

Suely Rolnik

SPHERES OF INSURRECTION

NOTES ON DECOLONIZING THE UNCONSCIOUS



[...]

What's the Difference between Macro- and Micropolitical Insurrection?

Let's summarize the principal aspects of an insurrection in order to examine their specificity in both macropolitical and micropolitical resistance. Greater attention will be placed on the specifically micropolitical aspects of resistance, because we have less accumulated experience on this front and because, moreover, it is in this sphere that we face our greatest challenge today: creating tools appropriate for the task of decolonizing the unconscious (the matrix of micropolitical resistance).

1) Focus

Macropolitics (a visible and audible focus, accessible on the subject side of subjective experience)

As outlined above, the focus of macropolitical insurrection is inequity in the distribution of rights corresponding to the cartography of social forms established by the colonial-capitalistic regime. In other words, its sharpest targets are the asymmetries in the power relations that are manifested not just between social classes but also between races, genders, sexualities, religions, ethnicities, and colonialities. Identifying these relations as the points of struggle involves the state as well as the laws that maintain these asymmetries.

Micropolitics (an invisible and inaudible focus, accessible in the experience of the tension between the subject and the outside-the-subject)

As it is also outlined above, the focus of micropolitical insurrection is the perverse abuse of the vital force of all the elements of the biosphere: the whole set of living beings that live on the planet, including humans. The abuse extends to the three spheres (hydrosphere, atmosphere, lithosphere) of the Earth's ecosystem that are indispensable for life and its preservation. This abuse is the micropolitical marrow of the regime of the colonial-capitalistic unconscious. The hegemony of its micropolitical dynamic constitutes a highly aggressive pathology with grave consequences not just for the destiny of humanity but for the entire planet, because it affects the four spheres of its ecosystem.

2) Potential agents

Macropolitics (human agents only)

The only potential agents of macropolitical insurrection are human beings (as this sphere of uprising involves the state), especially those who occupy subaltern positions in the fabric of society. Nonetheless, consciousness of the inequity in the distribution of rights, as well as the will to fight this inequity, can also emerge from those who occupy sovereign positions in the web of power relations.

Micropolitics (humans and nonhuman agents)

Potential agents of micropolitical insurgency include all the elements of the biosphere that break out in revolt when they resist violence against life. There are, of course, different dynamics corresponding to the human and nonhuman elements of this insurrection and their respective response to that violence. Nonhuman elements are sensitive to the vital anemia caused by the abuse imposed upon them, and they tend to come up with transfigurations that allow life to regain its pulse. One example of this is a river that dries up when too much colonial-capitalistic waste is dumped on it. The river can be said to insurrect when it responds to this situation by taking shelter underground,⁴⁰ where it once again finds conditions to flow, free from the poisonous effects of this waste. Another example is trees that bloom out of season, rebelling against the risk of sterility that comes with the buildup of pollution.

Human elements of the biosphere, on the other hand, respond to the abuse of life as a function of desire, the dominant politics of which vary according to each culture, in its different moments and contexts. In the culture proper to the colonial-capitalistic regime (whose logic remains the same over time, with adjustments in its different folds), the reduction of subjectivity to the subject (which is inseparable from the abuse of the drive) generates a trauma. In the wake of this trauma there tends to prevail a reactive response – the grounds for the politics of subjectivation hegemonic under that regime.

As mentioned above, the state of fragility brought about by the abuse of life tends to be interpreted as a signal of our own flaws: egotistic, existential, and/or social flaws. This frightens us and, in the presence of this imaginary threat, reactive responses tend to prevail. Desire then latches onto the status quo, acting to conserve it and thereby acting against the perseverance of life, instead of operating in its favor. The formations of the unconscious in the social field that follow from this are responsible for the hordes of zombies that walk the Earth in increasingly terrifying ways.

But when, in this context of adversity, desire manages to respond actively to the trauma of abuse, desire potentializes, and it seeks to act towards decolonizing the unconscious, looking for ways to direct the vital drive away from the fate that capitalist pimping imposes on it.

Subjectivity then gains a chance to live out the experience of the subject and the outside-the-subject simultaneously, in a quest to take back into its own hands the power to decide the destiny of the drive, assuming its ethical responsibility vis-à-vis life. It is through that very process that we turn into agents of micropolitical insurrection. Given the fact that decolonizing the unconscious necessarily entails the realm of our relations – from the most intimate to the more distant ones – the effects of any gesture in the direction of micropolitical insurrection are collective in nature.

Because we are all under the rule of the regime of the colonial-capitalistic unconscious, regardless of our place in the social, economic and cultural cartography, to be an agent of micropolitical insurgency does not depend on the position (more or less sovereign, more or less subaltern) we occupy in the web of power relations that constitutes that cartography. This may seem strange from a macropolitical point of view, and it may seem even more strange when our horizon is reduced to that sphere.

On the other hand, it is clear that, because everything that is lived at the level of forms and their codes is also and inextricably lived at the level of the forces that animate these forms and codes (and that also disorganize them, leading to their transfiguration), different subject positions in the relations of power in the macropolitical sphere (positions defined by class, race, ethnic, gender relations, and so forth) correspond to distinct experiences in the micropolitical sphere. It is important to note that there is no symmetry or parallel between potential agents of insurrection in either one of those spheres.

If, in the macropolitical sphere, these agents are distributed on a cartography organized in binary pairs (with the subaltern pole being the agent of insurrection par excellence), the logic of the distribution of these agents in the micropolitical diagram of forces is different, and it can emerge from any place in the fabric of society, because all of us are under the domain of the pimp-colonial-capitalistic unconscious. Faced with this fact, it is worth asking whether the effects that the abuse of the drive has on subalternized subjects are different than the effects it has on subjectivities that occupy the place of the sovereign. If this is the case, what is the nature of this difference?

When it comes to subalterns, both oppression and exploitation, as well as exclusion (which take place in the sphere of the macropolitical), produce, in the subjects who suffer from them, an experience of their existence as something worthless. This, in turn, generates an intolerable feeling of humiliation, which has, for the subject, a traumatic effect in the sphere of the micropolitical: it has the tendency to bruise even further a vital drive already weakened by the fear of a collapse of the self (a fear caused by the abuse). Class traumas, racial traumas, and ethnic traumas are among the most difficult traumas to overcome. They are constantly reaffirmed, from the beginning of an individual's life (which includes its family and community life) up to the very end. Moreover, these traumas date back to a time before birth, because they are inherited from one's ancestors and inscribed into one's DNA. They include far-removed experiences of colonization and slavery, the forced exile entailed by these experiences, the extermination of those who could not or did not adapt to forms of extreme power, and the (voluntary or involuntary) death of those who could not tolerate the inextricable, anemic state that these experiences cause in them (an anemic state so frequent among slaves brought to Brazil that the Angolan term used to describe this kind of death, "banzo," was adopted in Portuguese).⁴¹

The gravest thing is that these inherited traumas never stop being actualized. They're reproduced continuously, to this day. A double trauma – fear of collapse generated by the abuse of the vital drive; terror of humiliation generated by the disqualification that comes with the place society assigns to certain lives – threatens the integrity of life to such a degree that the responses produced by desire (regardless of whether they are most active or most reactive) tend to be intensified. The reactive response in subalternized subjects is a psychic defense strategy that further restricts their access to body-knowing in order to protect them from the toxic effects of trauma. This tends to prevent desire from acting in the direction of freeing itself from the colonization of the unconscious, which can, in turn, lead to an even greater submission both to the abuse of the drive and to oppression. The ranks of the underprivileged that fervently support political figures such as Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil,⁴² or that make absurd demands for

things such as the return of the military dictatorship, are very eloquent examples of this kind of reactivity.

The same threat to integrity can also, and on the contrary, generate an active response. It can move subalternized subjects to reconnect with body-knowing, as a matter of life or death. This, in turn, leads them to rip off the veil of phantasmatic narratives woven from their double trauma, narratives that mask the cause of their malaise and blur their vision of reality, leading them to the wrong actions. What moves them in this direction is the desire to take back the reins of the vital drive. When this takes place, these subjects tend to become stronger and more lucid, increasing their ability to resist (micropolitically) both abuse and humiliation and also (macropolitically) oppression, exploitation, and exclusion.

As far as the sovereign subject is concerned, the fear of collapse that comes from the abuse of the drive does not bring about a traumatic experience of humiliation linked to class and/or race. The alarm rings less stridently in the sovereign's subjectivity, and so the level of alertness triggered by the alarm – alertness in the face of a threat to life – is lower. But desire's response, in this case, oscillates equally across the range of micropolitics stretching between the two extreme poles (active and reactive) of possible destinies for the drive.

The reactive response originates from a decrease in desire's movement towards insurrection, which can lead to the triumph of a micropolitics that submits the vital drive to the whims of a subjectivity reduced to its gaze as subject. A response like this is reactive even if the gaze in question is (macro)politically correct. This reactive tendency is intensified by the material and narcissistic comfort that the sovereign position enjoys in the relations of power – the opposite of the place of discomfort that the subaltern is forced to occupy. All this leads sovereign subjectivity to hold on even tighter to established forms out of fear of losing its material privileges, which it tends to confuse with what it believes to be the vital privilege of its mode of existence. It is a mistake grounded on the imaginary of colonial-capitalistic societies, which elevates this mode of existence to the rank of the ideal that all of us should aspire to attain. In fact, this mode of existence corresponds to a sterile life, and it therefore does not

constitute any kind of privilege. On the contrary, it is pathetically miserable. In this respect, the sovereign subject differs from the subaltern subject: in the sphere of the macropolitical, the subaltern has nothing to lose and everything to gain.

On the other hand, the very fact that the level of alertness is lower in the subjectivity of the sovereign subject can expand its psychic conditions so that it does not surrender to the trauma of the abuse, and so that desire gains enough momentum to confront this trauma micropolitically by means of an active response. When this takes place, desire connects with eco-ethological knowing. It is then guided by this knowing as it tries to free the drive from its pimping. In other words, privileged material conditions can, in this case, facilitate change instead of stalling it, and when this happens, desire acts towards creative practices. Until recently, these creative practices were often and primordially carried out in the field of art. But today these same practices are being carried out with more and more frequency as transfigurations of modes of existence. This includes the investment of desire in activist movements erupting in everyday life under oppression (in domains defined by gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, etc.). It is worth noting, though, that, because of the reasons outlined above, when these kinds of transfigurations and movements take place in the marginalized parts of urban centers, they tend to be much fiercer, much more daring.

In the field of art, this is the context that gives rise to a renewed interest in the question of art and politics, which once again comes to the fore, though with renewed urgency and with a sense of radicality mobilized by the terrible situation of the planet. This time, however, the focus is less on works of art (and the challenge these works face in problematizing the art system from within, as was the case in the 1960s) and more on the following questions: How to resist the pimping of the potency of creation in art, which is to say, the pimping of its micropolitical potency? How can art strategies intervene beyond the sphere of institutionalized art, installing spaces that summon and support processes of experimentation and promote the proliferation of these processes as well as their respective becomings? Even more radically, how to contribute to the emancipation of the potency of

creation from its confinement not only in the spaces intended for art but in the very category of “art”?

Of course, there’s no generalizing when it comes to the realm of subjectivities. The figures outlined above, which embody active and reactive responses to abuse, overlap to different extents, thus composing different politics of desire that change over time. This is true for subjects in either a subaltern or a sovereign position. The dynamics of these figures in the micropolitical sphere are more complex and paradoxical than the positions each one occupies macropolitically in the social web. Nothing guarantees that all subalterns are, as a matter of principle, potential agents of micropolitical subordination, because their subjectivity may well be under the spell of the unconscious proper to the dominant regime, even when they fight this regime macropolitically. The reverse is also true: the sovereign subject can eventually turn into a micropolitically active agent if the spell of the values proper to the unconscious that rules the dynamics of that subject’s class identification is broken in its subjectivity. This is true even when this subject doesn’t go further than whatever is considered “politically correct” about its actions in the macropolitical field.

3) The Impulse That Moves These Agents

Macropolitics

What moves the agents of macropolitical insurrection is the will to “denounce,” in words and actions, the injustices inherent to the distribution of rights in the present forms of the world. What these agents seek to achieve is to “raise awareness” in society by conveying information and formulating explanations in a way that mobilizes some of its sectors into action (especially the oppressed sectors by means of *identification* with other subalternized elements of society). In sum, what moves macropolitical agents is the will to *empower* both subalterns and macropolitical movements and their organizations, thereby intensifying and expanding their collective strength with the intent of establishing a more equitable distribution of rights.

Micropolitics

What moves the agents of micropolitical insurrection is the will to persevere that corresponds to life itself, a will that, in humans, is manifested as the impulse to *announce* worlds to come, in a process of creation and experimentation that seeks to express these worlds. Embodied in words and actions that carry the pulse of these seeds of the future, this announcement tends to *mobilize other unconsciousnesses* by means of *resonances* with future embryos nesting in other bodies. New allies are thus added to the insubordination in the micropolitical sphere; these allies, for their part, are likely to throw themselves into other processes of experimentation. In those processes, other becomings of the world will be realized, different and unforeseeable from the perspective of those who mobilized them.

4) Intention

Macropolitics (empowering the subject)

The intention to insurrect macropolitically is the “empowering” of the subject, so that it frees itself from political oppression, from economic exploitation and social exclusion; so that it breaks its silence and undoes its invisibilization; so that it speaks up and so that others listen to it with the dignity it deserves; so that it occupies a duly recognized “place of existence.” Because micropolitical insurrection seeks to promote a more equitable distribution of positions within the web of power relations, the intention behind the empowerment of the subject has as its ultimate objective the institution of a more democratic state.

Micropolitics (potentialization of life)

The intention of micropolitical insurrection is the “potentialization” of life: the reappropriation of the vital force in its creating potency. In humans, the reappropriation of the drive depends on the reappropriation of language (verbal, visual, gestural, existential, and other such expressions of language).

This, in turn, entails inhabiting the two dimensions of language: on the one hand, the form of expression of the subject and, on the other hand, the forces that compose the outside-the-subject, which bring movement to language and transform it. It entails, most of all, inhabiting the tension that results from the paradoxical relation

between these two dimensions. The possibility of hurling oneself into a process of experimentation – a process fueled by this tension – depends on this. In this process, what guides desire is this tension: it guides it towards the expression (in words, images, gestures, modes of existence, modes of sexuality, etc.) of the embryonic worlds that disclose themselves to body-knowing.

Ultimately, there are two fundamental differences between the respective intentions of micropolitical and macropolitical struggles. First: expressing (in words and living actions) worlds that are emerging (which is proper to micropolitical insurrection) requires “implication” in that emergence, which is to say, it requires more than just an “explanation” that protects us and brings us imagined relief. This is a condition necessary for the drive-movement to complete its ethical destiny, producing an event. Second: *potentializing a life* is different from “empowering the subject,” the latter being an intention corresponding to the macropolitical sphere of insurrection. Both intentions are important and complementary. The problem comes when the empowerment of the subject alone is pursued. In this case, the potentialization of life, which depends on desire’s investment in the emergence of embryonic worlds, is disregarded. The result of this reduction is that we remain captive in the logic of the system we set out to combat.

Distinguishing between these intentions is especially necessary for bodies considered less valuable in the social imaginary – the poor body, the worker’s body, the black body, the indigenous body, the female body, homosexual, transsexual, and transgender bodies, and so forth. When the insurgency of these bodies includes a desire for vital potency, over and above the empowerment of subjects, what is likely to happen is that the drive-movement finds its singular expression, and that it produces effective transmutations of individual and collective reality.

5) Criteria for Evaluating Situations

Macropolitics (moral criterion)

The criterion used in the sphere of micropolitics to evaluate situations is exclusively rational and guided by the moral judging characteristic of the subject. What guides choices and actions in the macropolitical

sphere is a “moral compass.” Its needle points to systems of values corresponding to current modes of existence: the modes with which each subjectivity identifies in its experience as subject, the ones it uses to situate itself within the social field.

Micropolitics (drive-criterion and its ethics)

The criterion used in the micropolitical sphere to evaluate situations is a “drive-criterion.” What guides our choices and actions in the micropolitical sphere is an “ethical compass.” Its needle points to what life imposes as a condition for its perseverance every time life begins to wane, suffocated by the present modes of existence and their values (which lose meaning when this happens). In sum, the micropolitical criterion for deciphering situations is guided by the power of evaluation corresponding to affects, which can be accessed in the experience outside-the-subject.

6) Modes of Operation

Macropolitics (by negation)

Insurrection in the macropolitical sphere operates by means of negation. It is combat *against* oppressors and against the laws that uphold their power in all its manifestations, in individual and collective life. This is the condition necessary to subvert the distribution of positions within relationships marked by oppression and exploitation. If the struggle here operates by way of opposition, this is because the interests of the two combating poles within the web of power relations are, in fact, opposite, which makes the dynamic of their struggle dialectical.

Micropolitical (by affirmation)

Insurrection in the macropolitical sphere operates by means of affirmation. It is a combat *for* life in its germinating essence. It consists in not giving in to the abuse of the drive, and it is contingent upon an extensive labor: working through the trauma of this abuse, the effects of which include the depotentializing of the vital drive, which prepares the ground for its pimping. The objective of this operating mode, corresponding to micropolitical struggle, is to neutralize – to the greatest extent possible, in each moment and everywhere they appear

– the effects of the trauma of the abuse of the drive. Resisting this abuse is a necessary condition for disarticulating the power that the colonial-capitalistic unconscious has over our own subjectivities, a power that keeps us tangled up in the web of power relations, either in the position of the subaltern (even when we insurrect, macropolitically, against this position) or in the position of the sovereign (even when we proceed in a more or less macropolitically correct way).

Take, for example, women's struggles. Women's insurrection against inequalities in gender relations is indispensable and nondeferrable. That said, if women's insurrection is limited to the abandonment of their subaltern position in the sphere of macropolitics, there is nothing to guarantee that their subjectivity recovers its full existence, because that depends on reappropriating the drive, whose destiny has been sequestered by that same web of power relations. If women do not insurrect in the micropolitical sphere, they will likely remain dependent on a male gaze to feel themselves existing. In that way, women not only remain subject to the pitfalls of male domination and sexist abuse; they also continue to feed this domination with their own desire. In other words, if women's struggles do not incorporate the micropolitical sphere, these struggles tend to remain confined to a logic of opposition to men. Women's struggles then transform into a power dispute that takes the male character in the sexist scene as the only reference for their own identification. In this case, the hegemony of the male character is maintained, and so is the sexist scene that comes with it – precisely everything that women sought to fight in their macropolitical struggle.

The sexist scene, like any scene defined by power relations, is held up by two characters: the oppressor and the oppressed, both protagonists in the dynamic of this scene and both implied in it. To disarticulate this dynamic, the oppressed must leave behind the role assigned to it in this scripted abuse: either a victim of the oppressor or, in the best of cases, the opposite of the oppressor. The oppressed must then transfigure itself into other characters, or, better yet, it must leave the scene of abuse entirely. When this happens, the character of the oppressor, the scene partner of the oppressed, stays behind, talking to himself, and the show cannot go on. Isn't it exactly *this* insurrectional

operation, in the sphere of micropolitics, what the social movements mentioned above have introduced? And isn't this particularly true in relation to the webs of power relations defined by race, sex, and gender?

But what happens with the character to which the oppressor finds itself confined when the character of the oppressed (the other lead character in this scene of power relations) is transfigured? Let's look further into the example of the sexist scene. Different men (who until then could count on their place in this scene, and who always counted on the possibility of reprising their role whenever they wished to do so) respond differently when faced with the anguish that the destabilization of this scene causes in them. If the politics of desire that guides their response is an active one – this is more and more common, albeit still not frequent enough – this experience can thrust them into the same movement that made the women characters transmute themselves. What follows is an overcoming both of men's disconnection with the extrapersonal and of the impossibility to sustain themselves in the tension between the personal and the extrapersonal. Men can then be guided by the effects of the destabilization on their bodies. With the activation of their body-knowing, men, too, can re-create themselves (guided by the affects) in their interactions with the new characters composed by the women with whom they share the scene, becoming, like them, agents of micropolitical insurgency.

When this happens, the new characters composed of women will, on their part, tend to transmute – and will continue to transmute – based on the affects resulting from the new dynamics of interaction. New dances, new choreographies are thus created. Through them, new scripts can emerge, where the politics of desire that orients both these characters and the dynamic of their relation is no longer subject to the pimp-colonial-capitalistic unconscious. This process will lead to the formation of a different regime of the unconscious and to the consequent establishment of new kinds of scenes in the social field, far removed from sexism.

Obviously, though, cancelling the theater of sexism and invalidating the male character in its role as oppressor can also lead this character to a

reactive, violent response, one moved by its exasperated wish to conserve the scene and its characters just as they are, at any cost, for fear of collapsing. Unfortunately, this tendency has not only been prevalent; it has, in fact, expanded exponentially in recent times. One of its most obvious manifestations is the atrocious increase in the number of femicides, which take place just as feminist movements advance everywhere, especially in former colonies, in places such as Latin America and Africa. The growing strength of feminism is, moreover, one of the events that triggered the tsunami of conservatism (more and more narrow-minded and cruel) that has devastated the planet.

In sum, there is a fundamental difference between macro- and micropolitical struggles in terms of their respective approaches to power relations. While the macropolitical operation of resistance seeks to redistribute places inside the web of power relations, the insurrectional operation corresponding to the sphere of micropolitics seeks to act differently, in a way that dismantles these relations, dissolving its characters, their respective roles, and their whole scene. To fight against the pimping of the drive (the marrow of the colonial-capitalist unconscious) implies constructing for oneself a different body. It implies molting out of an outgrown shell structured in a dynamic of abuse, the same way grasshoppers molt out of their exoskeletons so that another body, still embryonic, can fully flourish and take its place. And if this struggle takes place by affirmation and not by opposition (as is the case in macropolitics), this is because the dynamics of tension between the personal and the extrapersonal are not, in this case, dialectical but, rather, paradoxical. Confronting this tension entails affirmative actions of a becoming-other of the characters involved in the scene of power relations.

In this operation of micropolitical struggle, the borders between politics, the clinic, and art become indiscernible. The clinical dimension of this struggle rests in the fact that its objective is to free the unconscious from its colonial-capitalistic yoke. It is an effort to *heal* life as much as possible from its impotence, which is an after-effect of its captivity in a relational weave of abuse that alienates subjectivity from the demands of the drive and that keeps desire captive in the dominant

regime, submissive in the face of this regime's pimping essence. And if this therapeutic operation is inseparable from an artistic operation, this is because healing in the sense invoked here can only be completed with the creation of new modes of existence. These modes materialize vital demands, thus completing the germination of the embryonic worlds that beat inside each body. Ultimately, every gesture of micropolitical insurrection is a movement towards the resurrection of life. It is a movement of that very resurrection.

If I use the term "artistic operation" to refer to the creation of new modes of existence that can embody vital demands, this is because in modern, Western culture (a culture that corresponds to the colonial-capitalistic regime), creation as a force is restricted to that specific activity conventionally referred to as "art," institutionalized as such just over two centuries ago. This being the case, the micropolitical mode of operating entails freeing the exercise of creation from its confinement in the field of art to the fullest extent possible, so that it can be reactivated in other practices of social life and in artistic practices themselves, because under financialized capitalism it became close to impossible to exercise creation even in the field of art. This is because art, under the new fold of the regime, became a privileged site for the pimping of the vital potency of creation.

Given the grip colonial-capitalistic abuse has on all of us (no one, not even the artist, escapes this grip), we're now at a point where ensuring that the force of creation remains channeled towards its ethical destiny has become notoriously challenging, even in the sphere of art. The specificity of this abuse in the field of art consists not just in neutralizing the potency of creation and reducing it to creativity but also in using it as an ostentatiously displayed access badge for entry into the international elites. To be a collector, to know the name of half a dozen artists and curators (the hottest ones on the market), to be a frequent guest at art openings and art fairs, and to tour and sightsee around the great art exhibitions of the world: all this has now become an essential element of the glamor projected onto the sterile existence of the elites, a glamor that imbues them with an air of seduction and that increases the value of their self-brand on the market. Furthermore, beyond the micropolitical advantages (i.e., increasing their narcissistic

capital) that art brings to the elites, and beyond the effects this has on their macropolitical power (i.e., increasing their economic capital), art brings to them an added economic advantage: art has become, more than ever, a privileged site for speculation and money laundering.

7) Modes of Cooperation

Macropolitics (via identitarian recognition, so as to build organized movements and/or political parties)

Cooperation in a macropolitical insurrection functions through the construction of organized movements and/or political parties. The agents of this mode of insurrection are grouped via *identitarian recognition*. This is a pragmatic effort, made on the basis of a previously outlined action plan, and with an eye towards a goal linked to the same claim (which, in this macropolitical sphere, is a concrete demand) and as a function of the same (subaltern) position within a determined segment of social life. It is through this position (which is located on the personal side of subjective experience) that an imagined identitarian outline is drawn, which creates a connection with others and provides the necessary basis for group formation on the grounds of identification.

Several segments of social life can come together in this way, around claims that involve, for instance, gender, race, and class. Movements, too, can come together around a single cause that concerns several of them. This is a mode of cooperation that generates momentum towards an effective reversal of power relations in the institutional sphere (which includes the state and its laws, but which cannot be reduced to it). The time of that struggle in each one of these movements is chronological, and it ends when its objective is reached. The movement, however, remains organized in order to face other emerging targets.

Micropolitics (via resonating frequencies of the affects, and towards the construction of the common)⁴³

Cooperation within micropolitical insurrection takes place through the construction of the common. The agents of this insurrection find each other and grow close to each other by means of the *intensive*

*resonance*⁴⁴ that manifests between the frequencies of affects (between vital emotions). These agents find and grow close to each other by weaving multiple, connecting webs between subjectivities and groups that are living through different situations, with singular languages and experiences, but united by a common element: the embryonic futures, the seeds that inhabit all the bodies involved in those webs. These seeds impose on agents the urgency to create forms that can materialize those worlds, thus completing their process of germination. This is only possible in a relational field, so long as desires guided by an ethical compass prevail in this field. When this happens, the result is that the actions driven by these desires are necessarily singular. The results, then, are different modes of expression of these embryonic futures, which interact and together create the ground for their own birth and generate new formations in the social field.

Temporary, relational territories thus emerge, varied and variable. Collective synergies are produced in these territories, synergies that nurture a reciprocal kind of reception that promotes, values, and legitimizes daring experimentation processes involving modes of existence that differ from hegemonic ones. These collective experiences expand the possibility of working through the trauma brought about by the perverse operation of the colonial-capitalistic regime, which restricts subjectivities to dominant forms and values marked by the expropriation of the creating potency of the drive.⁴⁵ Because working through this trauma is an endless task, what matters here is that this task reaches, in every situation, a threshold that allows for the vital drive to flow freely: freely enough, at least, to break away from its pimping. This is the condition necessary for the composition of an individual and a collective body that can resist the pimping of life and that can rebuff this pimping. The meaning of the term “the common” as proposed here consists precisely in this: the composition of this kind of collective body.

The possibility of constituting fields favorable for the emergence of an “event” – which is to say, the emergence of an effective transfiguration in the fabric of society – hinges upon these kinds of collective reappropriations of the drive. Thus conceived, an event is the result of

the germination of embryonic worlds that resonate across bodies and lead those bodies to unite, producing a birthing nest for other modes of existence and for their respective cartographies.

In sum, the modes of cooperation proper to macro- and micropolitical insurrection are completely different, but they are complementary and indispensable, as are all the other aspects of macro- and micropolitical insurrections. Events – transfigurations of the established – are the result of creating processes proper to micropolitical insurgency; they differ from macropolitical insurrectional actions, which unfold according to a predefined and already resolved form. While the macropolitical mode of cooperation generates pressure that makes possible a *more equitable distribution of rights* in the present cartography, the micropolitical mode of cooperation generates a force of *transindividual metamorphosis*⁴⁶ that creates new cartographies where the right to life can be fulfilled.

Moreover, to come together through “resonance” is different than to gather by means of “identification.” Both kinds of links are important. The problem comes when subjectivity confines itself within identitarian boundaries, reducing itself to them. This reduction tends to interrupt the processes of subjectivation set off by the tension between the personal and the extrapersonal: the tension produced in subjectivity by the effects of the forces of the other at the micropolitical level, if and when these effects manage to go beyond identitarian boundaries, in a way that threatens to dissolve them. Once these processes are interrupted, there is no chance for an effective transformation of reality, for there won’t be any metamorphoses of the politics of subjectivation and of the new modes of existence that would be created as a result of these politics.

Decolonizing the Unconscious is the Matrix of Micropolitical Insurrection

In light of the new state of affairs, we cannot postpone combining the programmatic protest of consciousnesses with the drive-protest of the unconsciousnesses. As this essay has insistently stated, the