista.
- Echeverría, Bolívar. (1998). *Valor de uso y utopía*.
- Echeverría, Bolívar. (2000). *La modernidad de lo barroco* (2nd ed.). Ediciones Era.
- Echeverría, Bolívar. (2005). Modernity and Capitalism (15 Theses) (Charlotte Broad, Trans.). *Theomai: Estudios Sobre Sociedad, Naturaleza y Desarrollo*, 11, 5.
- Echeverría, Bolívar (Ed.). (2008). La Modernidad Americana (Claves para su comprensión). In *La americanización de la modernidad*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Centro de Investigaciones sobre
- Echeverría, Bolívar. (2009). *¿Qué es la modernidad?* (Vol. 1). UNAM, Dirección General de Publicaciones y Fomento Editorial.
- Echeverría, Bolívar. (2019). *Modernity and "Whiteness"* (Rodrigo Ferreira, Trans.).
- El Financiero. (2015, May 13). *Geo: El sueño de Luis Orvañanos que se volvió pesadilla*. El Financiero.
<https://www.elfinanciero.com.mx/blogs/historias-de-negocios/geo-el-sueno-de-luis-orvananos-que-se-convirtio-en-una-pesadilla/>
- Elorza Morales, Miguel Angel. (2019). *Educación libertaria y comunalidad* (2nd ed.). Colegio de Investigadores en Educación de Oaxaca.
- England, Kim, & Ward, Kevin. (2016). Theorizing Neoliberalization. In Simon Springer, Kean Birch, & Julie MacLeavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Escalante Gonzalbo, Pablo. (2010). La etapa Indígena. In Dorothy Tanck de Estrada (Ed.), *Historia mínima de la educación en México*. El Colegio de México AC.
- Escobar, Arturo. (2008). *Territories of difference: Place, movements, life, redes*. Duke University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. (2014). *Sentipensar con la tierra: Nuevas lecturas sobre desarrollo, territorio y diferencia* (Primera edición). Ediciones Unaula.
- Escobar, Arturo. (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds* (Illustrated edition). Duke University Press Books.
- Espinosa Miñoso, Yuderlys. (2016). De por qué es necesario a feminismo decolonial: Diferenciación, dominación co-constitutiva de la modernidad occidental y el fin de la política de identidad. *Solar*, 12(1).
- Espinoza, Oscar. (2017). Neoliberalismo y educación superior en Chile: Una mirada crítica al rol desempeñado por el Banco Mundial y los "Chicago Boys." *Laplace En Revista*, 3(3), 93–114.
- Esteve, Gustavo. (1987). Regenerating People's Space. *Alternatives*, 12(1), 125–152.

- Esteve, Gustavo. (2009). Development. In Wolfgang Sachs (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power, Second Edition*.
- Esteve, Gustavo (Ed.). (2012). *Repensar el mundo con Iván Illich* (1a. edición). Taller Editorial La Casa del Mago.
- Esteve, Gustavo. (2013). La insurrección en curso. In Raúl Ornelas Bernal (Ed.), *Crisis civilizatoria y superación del capitalismo*. (pp. 129–202). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas.
- Esteve, Gustavo. (2022). *Gustavo Esteve: A critique of development and other essays*. Routledge.
- Esteve, Gustavo, Baschet, Jérôme, Almendra Quiguanás, Vilma Rocío, & Rozental, Emmanuel. (2013). *Rebelarse Desde El Nosotros*. En cortito qué s pa' largo.
- Esteve, Gustavo, & O'Donovan, Órla. (2014, October 14). *Conversing on the Commons: Interview with Gustavo Esteve*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mLZGhyNWD70>
- Esteve, Gustavo, Prakash, Madhu S., & Stuchul, Dana L. (2005). From a pedagogy for liberation to liberation from pedagogy. *Re-Thinking Freire: Globalization and the Environmental Crisis*, 13–30.
- Esteve, Gustavo, & Prakash, Madhu Suri. (2014). *Grassroots postmodernism: Remaking the soil of cultures*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Estrada Álvarez, Jairo. (2004). *Construcción del modelo neoliberal en Colombia, 1970-2004*. Ediciones Aurora.
- Estrada Álvarez, Jairo. (2006). *Las reformas estructurales y la construcción del orden neoliberal en Colombia*.
- Etcétera, Denilí. (2263). *Los caminos de la digna rabia*. Autonomía Zapatista.
- Ettlinger, Leopold. (1986). The Emergence of the Italian Architect during the Fifteenth Century. In Spiro Kostof (Ed.), *The Architect: Chapters in the history of the profession*. Oxford University Press.
- Ewen, Stuart. (1976). *Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- EZLN, Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional. (2005). Sixth Declaration of the Selva Lacandona. *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/sdsl-en/>
- FaCrea. (2021). *FaCrea*.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. (1968). *Subversión y cambio social*. Ediciones Tercer Mundo.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. (1970). *Las revoluciones inconclusas en América Latina (1809-1968)*. Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. (2008a). *El socialismo raizal y la Gran Colombia bolivariana: Investigación acción participativa*. Fundación Editorial el Perro y la Rana.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. (2008b). *La subversión en Colombia: El cambio social en la historia*. Fundación para la Investigación y la Cultura.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. (2014). *Socialismo raizal y el ordenamiento territorial*.
- Fanon, Frantz. (2005). *The Wretched of the Earth* (Richard Philcox, Trans.; Edición: Reprint). Grove Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks*.
- Farrés Delgado, Yasser. (2013). *Críticas decoloniales a la arquitectura, el urbanismo y la ordenación del territorio. Hacia una territorialización de ambientes humanos en cuba* [[Http://purl.org/dc/dcmitype/Text](http://purl.org/dc/dcmitype/Text), Universidad de Granada]. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/tesis?codigo=58765>
- Farrés Delgado, Yasser. (2016). *Arquitectura y decolonialidad: Algunas ideas sobre la Escuela de Artes Plásticas de Ricardo Porro*. 24.
- Farrés Delgado, Yasser. (2019). Dialogar con Quijano. *Revista de Sociología*, 28, 49–64.
- Farrés Delgado, Yasser, & Matarán Ruiz, Alberto. (2012). Colonialidad Territorial: Para Analizar A Foucault En El Marco De La Desterritorialización De La Metrópoli. *Notas Desde La Habana. TABULA RASA*, 21.
- Farrés Delgado, Yasser, & Matarán Ruiz, Alberto. (2014). Hacia una teoría urbana transmoderna y decolonial: Una introducción. *Polis (Santiago)*, 13(37), 339–361. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-65682014000100019>
- FA-UNAM. (2017). *Plan de Estudios Arquitectura 2017 TOMO I*. Facultad de Arquitectura, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Federici, Silvia. (2004). *Caliban and the Witch*. Autonomedia.
- Federici, Silvia. (2021). *Patriarchy of the Wage: Notes on Marx, Gender, and Feminism*.

- Fernández Alba, Antonio. (1984). Aprendizaje y práctica de la arquitectura en España. In Spiro Kostof (Ed.), *El arquitecto: Historia de una profesión*. Cátedra. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/libro?codigo=10390>
- Ferreira da Silva, Denise. (2007). *Toward a global idea of race* (Vol. 27). U of Minnesota Press.
- Ferreira da Silva, Denise. (2015). Before Man: Sylvia Wynter's Rewriting of the Modern Episteme. In Katherine McKittrick (Ed.), *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Ferreira da Silva, Denise. (2016). On Difference Without Separability. *Incerteza Viva: 32nd Bienal de São Paulo*, Eds. Jochen Volz and Júlia Rebouças (São Paulo: Fundação Bienal de São Paulo, 2016), 57–65.
- Ferreira da Silva, Denise. (2019, December 5). *Corpus Infinitum com Denise Ferreira da Silva da British Columbia University*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZfQnJZgxQIE>
- Ferreira da Silva, Denise. (2021). *Unpayable Debt*. Sternberg Press.
- Ferreira da Silva, Denise. (2021). Foreword. In Fred Moten & Stefano Harney, *All Incomplete*.
- Ferreira, Rodrigo. (2019). Translator's Preface. In Rodrigo Ferreira (Trans.), *Modernity and "Whiteness."*
- Ferretti, Federico. (2018). Teaching Anarchist Geographies: Elisée Reclus in Brussels and "The Art of Not Being Governed." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 108(1), 162–178.
- Filipe Narciso, Carla Alexandra. (2013). Urbanismo neoliberal y diseño del espacio público. *Legado de Arquitectura y Diseño*, 8(13), Article 13.
- Filipe Narciso, Carla Alexandra. (2022). Gobiernos progresistas y el giro a la izquierda: La producción discursiva del espacio público y las contradicciones socioterritoriales de la despolitización teórica en América Latina. In Emilio Pradilla Cobos (Ed.), *La producción de la ciudad latinoamericana durante el neoliberalismo*. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.
- Foucault, Michel. (1983). The Subject and Power. In Hubert L. Dreyfus & Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*.
- Foucault, Michel. (1984). What is an Author. In Paul Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader*. Pantheon.
- Foucault, Michel. (1998). *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth (Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, Vol. 1)* (Paul Rabinow, Ed.; 1 edition). The New Press.
- Foucault, Michel. (2001). *Power (The Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, Vol. 3)* (James D. Faubion, Ed.; Robert Hurley, Trans.; 1 edition). The New Press.
- Foucault, Michel. (2007a). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica. Curso en el Collège de France* (Edición: 1). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Foucault, Michel. (2007b). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78* (Michel Senellart, François Ewald, & Alessandro Fontana, Eds.). Palgrave Macmillan : République Française.
- Foucault, Michel. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79* (Michel Senellart, Ed.; Graham Burchell, Trans.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Franco Cárdenas, Luis Manuel. (2007). *Educando en arquitectura: El taller de arquitectura, en la educación-enseñanza del aprendizaje, a través de la vinculación-integración entre práctica y teoría*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Fr-ee. (2023). *Free—Fernando Romero Enterprise*. Free. <https://fr-ee.org/>
- Frichot, Hélène, & Runting, Helen. (2016). White, wide and scattered: Picturing her housing career. In Teresa Stoppani, Giorgio Ponzio, & George Themistokleous (Eds.), *This Thing Called Theory*.
- Fuentes, Diana. (2019). Foreword. In Rodrigo Ferreira (Trans.), *Modernity and "Whiteness."*
- Furet, François. (2000). *The Passing of an Illusion: The Idea of Communism in the Twentieth Century*.
- Gabbard, D. (2010). The outlook for social justice in our compulsory schools: An anarchist forecast. *Peace Studies Journal*, 3(1), 119–126.
- Gagne, Karen M. (2007). *On the Obsolescence of the Disciplines: Frantz Fanon and Sylvia Wynter Propose a New Mode of Being Human*.
- Gago, Verónica. (2015). *La razón neoliberal: Economías barrocas y pragmática popular*.
- Gago, Verónica. (2017). *Neoliberalism from below: Popular pragmatics and baroque economies*. Duke University Press.

- Galindo, María. (2015). La revolución feminista se llama Despatriarcalización. In *Descolonización y despatriarcalización de y desde los feminismos de Abya Yala*. ACSUR-Las Segovias.
- Galindo, María. (2018). *Feminismo urgente: ¡a despatriarcar!* Lavaca.
- Galindo, María. (2022). *Feminismo Bastardo* (2nd ed.). Mujeres Creando.
- Gallo, Silvio. (1997a). El paradigma anarquista de educación. *Semillas de Libertad*. <http://www.flyingmind.com/plataforma/doc7>
- Gallo, Silvio. (1997b). Pedagogía libertaria: Principios político-filosóficos. *Educação Libertária: Textos de Um Seminário. Rio de Janeiro: Achiamé*.
- Gallo, Silvio. (2012). Estúpida retórica: Algunas consideraciones sobre riesgo, libertad y educación. In Félix Grupo de Estudios J.D. Gómez Rojas (Ed.), *Educación anarquista: Aprendizaje para una sociedad libre*. Editorial Eleuterio.
- Garcés, Fernando. (2007). Las políticas del conocimiento y la colonialidad lingüística y epistémica. In Santiago Castro-Gómez & Ramón Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 217–242). Siglo del Hombre Editores Bogotá.
- Garcés, Marina. (2017). *Nueva ilustración radical*. Anagrama.
- García, Martha Cecilia. (2008). “El presente es de lucha, el futuro socialista.” *REVISTA CONTROVERSIA*, 190, Article 190. <https://doi.org/10.54118/controver.v0i190.144>
- García Moreno, Beatriz. (2002). Apuntes sobre la enseñanza de la arquitectura. *Revista Hito*, 1(20).
- García Peralta Nieto, María de los Angeles Beatriz. (2016). *La vivienda y el Estado mexicano durante el siglo XX. Un enfoque desde la economía política*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales.
- Garza, Cristina Rivera. (2019). *Los muertos indóciles: Necroescrituras y desapropiación*.
- Genosko, Gary. (2009). *Félix Guattari: A Critical Introduction*. Pluto Press ; Distributed in the United States of America exclusively by Palgrave Macmillan.
- Genth, Renate. (2002). *Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis: Erfindungsgeist und mimetische Begabung im Widerstreit und ihre Bedeutung für das Mensch-Maschine-Verhältnis* (Vol. 10). Lang. <https://ixtheo.de/Record/341367397>
- Gielen, Pascal. (2013). *Creativity and other fundamentalisms*. Mondriaan Fund.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. (2007). *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*.
- Girard, René. (1990). Innovation and Repetition. *SubStance*, 19(2/3), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3684663>
- Glazer, Nona Yetta. (1993). *Women's paid and unpaid labor: The work transfer in health care and retailing*. Temple University Press.
- Godin, Benoît. (2015). *Innovation Contested: The Idea of Innovation Over the Centuries*. Routledge.
- Goldin, Claudia. (2016). Human Capital. In Claude Diebolt & Michael Hauptert (Eds.), *Handbook of Cliometrics* (pp. 55–86). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40406-1_23
- Gómez Lara, Horacio. (2009). *Indígenas, Mexicanos y Rebeldes. Procesos educativos y resignificación de identidades en Los Altos de Chiapas* [PhD Thesis, Universidad de Sevilla]. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/tesis?codigo=130939>
- Gómez, Magdalena. (2014). Los derechos permitidos a una década de la contrarreforma indígena: Problemario. In Fabiola Escárzaga, Raquel Gutiérrez, Juan José Carrillo, & Eva Capece (Eds.), *Movimiento indígena en América Latina: Resistencia y transformación social....* Editorial 3600.
- González Bracco, Mercedes, & Laborde, Soledad. (2021). La humanización del espacio público como colonialidad del habitar: Una aproximación desde el caso de la ciudad de Buenos Aires. In Carolina Bernardina, Carmen Egea Jiménez, Bernardina Carolina Egea Rodríguez, & Danú Alberto Fabre Platas (Eds.), *Resignificación de los espacios públicos en Latinoamérica: Prácticas de renovación urbana para reflexionar y debatir*. Universidad de Granada.
- González Casanova, Pablo. (2015). Colonialismo interno. Una redefinición. In Elvira Concheiro Bórquez, Alejandro Fernando González Jiménez, Aldo A. Guevara Santiago, Jaime Ortega Reyna, & Víctor Hugo Pacheco Chávez (Eds.), *Antología del pensamiento crítico mexicano contemporáneo*. Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales. CLACSO. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv270kv1s>
- González, Cristina, & Hsu, Funie. (2014). *Education and empire: Colonial universities in Mexico, India and the United States*.

- González Escobar, Luis Fernando. (2013). *Del alarife al arquitecto: El saber hacer y el pensar la arquitectura en Colombia, 1847-1936*. OjoXoyo Investigación.
- González Gómez, Alberto Elías. (2022). *Convivencialidad y resistencia política desde abajo: La herencia de Iván Illich en México*. Editorial Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Goodwin, Brian C. (2007). *Nature's due: Healing our fragmented culture*. Floris Books.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (2003). *Los intelectuales y la organización de la cultura*. Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Gropius, Walter. (1919). *Bauhaus manifesto and program*. 2014.
- Grozdanic, Lidija. (2016a, May 18). *Reasons Why Architects Can Make Great Developers (or not?)—Archipreneur*. Archipreneur. <https://archipreneur.com/reasons-why-architects-can-make-great-developers-or-not/>
- Grozdanic, Lidija. (2016b, November 6). *Arquitectos como desarrolladores inmobiliarios: Los pros y los contras*. ArchDaily México. <https://www.archdaily.mx/mx/798841/arquitectos-como-desarrolladores-inmobiliarios-los-pros-y-los-contras>
- Grupo de Estudios J.D. Gómez Rojas, Félix (Ed.). (2012). *Educación anarquista: Aprendizaje para una sociedad libre*. Editorial Eleuterio.
- Guattari, Félix. (1984). *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics* (Rosemary Sheed, Trans.; Reprint edition). Penguin.
- Guattari, Félix. (1984). *The crisis of production of subjectivity*. 10.
- Guattari, Félix. (2005). *The three ecologies*. Continuum.
- Guattari, Félix. (2009). *Soft subversions: Texts and interviews 1977-1985* (Sylvère Lotringer, Ed.). Semiotext(e) ; Distributed by the MIT Press.
- Guattari, Félix. (2013). *Schizoanalytic Cartographies* (Andrew Goffey, Trans.; 1 edition). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Guattari, Félix. (2015). *Psychoanalysis and Transversality: Texts and Interviews 1955-1971*.
- Guattari, Félix. (2016). *Lines of flight: For another world of possibilities*. Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsburg Publishing Pl.
- Guattari, Félix, & Rolnik, Suely. (2006). *Micropolítica. Cartografías del deseo*. Traficantes de Sueños.
- Guerrero Solís, Sandra Paola. (2020). La neoliberalización de la universidad pública mexicana y su etapa de crisis. *Revista Digital FILHA*, 22.
- Guevara, Ernesto Che. (1977). Discurso clausura del Primer Encuentro Internacional de Estudiantes y Profesores de Arquitectura. 29 de septiembre de 1963. In *Ernesto Che Guevara. Escritos y discursos* (pp. 109–120). Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.
- Guilherme, Pedro. (2014). *Competitions serve a larger purpose in architectural knowledge*. Fourth International Conference on Architectural Research by Design ARbD'14.
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel (Ed.). (2011). *Palabras para tejernos, resistir y transformar en la época que estamos viviendo....* Ed. Quimant??
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel. (2017). *Horizontes comunitario-populares: Producción de lo común más allá de las políticas estado-céntricas*. Traficantes de sueños.
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel. (2020). Producir lo común: Entramados comunitarios y formas de lo político. *Re-Visiones*, 10, 3.
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel. (2021). Defender la vida: Una entrevista con Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar [Defending Life: Interview with Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar] (Vivette García-Deister, Trans.). *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*, 7(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.28968/cftt.v7i2.37654>
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel, & Salazar, Huáscar. (2015). Reproducción comunitaria de la vida. Pensando la transformación social en el presente. *El Apantle, Revista de Estudios Comunitarios*, 1.
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel, & Salazar Lohman, Huáscar (Eds.). (2015). Reproducción comunitaria de la vida Pensando la transformación social en el presente. *El Apantle, Revista de Estudios Comunitarios*, 1.
- Gutiérrez de Pineda, Virginia. (1997). *La familia en Colombia: Trasfondo histórico*. Ministerio de Cultura.
- Gutierrez Luna, Diana Itzu, Esteva, Gustavo, & Ragazzini, Irene. (2014). *Mandar obedeciendo en territorio zapatista*.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Polity Press.

- Hadjinicolaou, Nicos. (1999). *Historia del arte y lucha de clases*. Siglo XXI.
- Halberstam, Jack. (2013). The Wild Beyond: With and for the Undercommons. In Fred Moten & Stefano Harney, *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & black study*. Minor Compositions.
- Halberstam, Jack. (2018). *Trans*: A quick and quirky account of gender variability*. University of California Press.
- Haraway, Donna Jeanne. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Saidiya V. (2019). *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Riotous Black Girls, Troublesome Women, and Queer Radicals*.
- Hartman, Saidiya V. (2022). *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*.
- Hartman, Saidiya V. (2021). Foreword. In William C. Anderson, *The nation on no map: Black anarchism and abolition*. AK Press.
- Harvey, David. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Henwood, Doug. (1997). Talking About Work. *Monthly Review*, 18–30.
- Hernando, Almudena. (2018). *The Fantasy of Individuality: On the Sociohistorical Construction of the Modern Subject*.
- Hirtt, Nico. (2001). *Los tres ejes de la mercantilización escolar*. caum.
- Holling, Crawford S. (1973). Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 1–23.
- Holloway, John. (2010). *Crack Capitalism*.
- Holt, John. (2003). *Instead of Education: Ways to Help People do Things Better*.
- Hoff Gonçalves, Monica. (2019). Reflexões contrapedagógicas: Desaprender e incendiar não são coisas que se pode separar. *REVISTA POIÉISIS*, 20(33), Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.22409/poiesis.2033.41-54>
- hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. Routledge.
- hooks, bell. (2003). *Teaching Community*. Routledge.
- hooks, bell. (2010). *Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom*. Routledge.
- hooks, bell. (2015). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Routledge.
- Hornedo, Roberto. (2102). *Spatial Capital: The problem of Architectural Canon Formation*. Convivial Tools.
- Hornedo Rocha, Braulio. (2019). *Hacia una poética arquitectónica: Alternativas contra el desarrollo urbano Proemio*. <http://www.braulio-hornedo.com/poetica.htm>
- Ibero. (2023). *Plan Ideal, Licenciatura en Arquitectura*.
- Ibero, Serrano Monjaraz. (2021). *Plan de estudio Arquitectura*.
- Illich, Iván. (1968). *The futility of schooling in Latin America*. Saturday Review Associates.
- Illich, Iván. (1971). *Deschooling society* (1st ed.). Marion Boyars.
- Illich, Iván. (1973). School: The sacred cow. *Celebration of Awareness: A Call for Institutional Revolution*, 103–114.
- Illich, Iván. (1975). *Tools for conviviality*. Fontana.
- Illich, Iván. (1977). *Toward a History of Needs*. Pantheon Books.
- Illich, Iván. (1980). *Celebration of Awareness: A Call for Institutional Revolution*. Penguin Books.
- Illich, Iván. (1981). *Shadow work*. Marion Boyars.
- Illich, Iván. (1985). *La sociedad desescolarizada*. Joaquín Mortiz.
- Illich, Iván. (1996). *The Wisdom of Leopold Kohr*. E.F. Schumacher.
- Illich, Iván. (2006). *Obras reunidas Vol 1* (Valentina Borremans & Javier Sicilia, Eds.; Vol. 1). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Illich, Iván. (2014). *El mensaje de la choza de Gandhi y otros textos*. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos.
- Illich, Iván, & Cayley, David. (1992). *Ivan Illich in Conversation*.
- Illich, Iván, Zola, Irving K., & McKnight, John. (2000). *Disabling Professions*. Marion Boyars Publishers Ltd.
- Imarisha, Walidah. (2015, February 11). Rewriting the Future: Using Science Fiction to Re-Envision Justice. *Walidah Imarisha*. <https://www.walidah.com/blog/2015/2/11/rewriting-the-future-using-science-fiction-to-re-envision-justice>

- Inclán, Daniel. (2016). Pedagogía de la crueldad o cómo la violencia se hace cotidiana. In Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional EZLN (Ed.), *El Pensamiento Crítico Frente a la Hidra Capitalista III*. Enlace Zapatista.
- Irisarri Martínez, Carlos Javier. (2015). El arquitecto ilustrado: Del oficio a la profesión. Consolidación del modelo contemporáneo del arquitecto español en el siglo XVIII [doctoralThesis]. In *UEM*.
<https://abacus.universidadeuropea.com/handle/11268/4445>
- Jacobs, Daniel, & Utting, Brittany. (2019). Un-Working: New Tactics for Architectural Pedagogy. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 73(2), 261–263.
- Jacobs, Joseph, & Kayserling, Meyer. (1906). *Marano*. Jewish Encyclopedia.
<https://jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/10388-marano>
- Jappe, Anselm. (2014a). De lo que es el fetichismo de la mercancía y sobre si podemos librarnos de él. In Karl Marx, *El fetichismo de la mercancía (y su secreto)* (pp. 1–15). pepitas de calabaza ed.
- Jappe, Anselm. (2014b). Towards a History of the Critique of Value. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 25(2), 25–37.
- Jaramillo, Samuel. (2021). Reorientación del gran capital hacia lo inmobiliario. *Punto sur*, 4, Article 4.
<https://doi.org/10.34096/ps.n4.10401>
- Jiménez, Carlos, & García, Hugo. (1972). *Del espacio arquitectónico a la arquitectura como una mercancía*. Universidad del Valle.
- Johnson, Linton Kwesi. (2006). *Selected Poems*.
- Johnston, Jill. (1973). *Lesbian nation: The feminist solution*. Simon & Schuster.
- Jolliffe, Eleanor, & Crosby, Paul. (2023). *Architect: The Evolving Story of a Profession*.
- kalicabra. (2019). *Nuestro aprendizaje será autogestionado o no será* (1st ed.). kalicabra - libros radicalmente ilustrados.
- Kalmanovitz, Salomón. (2003). *Economía y nación: Una breve historia de Colombia* (Nueva ed., corr. y aum). Grupo Editorial Norma.
- Kaltefleiter, Caroline K., & Nocella II, Anthony J. (2012). Anarchy in the Academy: Staying True to Anarchism as an Academic-Activist. In Robert H. Haworth (Ed.), *Anarchist pedagogies: Collective actions, theories, and critical reflections on education* (pp. 200–216). PM Press.
- Kiersey, Nicholas. (2016). Neoliberalism and the biopolitical imagination. In Simon Springer, Kean Birch, & Julie MacLeavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kingfisher, Catherine. (2013). *A policy travelogue: Tracing welfare reform in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Canada*. Berghahn Books.
- Klepeis, Peter, & Vance, Colin. (2009). Neoliberal Policy and Deforestation in Southeastern Mexico: An Assessment of the PROCAMPO Program. *Economic Geography*, 79(3), 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-8287.2003.tb00210.x>
- Koedt, Anne. (1968). The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm, Notes from the First Year. *Takin' It to the Streets': A Sixties Reader*, 422–428.
- Kom'boa Ervin, Lorenzo. (2021). *Anarchism and the Black Revolution: The Definitive Edition*.
- Koolhaas, Rem, Zenghelis, Elia, Vriesendorp, Madelon, & Zenghelis, Zoe. (1972). *Exodus, or the voluntary prisoners of architecture*.
- Kostof, Spiro (Ed.). (1986). *The Architect: Chapters in the history of the profession*. Oxford University Press.
- Kostof, Spiro. (1995). *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* (Gregory Castillo, Ed.).
- Krenak, Ailton. (2020). *Ideas to Postpone the End of the World* (Anthony Doyle, Trans.).
- Krisis-Group. (1999). *Manifesto against Labour*. Krisis-Group. <https://www.krisis.org/1999/manifesto-against-labour/>
- Kropotkin, Pyotr. (1995). *Kropotkin: "The Conquest of Bread" and Other Writings* (Marshall S. Shatz, Ed.).
- Kropotkin, Pyotr. (1892). The spirit of revolt. *Commonweal*.
- Kropotkin, Pyotr. (1970). *Kropotkin revolutionary pamphlets: A collection of writings* (Unabridged and unaltered republ). Dover.
- Kubler, George. (1983). *Arquitectura mexicana del siglo XVI* (1st ed.). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kulić, Slavko. (2004). Neoliberalism as social-Darwinism. *Prometej Zagreb*.

- Kurz, Robert. (2018). Epílogo. La persona flexible. Un nuevo carácter social en la sociedad global de la crisis. In Krisis-Group, *Manifiesto contra el trabajo* (Segunda edición). Virus Editorial i Distribuidora.
- La Academia, Nacional de Arquitectura. (2023). *Academia Nacional de Arquitectura, México – México*.
<https://academianacionaldearquitectura.mx/>
- La Cecla, Franco. (2012). *Against architecture*. San Francisco ; Oakland : Green Arcade/PM Press.
http://archive.org/details/Against_Architecture_9781604866896
- Lackney, Jeffery. (1999). *A history of the studio-based learning model*.
- Lahiji, Nadir Z. (Ed.). (2016). *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues On Architecture And The Left*.
- Landrum, Lisa. (2015). Before Architecture: Archai, Architects and Architectonics in Plato and Aristotle. *Montreal Architectural Review*, 2. <https://mar.mcgill.ca/article/view/17>
- Lapavistas, Costas. (2016). *Beneficios sin producción. Cómo nos explotan las finanzas*. Madrid.
- Larner, Wendy. (2000). Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy*, 63(1), 5–25.
- Larner, Wendy. (2003). Neoliberalism? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 21(5), 509–512.
- Lash, Scott, & Urry, John. (1994). *Economías de signos y espacio: Sobre el capitalismo de la posorganización*. Amorrortu Buenos Aires.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. (2014, November 20). Speech at National Book Awards: “Books aren’t just commodities.” *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/nov/20/ursula-k-le-guin-national-book-awards-speech>
- Leal Villegas, Paulo Humberto. (2016). Latinoamérica ante las transformaciones del orden monetario y financiero mundial. *Economía Informa*, 396, 67–83.
- Lee, Zun. (2021). Home is where we displace our selves. In Fred Moten & Stefano Harney, *All Incomplete*.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (2014). From the city to urban society. In Neil J. Brenner (Ed.), *Implosions/Explosions: Towards a Study of Planetary Urbanization* (pp. 36–51). Jovis.
- LEGORRETA®. (2023). *LEGORRETA*. <https://www.legorreta.mx/>
- Lemke, Thomas. (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, 14(3), 49–64.
- Leroy-Beaulieu, Paul. (1882). *De la colonisation chez les peuples modernes* (2nd ed.). Guillaumin.
- Leyva, Rodolfo. (2009). No child left behind: A neoliberal repackaging of social Darwinism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 7(1), 365–381.
- Lienhard, Martín. (1996). De mestizajes, heterogeneidades, hibridismos y otras quimeras. In José Antonio Mazzotti & Juan Zevallos Aguilar (Eds.), *Asedios a la heterogeneidad cultural: Libro en homenaje a Antonio Cornejo Polar*. Filadelfia: Asociación Internacional de Peruanistas.
- Linsalata, Lucia, & Salazar Lohman, Huáscar (Eds.). (2015). Común ¿para qué? *El Apantle, Revista de Estudios Comunitarios*, 1.
- Llaguno y Amirola, Eugenio. (1829). *Tomo I. Noticias de los arquitectos y arquitectura de España desde su restauración*. Imprenta Real.
- Londoño Niño, Roberto José. (2014). La enseñanza de la historia de la arquitectura en Colombia, a partir de 1936. VI *Encuentro de Docentes e Investigadores En Historia Del Diseño, La Arquitectura y La Ciudad* Iván Hernández Larguía (La Plata, 2014).
- Loos, Adolf. (1982). *Heimatkunst, 1914*. In *Trotzdem, 1900-1930*.
- Loos, Adolf. (1998). Ornament and Education (1924). In Michael Mitchell (Trans.), *Ornament and Crime: Selected Essays* (pp. 183–189). Ariadne Press.
- López Guerra, Susana, & Flores Chávez, Marcelo. (2006). Las reformas educativas neoliberales en Latinoamérica. *Revista electrónica de investigación educativa*, 8(1), 1–15.
- López Obrador, Andrés Manuel. (2019, March 17). *Presidente López Obrador declara formalmente fin del modelo neoliberal y su política económica*. gob.mx. <http://www.gob.mx/presidencia/prensa/presidente-lopez-obrador-declara-formalmente-fin-del-modelo-neoliberal-y-su-politica-economica-lo-que-hagamos-sera-inspiracion-para-otros-pueblos>

- López Rodríguez, Mercedes. (2001). *Tiempos para rezar y tiempos para trabajar: La cristianización de las comunidades muiscas coloniales durante el siglo XVI, 1550-1600*. Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia.
- López, Xuno. (2016). Yo'taninnel bajtik, re-ch'ulel-izarnos y revivir lo sagrado desde nuestra propia humanidad como matriz del fin de la Jow-hidra capitalista. In Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional EZLN (Ed.), *El Pensamiento Critico Frente a la Hidra Capitalista III*. Enlace Zapatista.
- López y Rivas, Gilberto. (2004). *Autonomías: Democracia o contrainsurgencia*. Ediciones Era.
- López-Morales, Ernesto, & Gasic Klett, Ivo. (2021). El complejo urbano financiero inmobiliario en América latina. Introducción. *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, 25(1), Article 1.
- Lorde, Audre. (2007). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*.
- Lordon, Frédéric, & Ash, Gabriel. (2014). *Willing slaves of capital: Spinoza and Marx on desire*. Verso.
- Lugones, María. (2008). Colonialidad y Género. *TABULA RASA*, 29.
- Lugones, María. (2010). Toward a Decolonial Feminism. *Hypatia*, 25(4), 742–759.
- Lugones, María. (2011). Hacia metodologías de la decolonialidad. In Xochitl Leyva Solano, Rosalva Aída Hernández, Jorge Alonso, Mariano Báez, Axel Köhler, Arturo Escobar, Esteban Krotz, Marcio D'Olive Campos, Eduardo Restrepo, & José Antonio Flores, *Conocimientos y Prácticas Políticas: Reflexiones desde Nuestras Prácticas Políticas y de Conocimiento Situado, Tomo III*. CIESAS, UNICACH, PDTG-UNMSM.
- Lugones, María. (2016). The Coloniality of Gender. In Wendy Harcourt (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender and Development* (pp. 13–33). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Luhmann, Susanne. (1998). Queering/Querying Pedagogy? Or, Pedagogy Is a Pretty Queer Thing. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer Theory in Education* (pp. 120–132). Routledge.
- Lxarch. (2023). *Líderes para la Arquitectura*. <https://www.lxarch.com/>
- Macarov, David. (1980). *Work and welfare: The unholy alliance*. Sage Publications.
<http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0654/79025740-t.html>
- Machado Aráoz, Horacio. (2011). El auge de la minería transnacional en América Latina. De la ecología política del neoliberalismo a la anatomía política del colonialismo. In Héctor Alimonda (Ed.), *La naturaleza colonizada: Ecología política y minería en América Latina*. Ediciones CICCUS.
- Machado Aráoz, Horacio. (2016). Claves desde la Ecología Política para re-pensar la ciudad y las posibilidades de comunalización: Entrevista a Horacio Machado—Mina Lorena Navarro. *El Apantle, Revista de Estudios Comunitarios*, 2.
- Machado Aráoz, Horacio. (2018). *Potosí: Genealogía de la minería contemporánea*. Editorial Abya-Yala.
- Machado Aráoz, Horacio. (2019). *Minar. Colonialidad y genealogía del extractivismo* (2nd ed.). OnA ediciones.
- Macy, Joanna. (2007). *World as lover, world as self: Courage for global justice and ecological renewal*. Parallax Press.
<http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0719/2007022262.html>
- Malabou, Catherine. (2024). *Stop Thief!: Anarchism and Philosophy* (Carolyn Shread, Trans.).
- Malacrida, Sérgio Augusto. (2010). *O Sistema de Ensino Belas-Artes no Curso de Arquitetura da École des Beaux-Arts de Paris em sua tradição e ruptura: Legado de saber e de poder*. <https://repositorio.ufscar.br/handle/ufscar/2249>
- Maldonado Alvarado, Benjamín. (2002). *Los indios en las aulas: Dinámica de dominación y resistencia en Oaxaca*. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
http://www.cseiio.edu.mx/bibliotecavirtual/Sociales/Descargar/los_indios_en_las_aulas.pdf
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. (2007a). On the Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 240–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548>
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. (2007b). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: Contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In Santiago Castro-Gómez & Ramón Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*. Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. (2013). A modo de comentario inicial. In Catherine Walsh (Ed.), *Pedagogías decoloniales. Tomo I: Prácticas insurgentes de resistir, (re)existir y (re)vivir* (pp. 11–13). Editorial Abya-Yala.
- Mansfield, Nick. (2000). *Subjectivity: Theories of the self from Freud to Haraway*. New York University Press.

- Marañón Pimentel, Boris. (2017a). La colonialidad del trabajo. *Controversias y Concurrencias Latinoamericanas*, 9(15), 20–36.
- Marañón Pimentel, Boris. (2017b). *Una crítica descolonial del trabajo*. Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma
- Marcos, Capitán Insurgente. (2023, November 30). Fourteenth Part and Second Approach Alert: The (other) Rule of the Excluded Third. *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/2023/11/30/fourteenth-part-and-second-approach-alert-the-other-rule-of-the-excluded-third/>
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (2005). *Conversations with Durito: Stories of Zapatistas and Neoliberalism*.
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (2017). *Escritos sobre la guerra y la economía política* (Sergio Rodríguez Lascano, Ed.). Pensamiento Crítico Ediciones.
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (1997, June 20). 7 piezas sueltas del rompecabezas mundial (El neoliberalismo como rompecabezas: La inútil unidad mundial que fragmenta y destruye naciones.). *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/1997/06/20/7-piezas-sueltas-del-rompecabezas-mundial-el-neoliberalismo-como-rompecabezas-la-inutil-unidad-mundial-que-fragmenta-y-destruye-naciones/>
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (1999, November 20). Chiapas: La guerra. I. Entre el satélite y el microscopio, la mirada del otro (Carta 5.1). *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/1999/11/20/chiapas-la-guerra-i-entre-el-satelite-y-el-microscopio-la-mirada-del-otro-carta-5-1/>
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (2003a, February 1). ¿Cuáles son las características fundamentales de la IV Guerra Mundial? *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/2003/02/01/cuales-son-las-caracteristicas-fundamentales-de-la-iv-guerra-mundial/>
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (2003b, May 2). El mundo: Siete pensamientos en mayo de 2003. Mayo del 2003. *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/2003/05/02/el-mundo-siete-pensamientos-en-mayo-de-2003-mayo-del-2003/>
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. (2007, June 9). Conferencia “Dos políticas y una ética” en el Auditorio Ché Guevara. *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/2007/06/09/conferencia-etica-y-politica-en-el-auditorio-che-guevara-8-de-junio/>
- Mariátegui, José Carlos. (1958). *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* (2nd ed.). Amauta.
- Marín Tamayo, John Jairo. (2008). La construcción de una nueva identidad en los indígenas del Nuevo Reino de Granada. In *Fondo Editorial ICANH*. Fondo Editorial ICANH. <https://publicaciones.icanh.gov.co/index.php/picanh/catalog/book/158>
- Marsiske, Renate. (2006). *La universidad de México: Historia y Desarrollo*. 8, 25.
- Martínez Boom, Alberto. (2000). Malestar docente y profesionalización en América Latina. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, 6, 87–112.
- Martínez, Elizabeth, & García, Arnoldo. (2000). What is Neoliberalism? *Collective Liberation*. https://www.collectiveliberation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/What_Is_Neoliberalism.pdf
- Martínez Luna, Jaime. (2010). *Eso que llaman comunalidad*.
- Martínez Osorio, Pedro Arturo. (2012). *La enseñanza en arquitectura y las visiones normativas hegemónicas, desde el contexto global al local*. 4(1), 9.
- Martínez Posada, Jorge Eliécer. (2010). *La universidad productora de productores: Entre biopolítica y subjetividad*. Universidad de la Salle.
- Martínez Posada, Jorge Eliécer. (2014). *Subjetividad, biopolítica y educación: Una lectura desde el dispositivo*. Universidad de La Salle.
- Marx, Karl. (1975). Draft of an Article on Friedrich List’s book: Das Nationale System der Politischen Oekonomie. In Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 1844–45, Vol. 4* (Vol. 4).
- Marx, Karl. (1978). Letters from the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher: Marx to Ruge, Kreuznach, September 1843. In Robert C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader*.

- Marx, Karl. (1993). *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy* (Martin Nicolaus, Trans.). Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl. (2004). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 1*. Penguin UK.
- Mathieu, Nicole Claude. (2005). ¿Identidad sexual/ sexuada/ de sexo?. Tres modos de conceptualización de la relación sexo y género. In Rosa Ynés Och y Curiel Pichardo & Jules Falquet, *El patriarcado al desnudo: Tres feministas materialistas: Colette Guillaumin, Paola Tabet, Nicole Claude Mathieu*. Brecha Lésbica.
<https://repositorio.unal.edu.co/handle/unal/47117>
- Mato, Daniel. (2007). THINK TANKS, fundaciones y profesionales en la promoción de ideas (neo)liberales en América Latina. In Alejandro Grimson, Daniel Mato, & Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (Eds.), *Cultura y neoliberalismo* (1a. ed). Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Maturana, Humberto, & Varela, Francisco J. (1988). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding* (1st pbk. ed). New Science Library : Distributed in the United State by Random House.
- Mazzanti, Giancarlo. (2015). *Giancarlo Mazzanti, arquitecto colombiano*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s5kI-iW4e2s>
- Mbembe, Achille. (2017, December 4). *Rethinking Democracy Beyond the Human*.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A_k3YIupGok
- McKittrick, Katherine (Ed.). (2015). *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis*. Duke University Press.
- McNeil, Elizabeth, Wermers, James E., & Lunn, Joshua O. (Eds.). (2017). Introduction: Mapping Queer Space(s). In *Mapping Queer Space(s) of Praxis and Pedagogy* (1st ed., pp. 1–17). Palgrave Macmillan.
- McRobbie, Angela. (2018). *Be Creative: Making a Living in the New Culture Industries*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mead, Margaret. (1963). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies* (Vol. 370). Morrow New York.
- Mead, Margaret. (2001). *Sex and Temperament: In Three Primitive Societies*.
- Meadows, Donella, Meadows, Dennis, & Randers, Jorgen. (1991). *Beyond the Limits: Confronting Global Collapse, Envisioning a Sustainable Future*. McClelland & Stewart.
- Méndez, Alfredo. (2015, February 17). *La Jornada: Dueños de Geo se dieron vida millonaria con nuestro dinero: ex trabajadores*. <https://www.jornada.com.mx/2015/02/17/politica/012n1pol>
- Méndez, Ricardo. (2020). *La telaraña financiera: Una geografía de la financiarización y su crisis* (Vol. 66). RIL editores.
- Mendoza, Breny. (2010). La epistemología del sur, la colonialidad del género y el feminismo latinoamericano. In Yuderlys Espinosa Miñoso & Lucía de Leone (Eds.), *Aproximaciones críticas a las prácticas teórico-políticas del feminismo latinoamericano* (1a ed.). En la Frontera.
- Merchand Rojas, Marco Antonio. (2017). Estado, vivienda de interés social e inmobiliarias en México. *Cuadernos de Vivienda y Urbanismo*, 10(19), 6. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.cvu10-19.evis>
- Merchant, Carolyn. (1987). Der Tod der natur. *Ökologie, Frauen Und Neuzeitliche Naturwissenschaft. München*.
<https://doc1.bibliothek.li/aaj/000A063847.pdf>
- Meyer, Hannes. (1972). *El arquitecto en la lucha de clases y otros escritos*. Editorial G. Gili.
- Meyerhoff, Eli. (2019). *Beyond Education: Radical Studying for Another World* (Edición: 1). Univ Of Minnesota Press.
- Mijail, Johan. (2022). *Manifiesto antirracista: Escrituras para una biografía inmigrante*. Editorial Fruta Bomba.
- Decreto 0936 de Mayo 10 de 2002, Por el cual se establecen los estándares de calidad en programas profesionales de pregrado en Arquitectura, 0936 (2002).
- Minvivienda, Ministerio de Vivienda, Ciudad y Territorio. (2023). *Ministerio | Minvivienda*.
<https://minvivienda.gov.co/ministerio>
- Mirowski, Philip. (2014). *Never Let a Serious Crisis Go to Waste: How Neoliberalism Survived the Financial Meltdown*. Verso.
- Mirowski, Philip, & Plehwe, Dieter (Eds.). (2015). *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective, With a New Preface*.
- Mitchell, Nick. (2023a, April 26). *Committee on Teaching's Distinguished Teaching Award: Nick Mitchell*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Y7MfOi1Zgk>

- Mitchell, Nick. (2023b, June 1). *Nick Mitchell, "What Is a University? Gender, Race, Surplus."*
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HzQCPDfFaLc>
- Mitjans, Tito. (2020). De puentes afrotransfeministas Articulaciones feministas afrodiaspóricas frente a los procesos de desterritorialización antinegras. *Millcayac - Revista Digital de Ciencias Sociales*, VII(12).
- MOFA, Mujeres Organizadas Facultad de Arquitectura. (2021, April 28). Así se vive el paro feminista en la Facultad de arquitectura de la UNAM. *Malvestida*. <https://malvestida.com/2021/04/paro-en-la-facultad-de-arquitectura-de-la-unam/>
- MOFA, Mujeres Organizadas Facultad de Arquitectura, Consejerxs Alumnxs FA, CIDIFems, FemisFA, & Estudiantes Organizadxs de la FA. (2021). *Pliego petitorio con motivo de la Asamblea Resolutiva Estudiantil del día 22 de marzo del 2021 por la Violencia de Género en la Facultad de Arquitectura*.
- Moisés, Subcomandante Insurgente. (2023, November 13). Novena Parte: La Nueva Estructura de la Autonomía Zapatista. *Enlace Zapatista*. <https://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/2023/11/12/novena-parte-la-nueva-estructura-de-la-autonomia-zapatista/>
- Montes de Oca, Luis. (1940). Prologo. In Walter Lippmann, *Retorno a la libertad*. Unión tipográfica editorial hispano-americana.
- Moten, Fred. (1999). Review—Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America and Soul: Black Power, Politics, and Pleasure. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 43(4), 169–175.
- Moten, Fred. (2003). *In the break: The aesthetics of the Black radical tradition*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Moten, Fred. (2017a). *Black and Blur*. Duke University Press Books.
- Moten, Fred. (2017b). *From Day*. Belladonna.
- Moten, Fred. (2018a). *Stolen Life*. Duke University Press Books.
- Moten, Fred. (2018b). *The Universal Machine*. Duke University Press Books.
- Moten, Fred. (2015, August 5). *An Interview with Fred Moten, Part 1* (Adam Fitzgerald, Interviewer) [Interview].
<https://lithub.com/an-interview-with-fred-moten-pt-i/>
- Moten, Fred, & da Silva, Denise Ferreira. (2021, December 17). *The Multiplicity Turn: Theories of Identity from Poetry to Mathematics seminar - November 24, 2021*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hRfsGzvK144>
- Moten, Fred, & Harney, Stefano. (2013). *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & black study*. Minor Compositions.
- Moten, Fred, & Harney, Stefano. (2021). *All Incomplete*. Minor Compositions.
- Moten, Fred, & MAKC, Millennials Are Killing Capitalism. (2023, 25). *Fred Moten on Palestine and the Nation-State of Israel*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vWnzkJUAZnQ>
- Mudge, Stephanie I. (2016). Neoliberalism, accomplished and ongoing. In Simon Springer, Kean Birch, & Julie MacLeavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Mueller, Justin. (2012). Anarchism, the State, and the Role of Education. In Robert H. Haworth (Ed.), *Anarchist pedagogies: Collective actions, theories, and critical reflections on education* (pp. 14–31). PM Press.
- Muj Cumes, Edizon. (2023, October 26). *Milpa, ciencia y tecnología: Sembrar posibilidades más allá del mundo de uno*.
<https://centroculturaldigital.mx/revista/milpa-ciencia-y-tecnologia>
- Mujeres Creando. (2005). *La Virgen de los deseos* (1st ed.). Tinta Limón.
- Murphy, Agnes. (1968). *The ideology of French imperialism, 1871-1881*.
- Nandy, Ashis. (1987). *Traditions, Tyranny and Utopia: Essays in the Politics of Awareness*. Oxford UP.
- Naredo, José Manuel. (2010). *Raíces económicas del deterioro ecológico y social*. Siglo XXI de España Editores, SA.
<https://www.fundacionareces.es/recursos/doc/portal/2018/03/05/1641785598-25112013165528.pdf>
- Narodowski, Mariano. (2010). Cuasimonopolios escolares: Lo que el viento nunca se llevó. *Revista Educación y Pedagogía*, 58, 29–36.
- Navarrete Linares, Federico. (2016). *México racista: Una denuncia*. Grijalbo.
- Navarrete Linares, Federico. (2022). Blanquitud vs. Blancura, mestizaje y privilegio en México de los siglos XIX a XXI, una propuesta de interpretación. *Estudios Sociológicos*, v. 40, número especial, febrero de 2022.

- Ngcobo, Gabi. (2018). Dear History, We Don't Need Another Hero. In Gabi Ngcobo & Yvette Mutumba (Eds.), *We don't need another hero *Guidebook*: 10th Berlin Biennale für Zeitgenössische Kunst—10th Berlin Biennale for contemporary art*. Distanz Publishing.
- Nicholas, Lucy. (2012). Anarchism, Pedagogy, Queer Theory and Poststructuralism: Toward a Positive Ethical Theory, of Knowledge and the Self. In Robert H. Haworth (Ed.), *Anarchist pedagogies: Collective actions, theories, and critical reflections on education* (pp. 242–259). PM Press.
- Núñez, K. (2004). México, ejemplo del fracaso de la apertura comercial: UNCTAD. *La Jornada*.
- Oakley, Ann. (1972). *Sex, gender and society*. Temple Smith.
- Ochoa, Roberto. (2009). *Muerte al Leviatán: Principios para una política desde la gente*. Jus.
- Ockman, Joan. (2015). Foreword. In Peggy Deamer (Ed.), *The architect as worker: Immaterial labor, the creative class, and the politics of design*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Olssen, Mark. (2009). *Liberalism, neoliberalism, social democracy: Thin communitarian perspectives on political philosophy and education*. Routledge.
- OnA, ediciones. (2022). *FUTURO ANCESTRAL: TIEMPO NO BLANCO* (2nd ed.). OnA ediciones.
- Ordoñez, Mariana, & Amescua, Jesica. (2021, December 5). *Fetichización de la arquitectura: El objeto por encima del sujeto y los procesos*. ArchDaily México. <https://www.archdaily.mx/mx/972717/fetichizacion-de-la-arquitectura-el-objeto-por-encima-del-sujeto-y-los-procesos>
- Ordoñez, Mariana, Amescua, Jesica, & Ríos, Ximena. (2021). Actos de dominación y violencia patriarcal desde la arquitectura. *comunal*. <https://www.comunaltaller.com/violenciapatriarcal>
- Ornelas Bernal, Raúl (Ed.). (2013). *Crisis civilizatoria y superación del capitalismo*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas.
- Ornelas Delgado, Jaime. (2009). Neoliberalismo y capitalismo académico. In Pablo Gentili, Gaudêncio Frigotto, Roberto Leher, & Florencia Stubrin, *Políticas de privatización, espacio público y educación en América Latina*. Clacso. <http://biblioteca-repositorio.clacso.edu.ar:8080/bitstream/CLACSO/11995/1/Gentili-Políticas.pdf>
- Ortiz Flores, Enrique. (2006). Presentación. In Rino Torres, *La producción social de la vivienda en México: Su importancia nacional y su impacto en la economía de los hogares pobres*. Coalición Internacional para el Hábitat, Oficina Regional para América
- Ortiz Macedo, Luis. (2004). *La historia del arquitecto mexicano, siglos XVI-XX*. México: Grupo editorial.
- Ospina, Lucas. (2021, October 17). *Diez tesis sobre la violencia de la Economía Naranja*. <https://latoneriaypintura.co/2021/10/17/diez-tesis-sobre-la-violencia-de-la-economia-naranja/>
- Ospina, Lucas. (2023, September 13). *El verdadero negocio de la universidad hoy NO es la educación—@LuisaPoncas* [Tweet]. Twitter. <https://twitter.com/LuisaPoncas/status/1701789157633171703>
- Oyèwùmí, Oyèrónkẹ́. (2019, December 26). *Desaprendendo lições da Colonialidade: Escavando saberes subjugados e epistemologias Marginalizadas*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zeFI9vTl8ZU>
- Palomera, Jaime. (2018). Prólogo. In David Madden & Peter Marcuse, *En defensa de la vivienda* (Edición: 1). Capitán Swing.
- paperson, la. (2017). *A Third University Is Possible*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Parker, Emily Anne. (2018). The Human as Double Bind: Sylvia Wynter and the Genre of “Man.” *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 32(3), 439–449. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jspecphil.32.3.0439>
- Peck, Jamie. (2001). Neoliberalizing states: Thin policies/hard outcomes. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25(3), 445–455.
- Peck, Jamie, & Tickell, Adam. (2002). Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00247>
- Peet, Richard. (2002). Ideology, Discourse, and the Geography of Hegemony: From Socialist to Neoliberal Development in Postapartheid South Africa. *Antipode*, 34(1), 54–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00226>
- Pelletier, Louise. (2007). Genius, Fiction and the Author in Architecture. In Tim Anstey, Katja Grillner, & Rolf Hughes (Eds.), *Architecture and authorship*. Black Dog Publishing.

- Pereira da Silva, Daniel, Pestana, Heitor, Andreoni, Leilane, Ferretti, Marcelo, Fogaça, Marcia, Senhorini, Mario, da Silva Junior, Nelson, Beer, Paulo, & Ambra, Pedro. (2023). Matrices psicológicas de la episteme neoliberal: Un análisis sobre el concepto de libertad. In danie valencia sepúlveda (Trans.), *Neoliberalismo como gestão do sofrimento psíquico*. Círculo de lectura y estudio sobre salud mental: neoliberalismo, subjetividad y sufrimiento psíquico.
- Pérez Jaramillo, Jorge. (2002). Preparación para la educación y la práctica de arquitectura sin fronteras: Riesgos y oportunidades. *Revista Hito*, 1(20).
- Pérez Plaja, Fraterna. (2021, 21). *Conversation with Fraterna Pérez Plaja* [Personal communication].
- Pérez Rueda, Ani. (2022). *Las falsas alternativas: Pedagogía libertaria y nueva educación*. Virus.
- Perlman, Fredy. (2018). *The Machine And Its Discontents: A Fredy Perlman Anthology*.
- Peters, Michael A. (2016). Education, neoliberalism, and human capital homo economicus as 'entrepreneur of himself.' In Simon Springer, Kean Birch, & Julie MacLeavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Piña Dreinhofer, Agustín. (2013). Siglo XIX: Arquitectura porfirista. *Material de Lectura*, 6.
- Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (1998). *Queer Theory in Education*. Routledge.
- Plata, William Elvis. (2016). Frailes y evangelización en el Nuevo Reino de Granada (s. Xvi). Vicisitudes de un proceso conflictivo y no muy exitoso. *Franciscanum*, 58(165), 263. <https://doi.org/10.21500/01201468.2190>
- Plato. (2007). *The Being of the Beautiful: Plato's Theaetetus, Sophist, and Statesman* (Seth Benardete, Trans.).
- Plehwe, Dieter, Walpen, Bernhard JA, & Neunhöffer, Gisela. (2007). *Neoliberal hegemony: A global critique*. Routledge.
- Portilla, Isabella. (2005). El Sueño de Las Torres con escalinatas. *Directo Bogotá*, 9.
- Pradilla Cobos, Emilio, & Jiménez, Carlos. (1973). *Arquitectura: Urbanismo y dependencia neocolonial*. SIAP.
- Prakash, Madhu Suri, & Esteva, Gustavo. (2008). *Escaping Education: Living As Learning Within Grassroots Cultures* (2nd edition). Peter Lang Inc., International Academic Publishers.
- Proceso de liberación de la Madre Tierra. (2016). *Libertad y alegría con Uma Kiwe Palabra del Proceso de Liberación de la Madre Tierra*. Editorial Punto de Liberación.
- Proceso de liberación de la Madre Tierra. (2019). *¡Bajo el cemento el alimento! Memorias de la segunda marcha de la comida*. Imprenta Comunera.
- Proceso de liberación de la Madre Tierra. (2021). *Sencillamente nasa* (1st ed.). Editorial Punto de Liberación.
- Puebla Cadena, Claudia. (2002). *Del intervencionismo estatal a las estrategias facilitadoras: Los cambios en la política de vivienda en México, (1972-1994)*. El Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Demográficos y de Desarrollo Urbano.
- Puiggrós, Adriana. (1994). *Imperialismo, educación y neoliberalismo en América Latina*. Paidós Buenos Aires.
- Purcell, Mark. (2008). *Recapturing democracy: Neoliberalization and the struggle for alternative urban futures*. Routledge.
- Queiroz, L., Pouchain, I., Diniz, N., & Fidalgo, T. (2020). Nexos Financeirização/Urbanização: Construindo um marco teórico. *As Metrôpoles Eo Capitalismo Financeirizado. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital, Observatório Das Metrôpoles*.
- Quijano, Aníbal. (1988). Notas sobre los problemas de la investigación social en América Latina. *Cuadernos Del CENDES*, 9, 110–119.
- Quijano, Aníbal. (1992). Colonialidad y Modernidad/Racionalidad. *Perú Indígena*, 13(29), 11–20.
- Quijano, Aníbal. (2000). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views From the South*, 1, 48.
- Quijano, Aníbal. (2001). *La colonialidad y la cuestión del poder*. Texto inédito.
- Quijano, Aníbal. (2013). El trabajo. *Argumentos (México, DF)*, 26(72), 145–163.
- Quijano, Aníbal. (2014). *Cuestiones y horizontes: De la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder: antología esencial* (Danilo de Assis Clímaco, Ed.; Primera edición). CLACSO. <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/gc01/9789877220186.pdf>
- Quintero, Pablo. (2010). Notas sobre la teoría de la colonialidad del poder y la estructuración de la sociedad en América Latina. *Papeles de Trabajo. Centro de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Etnolingüística y Antropología Socio-Cultural*, 19, Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.35305/revista.v0i19.122>
- Ramnath, Maia. (2012). *Decolonizing Anarchism: An Antiauthoritarian History of India's Liberation Struggle*. AK Press.

- Raunig, Gerald. (2013). *Factories of Knowledge, Industries of Creativity* (Aileen Derieg, Trans.). Semiotext(e) ; distributed by the MIT Press.
- Raunig, Gerald. (2016). *Dividuum: Machinic capitalism and molecular revolution*. Semiotext(e).
- Read, Jason. (2009). A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity. *Foucault Studies*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i0.2465>
- Read, Jason. (2016). *The politics of transindividuality*. Brill.
- Real Audiencia, del Nuevo Reino de Granada. (1948). *Libro de Acuerdo de la Real Audiencia del Nuevo Reino de Granada, 1557-1567*. Antena.
- Restrepo, Eduardo. (1996). *Los tuqueros negros del Pacífico sur colombiano*.
- Reyes Rojas, Alfredo M. (2022). Arquitectura sin Arquitectos o la importancia del Arquitecto y la Arquitectura en el País. In Rubén Hernández Molina (Ed.), *El oficio del arquitecto: Reflexión Nacional*. ACFA.
- Reyes Rojas, Alfredo M. (2019, August 9). Los atributos de los Arquitectos. *Consejo Profesional Nacional de Arquitectura y sus Profesiones Auxiliares*. <https://cpnaa.gov.co/los-atributos-de-los-arquitectos/>
- Rich, Adrienne. (2002). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. In *Culture, Society and Sexuality* (pp. 199–225). Routledge.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. (1993). Mestizaje colonial andino: Una hipótesis de trabajo. *Violencias Encubiertas En Bolivia*, 1.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. (2010a). *Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: Una reflexión sobre prácticas y discursos descolonizadores*. Tinta Limón Ediciones.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. (2010b). *Violencias (re) encubiertas en Bolivia* (1st ed.). La Mirada Salvaje.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. (2018). *Un mundo ch'ixi es posible. Ensayos desde un presente en crisis*. Tinta Limón.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. (2016, June 17). *Conferencia ¿Es posible descolonizar el mestizaje?* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aKHEAq9AhLU>
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia, & Barragan, Rossana (Eds.). (1997). *Debates postcoloniales: Una introducción a los estudios de la subalternidad*. Taller de Historia Oral Andina.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia, Domingues, José Mauricio, Escobar, Arturo, & Leff, Enrique. (2016). Debate sobre el colonialismo intelectual. *Cuestiones de Sociología*.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia, & Federici, Silvia. (2018). *Conversatorio entre Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui y Silvia Federici*. https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?ref=watch_permalink&v=2268308433403303
- Robert, Jean. (1999). *La Libertad de Habitar*. Habitat International Coalition HIC.
- Robert, Jean. (2011). *El análisis del fetichismo de las mercancías, aportación primordial de Karl Marx*. 12.
- Robert, Jean. (2018). Modernity's Spatial Imperative (2000). *The International Journal of Illich Studies*, 6(1), Article 1.
- Robert, Jean. (2021). El arte de habitar no se deja alfabetizar. *The International Journal of Illich Studies*, 8(2), Article 2.
- Robert, Jean. (2022). *La edad de los sistemas en el pensamiento del Illich tardío*. Itaca.
- Robinson, Cedric J. (2020). *Black marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition* (Third edition, revised and updated). The University of North Carolina Press.
- Roca, Juan Manuel. (2019). *Manténgase lejos de los tibios: (Escritos libertarios)*. Taller de Edición-Rocca.
- Rodríguez Lascano, Sergio. (2017). A manera de prólogo. In Sergio Rodríguez Lascano (Ed.), *Escritos sobre la guerra y la economía política*. Pensamiento Crítico Ediciones.
- Roediger, David R. (2008). *Black on white: Black writers on what it means to be white*. Schocken.
- Rojkind Arquitectos. (2023). *Rojkind Arquitectos | Home*. Rojkind Arquitectos. <https://rojkindarquitectos.com/>
- Rolnik, Raquel. (2019). *Urban Warfare: Housing and cities in an age of finance* (Gabriel Hirschhorn, Trans.).
- Rolnik, Suely. (2017). The Spheres of Insurrection: Suggestions for Combating the Pimping of Life. *E-Flux Journal*.
- Rolnik, Suely. (2019). *Esferas de la insurrección: Apuntes para descolonizar el inconsciente* (Cecilia Palmeiro, Marcía Cabrera, & Damian Kraus, Trans.).
- Rolnik, Suely. (2022). Las arañas, los guaraníes y algunos europeos. Otros apuntes para descolonizar el inconsciente. *F-íLia*, 5, 133–170.
- Rolnik, Suely. (2023, 25). *Politizar el deseo, descolonizar el inconsciente*.

- Romero Sotelo, María Eugenia. (2016). *Los orígenes del neoliberalismo en México: La Escuela Austriaca*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Rönn, Magnus, Andersson, Jonas E., & Bloxham Zettersten, Gerd. (2013). *Architectural Competitions – Histories and Practice*. KTH Royal Institute of Technology. <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-140437>
- Rose, Nikolas S. (1996). *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenfeld, Myra Nan. (1986). The Royal Building Administration in France from Charles V to Louis XIV. In Spiro Kostof (Ed.), *The Architect: Chapters in the history of the profession*. Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, Gayle. (2000). El tráfico de mujeres: Notas sobre la ‘economía política’ del sexo. In Marysa Navarro & Catharine R. Stimpson, *¿Qué son los estudios de mujeres?* FCE. <http://dspace5.filo.uba.ar/handle/filodigital/8235>
- Safatle, Vladimir. (2023a). La economía y su extensión dentro de la psicología por otros medios: El sufrimiento psíquico y el neoliberalismo como economía moral. In danie valencia sepúlveda (Trans.), *Neoliberalismo como gestão do sofrimento psíquico* (1st ed.). Círculo de lectura y estudio sobre salud mental: neoliberalismo, subjetividad y sufrimiento psíquico.
- Safatle, Vladimir. (2023b). La economía y su extensión dentro de la psicología por otros medios: El sufrimiento psíquico y el neoliberalismo como economía moral. In danie valencia sepúlveda (Trans.), *Neoliberalismo como gestão do sofrimento psíquico*. Círculo de lectura y estudio sobre salud mental: neoliberalismo, subjetividad y sufrimiento psíquico.
- Safatle, Vladimir, Franco, Fábio, Lemes de Castro, Julio Cesar, Manzi, Ronaldo, & Afshar, Yasmin. (2023). El sujeto y el orden del mercado: Génesis teórica del neoliberalismo. In danie valencia sepúlveda (Trans.), *Neoliberalismo como gestão do sofrimento psíquico*. Círculo de lectura y estudio sobre salud mental: neoliberalismo, subjetividad y sufrimiento psíquico.
- Said, Edward W. (2003). *Orientalism* (25th anniversary edition). Vintage Books.
- Salazar Bondy, Augusto. (1968). Reflexiones sobre la reforma universitaria. *ACTUAL, Revista de La Universidad de Los Andes*.
- Salazar González, Guadalupe. (2021). La enseñanza-aprendizaje en la era digital. Formal o informal, especializado o difuso, información o formación. *Revista ASINEA*, 1(53).
- Saldarriaga Roa, Alberto. (1985). La industria de la enseñanza de la Arquitectura en Colombia. *Revista Hito*, 1(5).
- Saldarriaga Roa, Alberto, & Fonseca, Lorenzo. (1984). La Arquitectura Moderna en Colombia. *Arte En Colombia*, 23.
- Saldarriaga Roa, Alberto, Pinzón Rivera, José Alezander, & Ortiz Crespo, Alfonso. (2017). *En busca de Thomas Reed: Arquitectura y política en el siglo XIX* (2nd ed.). Instituto Distrital de Patrimonio Cultural.
- Salinas, Fernando. (1972). La arquitectura revolucionaria del tercer mundo. *Calli Internacional. Revista Analítica de Arquitectura Contemporánea*, 58, 13–16.
- Santos, Milton. (2017). *Toward an Other Globalization: From the Single Thought to Universal Conscience* (Lucas Melgaço & Tim Clarke, Trans.).
- Sarfatti Larson, Magali. (2013). *The Rise of Professionalism: Monopolies of Competence and Sheltered Markets*. Transaction Publishers.
- SCA, Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos. (2023). *Manifiesto, Lecciones invaluableles que resaltan la arquitectura como una fuerza más allá de una profesión*. Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos. <https://sociedadcolombianadearquitectos.org/home/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/38Congreso-SCA-manifiesto.pdf>
- Schnapp, Jeffrey T. (2008). The Face of the Modern Architect. *Grey Room*, 33, 6–25.
- Schumacher, Patrik. (2011). *The Autopoiesis of Architecture, Volume I: A New Framework for Architecture*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Schumacher, Patrik. (2023, December 7). *Tectonism: Architecture for the 21st Century*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=93AjRPhTP7E>
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1944). *Teoría del desenvolvimiento económico*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1947). The creative response in economic history. *The Journal of Economic History*, 7(2), 149–159.

- Schumpeter, Joseph Alois. (1961). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle* (Redvers Opie, Trans.). Harvard University Press Cambridge, MA.
- Schürmann, Reiner. (1987). *Heidegger on Being and Acting: From Principles to Anarchy* (Christine-Marie Gros, Trans.). Indiana University Press.
- Schvartzberg, Manuel. (2015). Foucault's "environmental" power: Architecture and neoliberal subjectivization. In Peggy Deamer (Ed.), *The Architect as Worker: Immaterial Labor, the Creative Class, and the Politics of Design* (pp. 181–205). Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Scott, Joan. (2000). El género, una categoría para el análisis histórico. In Marysa Navarro & Catharine R. Stimpson, *¿Qué son los estudios de mujeres?* FCE. <http://dspace5.filo.uba.ar/handle/filodigital/8235>
- SEDUVI, Secretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda. (2023). *Misión y Visión*. Secretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda de la CDMX. <https://www.seduvi.cdmx.gob.mx/secretaria/mision-y-vision>
- Segato, Rita. (2018). *Contra-Pedagogías de la Crueldad*. Prometeo Libros.
- Segato, Rita Laura. (2010). Los cauces profundos de la raza latinoamericana: Una relectura del mestizaje. *Crítica y Emancipación*, 2(3), 11–44.
- Seidman, Michael. (1991). *Workers against work: Labor in Paris and Barcelona during the popular fronts*. University of California Press. http://digitool.hbz-nrw.de:1801/webclient/DeliveryManager?pid=841448&custom_att_2=simple_viewer
- Sentipensante. (2019). *Vida, obra y conceptos principales de Orlando Fals Borda*. Sentipensante. <https://sentipensante.red/>
- Serrano Valero, Fabián. (2020). *La Minga Indígena, hacia una revolución sin líderes*. Imprenta Comunera.
- Sharma, Kriti. (2015). *Interdependence: Biology and beyond*. Fordham Univ Press.
- Shimbo, Lúcia Zanin, & Rufino, Beatriz (Eds.). (2019). *Financeirização e estudos urbanos na América Latina*. Letra Capital Editora.
- Silva Montes, César. (2011). Neoliberalismo y educación superior en el norte de México. *Educación y Humanismo*, 13(21), 112–12.
- Simondon, Gilbert. (2020). *Individuation in Light of Notions of Form and Information*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Smith, Adam. (2018). *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, Vol. 2 (Classic Reprint)*. FB&C Limited.
- Snorton, C. Riley. (2017). *Black on both sides: A racial history of trans identity*. University of Minnesota.
- Socoloff, Ivana Claudia. (2019). Financiarización de la producción urbana: El caso argentino en perspectiva. *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1344/sn2019.23.21493>
- Sohn-Rethel, Alfred. (2021). *Intellectual and Manual Labour: A Critique of Epistemology*.
- Sordo Madaleno. (2023). *Sordo Madaleno | Architecture & Design Studio*. <https://sordomadaleno.com/>
- Soriano Jiménez, Ignacio C. (2017a). *Semblanza de Carmen Paredes Sans (1896-1970)*. Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes - Portal Editores y Editoriales Iberoamericanos (siglos XIX-XXI) - EDI-RED. <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmc961j7>
- Soriano Jiménez, Ignacio C. (2017b). *Semblanza de Vértice (1925-1939; 1946-1972)*. Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes - Portal Editores y Editoriales Iberoamericanos (siglos XIX-XXI) - EDI-RED. <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/editorial-vertice-1925-1939-1946-1972-semblanza/>
- Soto Arango, Diana Elvira. (2005). Aproximación histórica a la universidad colombiana. *Revista Historia de La Educación Latinoamericana*, 7, 99–136.
- Spencer, Douglas. (2016). *The architecture of neoliberalism: How contemporary architecture became an instrument of control and compliance*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Spencer, Douglas. (2019). Island Life: The Eco-Imaginary Of Capitalism. *Log*, 47, 167–174.
- Spencer, Douglas. (2020). *Critique of Architecture: Essays on Theory, Autonomy, and Political Economy*.
- Spencer, Douglas. (2023, April 7). *A message to the academic architectural critic—@ytheory*. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/p/Cqw_u_KAOOOR/
- Spinoza, Benedictus de. (1994). *A Spinoza Reader: The Ethics and Other Works* (Edwin Curley, Trans.).

- Springer, Simon. (2012). Neoliberalism as discourse: Between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 133–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.656375>
- Springer, Simon. (2015). *Violent neoliberalism: Development, discourse, and dispossession in Cambodia*. Springer.
- Springer, Simon. (2016a). Fuck neoliberalism. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 15(2), 285–292.
- Springer, Simon. (2016b). *The discourse of neoliberalism: An anatomy of a powerful idea*. Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Steger, Hanns Albert. (1972). *El movimiento estudiantil revolucionario latinoamericano entre las dos Guerras Mundiales* (Vol. 17). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Dirección General de Difusión
- Stevens, Garry. (2002). *The favored circle: The social foundations of architectural distinction*. MIT press.
- Suissa, Judith. (2006). *Anarchism and education: A philosophical perspective*. Routledge.
- Tafari, Manfredo. (1976). *Architecture and utopia: Design and capitalist development*. MIT Press.
- Taibo, Carlos. (2015). *Repensar la anarquía: Acción directa, autogestión y autonomía* (3rd ed.). Los Libros de la Catarata.
- Taibo, Carlos. (2018). *El decrecimiento explicado con sencillez*. Imprenta Comunera.
- Taller. (2023). *Taller Architects*. TALLER Architects. <http://tallerarchitects.com/>
- Tari, Marcello. (2016). *Un comunismo más fuerte que la metrópoli: La Autonomía Italiana en la década de 1970* (Vicente Barbarroja, Trans.).
- Tatiana Bilbao Estudio. (2023). *Tatiana Bilbao Estudio*. Tatiana Bilbao Estudio. <https://tatianabilbao.com/>
- Tazi-Preve, Irene. (1992). *Der Mord an der Mutter (Matricide)*. Universität Innsbruck.
- Tec de Monterrey. (2021a). *Folleto Estudios Creativos*.
- Tec de Monterrey. (2021b). *Plan de Estudios, Arquitectura*. https://tec.mx/sites/default/files/2023-03/Planes%20de%20Estudio%20ESC%20%28Marzo2023%29_ARQ.png
- Tec de Monterrey. (2023a). *Arquitecto*. <https://conecta.tec.mx/es/estudios-creativos/arquitecto>
- Tec de Monterrey. (2023b). *Arquitectura*. <https://tec.mx/es/estudios-creativos/arquitecto>
- Tec de Monterrey. (2023c). *Inicio | Tecnológico de Monterrey*. <https://tec.mx/es>
- Tec de Monterrey. (2023d). *Modelo Tec*. <https://tec.mx/es/modelo-tec>
- Tejido de Educación ACIN. (2014). *Inventos por el Wet wet fxi'zenxi* (Asociación de Cabildos Indígenas del norte del Cauca (ACIN)).
- Tejido de Educación ACIN. (2015). *Continuar con la liberación de la madre tierra a corto, mediano y largo plazo* (Asociación de Cabildos Indígenas del norte del Cauca (ACIN)).
- Thatcher, Margaret, & Butt, Ronald. (1981, May 3). Interview for Sunday Times. *Sunday Times*. <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104475>
- The Invisible Committee. (2009). *The Coming Insurrection*.
- The Invisible Committee. (2015). *To Our Friends*.
- Toca Fernández, Antonio. (2017). Crítica de la arquitectura en México. *tiempo en la casa*, 38.
- Tolstoy, Leo. (2008). On Education. In Matt Hern, *Everywhere all the time: A new deschooling reader*. AK Press.
- Tornel, Carlos. (2023). Book review: Gustavo Esteva: A critique of development and other essays. *Antipode*.
- Torres-González, Jaime. (2010). *Influencia de la política neoliberal en la sociedad colombiana y el fortalecimiento del Autoritarismo* [PhD Thesis]. <https://refubium.fu-berlin.de/handle/fub188/6258>
- Trasatti, Filippo. (2005). *Actualidad de la pedagogía libertaria*. Editorial Popular.
- Troiani, Igea. (2017). Academic capitalism in architecture schools: A feminist critique of employability, 24/7 work and entrepreneurship. In Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, & Helen Runting (Eds.), *Architecture and feminisms: Ecologies, economies, technologies* (1st ed., pp. 170–180). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203729717-1>
- Tünnermann Bernheim, Carlos. (1991). *Historia de la universidad en América Latina: De la Epoca Colonial a la Reforma de Córdoba*. Editorial Universitaria Centroamericana.
- Tzul Tzul, Gladys. (2015). Sistemas de gobierno comunal indígena: La organización de la reproducción de la vida. *El Apantle, Revista de Estudios Comunitarios*, 1(Común ¿para qué?).

- Tzul Tzul, Gladys. (2016). *Sistemas de gobierno comunal indígena: Mujeres y tramas de parentesco en Chuimeq'ena'*. SOCEE, Sociedad Comunitaria de Estudios Estratégicos : Tz'i'kin, Centro de Investigación y Pluralismo Jurídico : Maya' Wuj Editorial.
- UIA. (2017). *UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education*. International Union of Architects / UIA.
- Ulloa, Astrid. (2013). *The Ecological Native: Indigenous Peoples' Movements and Eco-Governmentality in Columbia*. Routledge.
- Ulloa, Astrid, Rubio, Heidi, & Campos, Claudia. (1996). Trua wandra. *Estrategias Para El Manejo de La Fauna Con Comunidades Embera En El Parque Nacional Natural de Utría, Chocó, Colombia*.
- Ulloa Vergara, Rodolfo. (2015). Los concursos de arquitectura: Buen gobierno, transparencia y calidad. In Mauricio Uribe González (Ed.), *Concursos de arquitectura en Colombia 1575-2015* (Primera edición). Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos.
- UN. (2023). *THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- UN, General Assembly. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. *UN Doc. A/RES/70/1 (September 25, 2015)*.
- UNAL, Arquitectura. (2015). *Proyecto Educativo de Programa Autoevaluación y Seguimiento de la Calidad de los Programas de Pregrado Arquitectura*. http://www.pregrado.unal.edu.co/docs/pep/pep_2_31.pdf
- UNAM. (2023a). *Informacion General y Objetivos*. UNAM | Facultad de Arquitectura. <https://arquitectura.unam.mx/informacion-general-y-objetivos.html>
- UNAM. (2023b). *Misión, Visión y Objetivos*. UNAM | Facultad de Arquitectura. <https://arquitectura.unam.mx/fa.html>
- Uniandes, ArqDis. (2021). *Competencias—Programa Arquitectura*. Universidad de Los Andes.
- Uribe González, Mauricio (Ed.). (2015). *Concursos de arquitectura en Colombia 1575-2015* (Primera edición). Sociedad Colombiana de Arquitectos.
- Urquiaga Blanco, Juan. (2013). Prologo: Siglo XIX: Arquitectura porfirista. *Material de Lectura*, 6.
- Urrutia, Juan Pablo. (2014, October 1). Formación de arquitectos con espíritu emprendedor. *ArchDaily México*. <https://www.archdaily.mx/mx/627984/opinion-formacion-de-arquitectos-con-espiritu-emprendedor>
- Valencia Mosquera, Pamela. (2021). Los principios filosóficos del neoliberalismo: Una aproximación a sus consecuencias políticas en Colombia. *Revista de Antropología y Sociología: Virajes*, 23(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.17151/rasv.2021.23.1.11>
- valencia sepúlveda, danie. (2022). *Cuando el mundo llegue a su fin nadie se salvará, reconstruiremos nuevos mundos*. Terremoto. <https://terremoto.mx/revista/cuando-el-mundo-llegue-a-su-fin-nadie-se-salvara-reconstruiremos-nuevos-mundos/>
- Valero, Perla. (2023). El devenir–blanco del mundo: Debates Sur-Norte sobre la blanquitud desde Latinoamérica. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies*, 18(2), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17442222.2021.1954763>
- Vera Herrera, Ramón. (2012). La construcción colectiva del saber. In Gustavo Esteva (Ed.), *Repensar el mundo con Iván Illich* (1a. edición). Taller Editorial La Casa del Mago.
- Villagrán García, José. (2011). Meditaciones sobre una crisis formal. In Víctor Arias Montes & Ramón Vargas Salguero (Eds.), *Ideario de los arquitectos mexicanos. Tomo III: nuevas propuestas*. Instituto Nacional de Bellas Artes : Conaculta : Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Facultad de Arquitectura.
- Viveros Vigoya, Mara. (2016). La interseccionalidad: Una aproximación situada a la dominación. *Debate Feminista*, 52, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.df.2016.09.005>
- Viviescas, Fernando. (1994). La Enseñanza de la Arquitectura en Colombia: El pensamiento ignorado.... *Revista Hito*, 2(19).
- Vogt, Evon Zartman, & Viqueira, Carmen. (1973). Los zinacantecos: Un grupo maya en el siglo XX. (*No Title*). <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000797612907264>
- von Mises, Ludwig. (1998a). *Human action: A treatise on economics* (Scholar's ed.). Ludwig Von Mises Institute.
- von Mises, Ludwig. (1998b). *Problemas económicos de México: Ayer y hoy*. Instituto Cultural Ludwig von Mises.

- von Werlhof, Claudia. (2015). *¡Madre Tierra o muerte!: Reflexiones para una teoría crítica del patriarcado*. El Rebozo Palapa Editorial.
- Ward, Kevin, & England, Kim. (2007). Introduction: Reading Neoliberalization. In Kim England & Kevin Ward (Eds.), *Neoliberalization* (1st ed., pp. 1–22). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470712801.ch1>
- Weber, Max. (2001). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Third Edition* (Stephen Kalberg, Trans.).
- Weeks, Kathi. (2011). *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Duke University Press.
- Weiler, Gerda. (1996). *Der enteignete Mythos: Eine feministische Revision der Archetypenlehre CG Jungs und Erich Neumanns*. <https://philpapers.org/rec/WEIDEM>
- Weller, Sally, & O'Neill, Phillip. (2016). Neoliberalism in question. In Simon Springer, Kean Birch, & Julie MacLeavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wilkinson, Catherine. (1986). The New Professionalism in the Renaissance. In Spiro Kostof (Ed.), *The Architect: Chapters in the history of the profession*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Christopher R., & Arrigo, Bruce A. (2001). Anarchaos and Order: On the Emergence of Social Justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, 5(2), 223–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480601005002005>
- Williamson, John. (1990). Chapter 2: What Washington Means by Policy Reform. In John Williamson, *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* Institute for International Economics.
- Willis, Anne-Marie. (2006). Ontological Designing. *Design Philosophy Papers*, 4(2), 69–92.
- Willis, Katie, Smith, Adrian, & Stenning, Alison. (2008). Introduction: Social justice and neoliberalism. *Social Justice and Neoliberalism: Global Perspectives*, 1–15.
- Wilson, Mabel O. (2019). White By Design. In Darby English & Charlotte Barat (Eds.), *Among others: Blackness at MoMA*. The Museum of Modern Art.
- Wilson, Mabel O., Carver, Jordan, & Baxi, Kadambari. (2015). Working globally: The human networks of transnational architectural projects. In Peggy Deamer (Ed.), *The architect as worker: Immaterial labor, the creative class, and the politics of design*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Wilson, Mabel O., Cheng, Irene, & Davis, Charles L. (2020). *Race and Modern Architecture: A Critical History from the Enlightenment to the Present*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Wittig, Monique. (1996). The category of sex. *Sex in Question: French Materialist Feminism*, 24–29.
- Wittig, Monique. (2018). *La Pensée straight*.
- Wolf, Doris. (1994). *Was war vor den Pharaonen?: Die Entdeckung der Urmütter Ägyptens*. Kreuz-Verlag. <https://ixtheo.de/Record/132800888>
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. (2002). *The Origin Of Capitalism: A Longer View* (New ed.). Verso.
- Wynter, Sylvia. (1995). 1492: A new world view. In Vera Lawrence Hyatt & Rex M. Nettleford (Eds.), *Race, discourse, and the origin of the Americas: A new world view* (pp. 5–57). Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Wynter, Sylvia. (2003). Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257–337.
- Wynter, Sylvia. (2007). Human being as noun? Or being human as praxis? Towards the autopoietic turn/overtun: A manifesto. *Unpublished Essay*.
- Wynter, Sylvia. (2015). On how we mistook the map for the territory, and reimprisoned ourselves in our unbearable wrongness of being, of desêtre: Black studies toward the human project. In Lewis R. Gordon & Jane Anna Gordon, *Not only the master's tools: African American studies in theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Wynter, Sylvia, & McKittrick, Katherine. (2015). UNPARALLELED CATASTROPHE FOR OUR SPECIES? Or, to Give Humanness a Different Future: Conversations. In Katherine McKittrick (Ed.), *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Wynter, Sylvia, & Thomas, Greg. (2006). *Proud Flesh Inter/Views: Sylvia Wynter in ProudFlesh: A New Afrikan Journal of Culture, Politics & Consciousness*.
- Zapata Olivella, Manuel. (1948). Vasconcelos, filósofo de la Reconquista. *Semanario Sábado Entre*.

- Zapata Olivella, Manuel. (2020a). *El hombre colombiano* (2nd ed.). Universidad del Valle.
- Zapata Olivella, Manuel. (2020b). *La rebelión de los genes. El mestizaje americano en la sociedad futura* (2nd ed.). Universidad del Valle.
- Zapata Olivella, Manuel. (2020c). *Las claves mágicas de América: Raza, clase y cultura* (2nd ed.). Universidad del Valle.
- Zephaniah, Benjamin. (2019, June 20). Why I am an anarchist: Benjamin Zephaniah. *Autonomies*.
<https://autonomies.org/2019/06/why-i-am-an-anarchist-benjamin-zephaniah/>
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2015a). *Descolonizar el pensamiento crítico y las rebeldías. Autonomías y emancipaciones en la era del progresismo*. Bajo Tierra Ediciones.
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2015b). *Latiendo resistencia: Mundos nuevos y guerras de despojo*. El Rebozo, Palapa Editorial.
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2015c). Los trabajos colectivos como bienes comunes material/simbólicos. *El Apantle, Revista de Estudios Comunitarios*, 1.
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2016). Participación de Raúl Zibechi. In Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional EZLN (Ed.), *El Pensamiento Crítico Frente a la Hidra Capitalista III*. Enlace Zapatista.
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2021). La comunidad autónoma urbana. El mundo nuevo en el corazón del viejo. In Alicia Hopkins & César Enrique Pineda (Eds.), *Pensar las autonomías. Experiencias de autogestión, poder popular y autonomía*. Bajo Tierra Ediciones.
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2022). *Mundos otros y pueblos en movimiento. Debates sobre anti-colonialismo y transición en América Latina*. Ediciones desde abajo.
- Zibechi, Raúl. (2015d, May 20). Raúl Zibechi – En el seminario “El Pensamiento Crítico Frente a la Hidra Capitalista” realizado en el CIDECI-Unitierra, Chiapas, del 3 al 9 de mayo 2015.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0vEyou6KL_k
- Zibechi, Raúl, & Machado, Decio. (2017). *Cambiar el mundo desde arriba: Los límites del progresismo*. Bajo Tierra Ediciones.

Esta tesis se terminó en lo que hoy se conoce como ciudad de México en diciembre de 2023.

Terminamos este estudio en un contexto de violencia colonial, patriarcal y capitalista generalizada. Aún continúa la violenta (*sub*)valorización de la vida. El mal llamado tren maya se acaba de inaugurar, continuando los procesos de despojo. La experiencia autónoma Zapatista asediada por el narcoestado mexicano. El pueblo digno y rebelde Otomí, aún sin vivienda y asediado pero r-existiendo en la Casa de los Pueblos y las Comunidades Indígenas, “Samir Flores Soberanes”. Procesos autónomos y espacios ocupados desalojados y criminalizados.

A Gil Scott-Heron se le olvidó añadir que si la revolución no será televisada, los genocidios coloniales fascistas sí serán televisados. Para lxs palestinxs, la violencia colonial comenzó en 1947, pero desde el 7 de octubre de 2023 presenciamos en directo su genocidio a manos del estado fascista etno-nacionalista y sionista de Israel. Somos “solidarixs con lxs palestinxs, porque [estamos] comprometidxs con la alternativa insurgente, cuyo reavivamiento es(tá en) la internacional antinacional” (Moten, 2018, p. 215).

Lxs arquitectxs aún siguen siendo unxs de lxs “perros guardianes del colonialismo” (Césaire, 2001, p. 55) y la arquitectura es una máquina de guerra al servicio del capitalismo globalitario. Desde 1997, el ahora conocido como Capitán Insurgente Marcos sostiene que en el marco de la cuarta guerra mundial “se destruyen los territorios y se despueblan. [...] No por afán destructivo, sino para reconstruir y reordenar” (Marcos, 2003). “La destrucción se vuelve negocio desde antes de que se lleve a cabo” (Rodríguez Lascano, 2017, p. 21). Este es el negocio del *mundo arquitectónico*.

—

This thesis was completed in what is now known as ciudad de México in December 2023.

We finish this study in a context of generalised colonial, patriarchal and capitalist violence. The violent (*sub*)valorization of life still continues. The so-called *tren maya* has just been inaugurated, continuing the processes of dispossession. The autonomous Zapatista experience besieged by the Mexican narco-state. *El pueblo digno y rebelde Otomí*, still without housing and besieged but r-existing at *Casa de los Pueblos y las Comunidades Indígenas*, “Samir Flores Soberanes.” Autonomous processes and occupied spaces evicted and criminalized.

Gil Scott-Heron forgot to add that if *the revolution will not be televised*, fascist colonial genocides will be televised. For Palestinians, settler-colonial violence commenced in 1948, but since the 7th of October 2023 we witness live their genocide at the hands of the fascist ethno-nationalist and Zionist state of Israel. We are “in solidarity with the Palestinians, because [we’re] committed to the insurgent alternative, whose refreshment is (in) the antinational international” (Moten, 2018, p. 215).

Still architects are one of the “watchdogs of colonialism” (Césaire, 2001, p. 55) and architecture is a war machine at the service of globalitarian capitalism. Since 1997, the now known as Capitán Insurgente Marcos has argued that under the fourth world war “territories are destroyed and depopulated. [...] Not out of destructive urge, but in order to rebuild and reorganise” (Marcos, 2003). “Destruction becomes business before it takes place” (Rodríguez Lascano, 2017, p. 21). This is the business of the *architectural world*.

