Introduction

The Power of Images

Jens Andermann and William Rowe

To suggest that images have a privileged purchase on power is hardly an original proposition. In fact, that representation and the artifact which sustains it exercise some kind of dominion both over the beholder and the referent they command into their domain, is indeed the fundamental, if sometimes unadmitted, assumption of all theories of mimesis, most notoriously in the case of their more obsessive cousins such as fetishism and sympathetic magic. As W. J. T. Mitchell (1986: 5–6) has argued, a deep mistrust and even fear of visual representation underlies a tradition in Western philosophical thought that has come down to us from the Platonic distinction between *eidolon* – that which provides a mere likeness (*eikon*) or semblance (*phantasma*) – and *eidos*, or idea, as that in which the true, spiritual essence of the (only apparently) material universe is crystallized. Yet it is in this spectral insubstantiality, precisely, that the image tends to return as the repressed other of language – and of written language in particular – which has supposedly exorcised it but in whose very substance it re-emerges in manifold forms of tropes, figures of speech, calligraphies and cryptographies. As in all antagonisms, then, in the contest between images and ideas, each of the contenders is from the very outset affected and contaminated by that which it constitutes as its other, and just as no writing is exempt from the stigma of idolatry, all images in one way or the other bear the mark, or indeed the inscription, of the verbal. Mitchell has gone so far as to suggest – borrowing an expression from Michel de Certeau – that all representation is therefore by nature 'heterological', or indeed that 'the interaction of pictures and texts is constitutive of representations as such: all media are mixed media, and all representations are heterogeneous; there are no "purely" visual or verbal arts, though the impulse to purify media is one of the central utopian gestures of modernism' (Mitchell 1994: 4–5).

While, then, the power of images in this strand of thought is related to what might be called their irrepressible supplementarity, from a quite different angle (to use a cinematographic expression) the linkage between power, knowledge and visibility has been analysed by Michel Foucault in his investigations into modernity's techniques of domination qua surveillance: the 'making visible' of bodies both subjectified and serialized, from the vantage point of incorporeal networks of panoptic observation, becomes, in this account, constitutive of the shift from sovereignty to discipline out of which the modern state emerges (Foucault 1980, 1991). Representation entails in this sense the distinction between that which can be visualised and hence objectified – the realm of the physical, the bodily, the subaltern – and the immaterial, disembodied reason of the law to which it succumbs; yet, paradoxically, the power of the latter can confirm and reproduce itself only in the endless production and proliferation of images. Hence also the – again paradoxical – affinity between the image and *ideology* (which, we may recall here, has been described by Althusser (1971: 127–186) as an act of language that slides into the visual, as an interpellation which sets in motion a 'mirror structure' that is 'doubly speculary', as the interpellated subject contemplates 'its own image' in the Absolute Subject to which it is thus subjected).

If the problematic, even enigmatic, relationship between images and power has already occupied modern critiques of representation to a great extent, recent developments in information technology have added a new urge to the question. Yet do digital imaging, synthetic holography, virtual environment helmets and multispectral sensors indeed nullify, as Jonathan Crary has suggested, 'most of the culturally established meanings of the terms *observer* and *representation*', as they 'relocate vision to a plane severed from a human observer' (Crary 1990: 1)? Or is instead, as Mitchell argues, the 'pictorial turn' in contemporary human sciences due to the paradox that, while the attitudes of idolatry, iconoclasm, iconophilia and fetishism are as old as image-making itself, these now confront 'the fantasy of a pictorial turn, of a culture totally dominated by images, [which] has become a real technical possibility on a global scale'? And do we therefore, as Mitchell goes on to suggest, need an updated iconology in the form of 'a postlinguistic, postsemiotic rediscovery of the picture as a complex interplay between visuality, apparatus, institutions, discourse, bodies, and figurality' (Mitchell 1994: 14–16)?[1]

This book seeks to advance the hypothesis that the link between images and power – that is, the cultural status of visual and other images, and the ways in which they are forged, circulated and reified – has a local and historical specificity which, at the very least, calls for caution when forecasting a cultural predominance of the image on a global scale. More concretely, the chapters collected here discuss the idea that the image, in

Latin America, historically constitutes a contested site, one at which figurations of identity and alterity are constantly reproduced as well as reassembled and re-signified. National iconographies, as they become hardened and stabilized, viabilise the State as the central instance of interpellation, yet they seem to retain, at the same time, part of the charge of otherness from which their iconicity derives, and which, at certain historical junctures, may suddenly be unleashed in counter-images and anti-icons (think, for instance, of the equivocal trajectory of the image – and indeed the body – of Eva Perón, or of the changing fate of the various indianisms and indigenisms across the continent). The notion of iconography, then, is used here not merely in the narrow sense of a visual philology aimed at the recovery of lost or forgotten narrative contents, as it has come to be understood through certain parochial and reductive readings of the conceptual writings of Erwin Panofsky (1939, 1955), among others. Even though the intellectual and disciplinary traditions out of which the contributors to this volume argue are much more manifold, perhaps it does make sense here to briefly sketch out two of modernity's key concepts of iconicity, which have been most influential for the reconceptualising of the status and impact of the image in recent cultural criticism, and which could thus be conceived as opposite, yet complementary, ends of the critical endeavour proposed by this book. One of these conceptual strands might be identified with the Warburg school's project of iconography as part of a 'general science of culture' *(allgemeine Kulturwissenschaft)* – of which Panofsky and Ernst Cassirer were the theoretical protagonists – and particularly with Aby Warburg's own attempt to formulate a theory of visual memory; the other could be said to take its cues from Walter Benjamin's roughly contemporary notion of the 'dialectical image'. Both concepts, as well as the intellectual enterprises from which they stem, are of course profoundly intertwined, and might have been even more so had Benjamin's application to Warburg's Institute of the General Science of Culture in the late 1920s been successful. Let us, then, look briefly at these approaches and map out some of the different theoretical and methodological conclusions they may entail. In both cases, there is a challenge, which this book takes up, to think about images not solely as representations of cultural history, but as depositories and instruments of power.

Warburg's notion of the image was in the first place intended as a challenge to earlier conceptions of an autonomous art history brought forward by some of Jakob Burckhardt's disciples (foremost among them Wölfflin and Riegl), as one of visual forms and styles embodying certain ideals and moods supposed to be of ontological status and thus removed from historical change. In contrast, Warburg opposed such normative formalism as much as a naïve, unreflected hermeneutic empathy, and

instead claimed that a work's content *(Gehalt)* and meaning could only be assessed in determining its particular, functional relation to wider symbolic chains, both those particular to its specific historical location and those which had been preserved and transmitted across the ages. Rather than towards a formal history of art, then, iconographic interrogation of the image would breach out into an attempt to understand the functioning of social memory through the ways in which images re-present fragments of past discourses and belief systems otherwise submerged by historical change. As Edgar Wind suggests in an early theoretical synthesis of the Warburg group's intellectual project, first published in 1931, this reconception of art criticism as a cultural theory of memory was principally informed by a 'bipolar theory of the symbol' inspired by the neokantian aesthetic of Friedrich Theodor Vischer: following Vischer, Warburg conceived the symbol initially as a juncture between the image (any kind of visual object) and meaning (a concept materialised in language). This juncture, however, is articulated in fundamentally antagonistic ways at different stages of the history of cultures. In his 'Lecture on Serpent Ritual', first published in 1939, Warburg describes the Hopi snake dance as a manifestation of the first, 'magically binding' conception of the symbolic, which characterizes the 'religious mind': the 'animal dance' is thus analysed as a 'self-loss to a strange being', as 'that which links man to the forces of nature' or, 'in other words, the magical act, which produces a bond that is experienced as real' (Warburg 1988: 24–5).[2] The controversy over the Eucharist marks the point of inflection or crisis of this religious, sympathetic notion of the symbol, as it is opposed by another, 'logically dividing', conception, which manifests itself in the 'just as' of comparison. There is thus a notion of the symbol which is not yet a sign, but the insoluble, magic unity of image and meaning, and a quite different conception that rests on the production of comparison, and which is most clearly realised in allegory. It is in the tension between these two notions, or in 'the critical phase, in which the symbol is understood as a sign and yet retains its liveliness as an image, where the excitation of the soul, held in a tense balance between these two poles, is neither concentrated by the binding force of metaphor to the extent of being released into action, nor dissolved by the dissembling order of thought to the point of being dematerialized into a mere concept,' that Warburg posits the iconic image. This means, at the same time, that the 'harmonious expression' of art is always nourished by its most radical opposite, that which Warburg calls the 'darkest energies of human life' (Wind 1994: 175). As for Warburg, therefore, there is no fundamental difference between artistic and gestual, or even motoric, expression, since art itself emerges from a region where expression is conceived as unmediated, while the body, on the other hand, is the bearer of a physiological memory that is always already metaphor-

ical; even the most discrete and minor gesture or detail can become endowed with iconic properties, or saturated with mnemonic energy. Iconography, then, rather than the study of the work as product, is a concern with its production at the nodal point of the transmission – of preservation as well as transformation – of cultural forms and contents on the borders, or in-between spaces, of discourses and disciplines, and of past and present.

For Benjamin, the ‘dark energies’ which endow the image with a power that reaches far beyond its ‘form’ or ‘content’, were not so much, as for Warburg, those emerging from the visual, gestual, or even physiological memory of an archaic phase prior to the split that constitutes the symbolic order. Rather, they were the product of the resurgent archaic within capitalist modernity itself, in its infinite proliferation of *wish images* projected onto the surface of the commodity, and which charge it with a desire as yet unconscious of itself. Commodity culture, Susan Buck-Morss (1989) has suggested, becomes in Benjamin’s gaze a modern version of Baroque emblematic. Instead of merely denouncing the ideological delusion of modern capitalist idolatry, however, Benjamin’s work sought to incorporate and develop the image into a critical strategy, one capable of opening up and rescuing the contingents of social desire locked up, as it were, in the wish image. As Theodor W. Adorno puts it, Benjamin’s own *dialectical images*, creatively exploring the intellectual potential of surrealist montage, created ‘picture puzzles which shock by way of their enigmatic form, and thereby set thinking in motion’ (Adorno 1970: 53). In her brilliant experimental reconstruction of Benjamin’s Arcades project, Buck-Morss has described this philosophical method as a ‘dialectics of seeing’, one that relies ‘on the interpretative power of images that make conceptual points concretely, with reference to the world outside the text’ (Buck-Morss 1989: 6).

Reference, of course, as a relay that inexorably slides down the metonymic chain of memory, had been precisely the point at which Warburg’s critical revision of hermeneutics had set in. In a way, we could understand the different conceptions of iconicity and the critical use to which they are put in Benjamin and the Warburg school art historians, as a difference in the degree and purpose of suspicion towards the image. For Warburg, the image’s source of power had been one that profoundly opposed the divisive, analytical regime of reason and language, even if it also secretly inhabited it: the mission of these latter, therefore, lay in the disentanglement of memory’s intricate paths, of which the image was seen to be an enigmatic crossroads. Iconography, in other words, had to turn the attention of consciousness to the unconscious grip which the image exercises over us.[3] Meanwhile, Benjamin sought to wield the image into a strategy not only of unveiling the present condition, but of

making apparent its immanent desires for redemption, at the same time as it is only as an image that flashes up, unexpectedly, at a moment of danger, that historical memory can be saved from the threat that hangs over past and present (Benjamin 1969: 253–64). The image, in other words, has to be forged into an instrument of political struggle, rather than be tamed by the dissecting, analytical gaze of the specialised researcher.

It is in the double sense outlined here that this book attempts to advance the subject of iconography and the state, both as an object of study and as a means to re-politicise the practice of Latin American cultural studies. As such, it constitutes both an attempt to broaden cultural research beyond the limits of the lettered city – thanks to the encounter of different intellectual trajectories within disciplines as diverse as anthropology, literary criticism, art history and the history of science – and to conceive iconography as a key site of the cultural manufacture of the scene of politics in Latin America. The chapters of this book map out the question of iconography and the nation-state in an order that is thematic and, at the same time, roughly chronological. The first section discusses the ways in which, from the late colonial era to post-independence republicanism, images of the nation-state and the public sphere of their consumption emerge in a process of mutual implication. Section two further pursues the trajectory of the figurations of difference and locality in the modern languages of avant-garde art, literature and music, while section three looks at the ways in which modern state power had to be radically reconceptualised in the face of a new political and cultural subject, the mass or multitude, whose mobility and fugacity had to be captured by and in new images of collectivity. The fourth section, finally, analyses the construction of modern territorialities as providing the ground upon which these political iconographies were to be staged, as well as their dismantling in the new global order of porous spaces and transterritorial identities.

The chapters included in the first section discuss visual and mnemonic strategies of representing the colonial and national collectives of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Magali Carrera, in 'From Royal Subject to Citizen', analyses the shift in visual representations of the body before and after Mexican independence, in their relation to the contemporary process of recharting the *colonial* as *national* territory: the space of the nation, she argues, is mapped onto the idealised body of the citizen, but at the same time this reterritorialisation of the state is a form of capture of the citizens' bodies, which submits them to new forms of behavioural control. Whereas the colonial human image (both as portrait and as *pintura de castas*) had focused less on individual than on typified, corporate bodies that made up the physical integrity of the colonial state (imagined precisely as a hierarchised, anthropomorphic body), the national image will, in contrast, draw upon an allegorical, individualised body that

nonetheless continues to take its inspiration from colonial forms of typification. Gordon Brotherston presents those longer continuities of transmission, which have often wilfully been obscured, between native Mexican texts *(tlacuilolli)* and literature, art, film, and practices of popular memory in Mexico. The endurance of non-Western signs, image-concepts, and formats has been closely linked with the failures of the state to invent an inclusive iconography, and in the postrevolutionary period became a vehicle for mobilising concepts of collective space and time for a critique of official versions of history. The mixing of native iconographic traditions with those brought from Europe allows a critical reading of the visual languages used to construct centralised power in Mexico.

Nineteenth-century public space, as Beatriz González Stephan shows in her chapter on Venezuela's first national exhibition, held in 1883, became a site of negotiations not only about ethnicised but also about the gendered images of power which emerge in the context of state consolidation. Antonio Guzmán Blanco's regime of authoritarian modernisation, she suggests, in the name and image of a Bolívar transformed into phallic founding father, created by means of architecture, the display of industrial machinery, and fine arts exhibitions (shows focusing on the 'male' materials of sculpted stone and oil on canvas), a patriarchal and phallocentric imagery of progress and citizenship. However, the spaces of performance of these images, such as the national exhibitions, also provided opportunities for alternative subjects (women, mestizos, etc.) to introduce minor, subaltern materials and themes, or to appropriate the state's signifiers. Thus, for instance, 'natural hair portraits' woven by female 'artisans' such as the one depicting Policarpa Salavarrieta, a heroine of the Independence struggle, show to what extent the gendered image of the state is always a contested one. These subalternised forms can be conceived, González suggests, as paradoxical objects that depict the 'hard' subject of 'the fatherland' using the 'bland' materials its official imagery seeks to suppress and marginalize. While the space of the exhibition – an event of limited duration – is thus not only one of the canonisation of dominant images of the nation-state, but also of the emergence of alternative, potentially subversive, counter-images, the foundation of museums – as Alvaro Fernández Bravo suggests in the following chapter on the creation of history and fine arts museums in Argentina – arises as an attempt to put an end to iconographic instability, and thus to confer an imaginary *longue durée* to the symbols of victory of one particular political faction. In the face of the 'threat' of cosmopolitism detected in the immigrant masses arriving from overseas, the Argentine elite of the late nineteenth century sought refuge in 'museumisation', granting public visibility to historical relics formerly in the possession of a handful of families, but now exposed to the citizenry as a 'shared her-

itage': the citizen, in other words, is supposed to be first of all a spectator, one who gazes at, rather than acts on, the stage of history.

In contrast, the essays collected in the second section discuss the ways in which the themes of alterity and locality have informed the production and reception of Latin American art at different stages of twentieth-century modernity. Trinidad Pérez, in 'Exoticism, Alterity, and the Ecuadorean Elite', links Antonio Cornejo Polar's discussion of the reader's position in indigenist literature to Panofsky's notion of perspective as a symbolic form: the encounter, in the work of Ecuadorean artist Camilo Egas, between colonial iconographies of the Indian and a modern painterly vocabulary and forms, she argues, results in a double detachment, not only of the beholder's gaze from the image, but moreover of the circuit of production and consumption of fine art from the 'subaltern' subject matter that supposedly informs its meaning. Although the Indian, in Egas's work as well as in contemporary ethnographic and political writing in Ecuador, is rhetorically proclaimed as a symbol of the nation, his artistic representation runs contrary to the shared cultural identity it suggests. Florencia Garramuño, in the following chapter, analyses how tango and samba music pervades narrative and the visual arts, to produce 'primitivist iconographies' of Argentina and Brazil. 'Primitivism', she argues, in the avant-garde as well as in urban upper-class cultural consumption in general, changes its location in early twentieth century from a reason for exclusion into one for inclusion. At the same time, however, writers involved with modernising projects rivalling those of the avant-garde, such as social realism, take up tango and samba as narrative tropes to denounce the 'corrupting' impact of modernisation. Primitivism, rather than as a fashionable quote, becomes associated here with the tragic pitfalls of modernity's promise of social mobility – the very phenomenon that has made the trajectory of tango and samba from the outskirts to the city centres possible.

While modern artistic production as discussed by Pérez and Garramuño attempts to forge images that are both 'up to date', at the height of universal modernity, and embedded in local memory and tradition, the art of the Argentine avant-garde of the 1960s is shown by Andrea Giunta to have been systematically stripped of any trace of locality. The 1965 exhibition *Argentina in the World*, a key event of the cultural *movida* sponsored by the Instituto Torcuato di Tella as part of a concerted action to refocus Argentine art after the fall of the first Peronist regime, attempted nothing less than to merge local production completely with contemporary 'international style'. In a strange recycling of an earlier Brazilian avant-garde's slogan –'art for export' – the national identity of Argentine art was now to be established not by emphasizing its local distinctiveness, but by seeking its *in-difference*, its lack of particularity, to be confirmed

on behalf of the leading lights of international art criticism. As Giunta points out, the notion of artistic freedom as, first and foremost, one from art's location within geographically and historically specific cultural and socioeconomic struggles, also played a key part in the U.S.-funded ideological counter-offensive against the Cuban revolution known as 'Alliance for Progress'. However, she suggests, over-insistence on the 'international style', rather than gaining Argentine artists a recognition of their contemporariness, provoked a new demand for a recognizably 'local' content on the part of the metropolitan art scene: the universal temporality of 'international style' had, in fact, never implied the possibility of a place for artists working on its margins.

The politics of locality proposed by the historical avant-garde, then, was turned upside down in Argentina following an experience of populism which, for many artists and intellectuals, had been a traumatic one. The third section analyses the representations that the emergence of masses and multitudes as political and cultural actors of Latin American modernity has generated from the late nineteenth century to this day. In chapter 8, Hendrik Kraay looks at the ways in which earlier, Imperial representations of the popular classes were refashioned, at the beginnings of the Brazilian Republic, into a new, monumental image of collective identity. Analysing the construction of a monument to independence at Salvador de Bahia, whose use of the popular image of the *caboclo* warrior sought to recall as well as replace by a new civic ritual the more performative, traditional celebrations of local identity, Kraay argues that monuments, while attempting to petrify the flow of memory, inexorably become ephemeral unless they succeed in integrating new ritual contexts, which regularly reclaim, indeed remonumentalise them. In Bahia, on the contrary, a bifurcation of mnemonic rituals occurred, as 'the nation' and 'the people' became two notions spatially and ritually separate from one another. At the same time, Kraay suggests, the failure of the 'Republican ritual' allows one to read its 'Imperial' predecessor in a new light, as one that had succeeded in theatricalising, and thus conferring a durable form to the tensions between these two antagonic notions.

A similar ambiguity is suggested in Andrea Noble's analysis of photographs of the Mexican Revolution, particularly the iconic image depicting Francisco 'Pancho' Villa in the presidential chair, flanked by Emiliano Zapata. Thanks to a synecdochal operation, this brief moment in December 1914 came to stand for the entire revolution, or rather, Noble suggests, imaginarily transformed a long, contradictory struggle for hegemony into a single moment of rupture. However, the iconic power of *Villa en la silla* derives not only from the appropriation of its national-popular visual rhetoric (the two *caudillos* surrounded by a male, multiracial 'sea of faces') on behalf of the triumphant conservative fac-

tion. Rather, the image's power lies in its ongoing ability to transform itself into counter-memory, one whose meaning turns on the disavowal of what might-have-been: iconicity, Noble proposes, is a form of compulsive repetition, here of the repressed of the revolution which is, precisely, popular power. In what could be read as an attempt to theorise the historical readings of the preceding chapters, but also as another case study contrasting photographs of mass gatherings in Argentina with literary texts by Arturo Cancela and Osvaldo Lamborghini, Graciela Montaldo in the final chapter of the section, characterises masses as a figuration of the internal aporias of the modern project of the nation. Masses are the illegitimate subjects of the *polis*, as they are devoid of speech and ratio: represented as pure physical presence – a mutable and de-individualised cluster of bodies – the masses are the antagonistic other of the figure of the intellectual who, as pure voice/ratio, dwells on the opposite limit of civic space. However, Montaldo reminds us, the performance of the masses and of mass violence, in the political arena of the Argentine cities, has been a contradictory one, not necessarily constrained by class divisions, ever since the pogroms committed by Creole upper-class mobs during the *Semana Trágica* of 1919. It also has gendered connotations, as to become a mass is to be stripped of the physical carcass of a civic identity modelled in the image of the masculine (insertive) body, and to become part of a feminised (receptive) collective body exposed to the penetrative and punishing actions of the state.

The final section comprises three very different approaches to one of the nation-state's paramount forms of visual capture, the territorialisation of space. Claudio Canaparo, in his chapter on the conquest of the Argentine south, makes the provocative point that, rather than purely on military violence, the production of national territory chiefly relied on the submission of space to new regimes of velocity, as generated by the railway and the telegraph, technologies that erased earlier forms of locality and produced a territory-in-movement, whose directionality and unified time pointed inevitably to the port-capital. Drawing on Paul Virilio's 'dromological' account of modernity, Canaparo shows military and audiovisual technologies (the new, long-range Remington rifles introduced into the Argentine army in the wake of General Roca's 'Desert Campaign', and the development of communication technology from 'marconigraphic' waves to cable television) to have been two complementary forms of territorial capture, thanks to which not only the ground itself but also the 'atmosphere' could become the object of striation on behalf of the state. Whereas Canaparo suggests that the notion of Patagonia as a 'desert' resulted from a symbolic emptying-out of space, to allow for its technological re-territorialisation, Gabriela Nouzeilles, in her reading of late nineteenth-century travel narratives to Patagonia, shows it to have been submitted to the

trope of desertification since its very 'discovery'. The Jungle and the Desert can be read, she argues, as the external effects of a narrative of self-fashioning on behalf of a particular masculine subject, the Explorer, who constructs spatial exteriors so as to distinguish himself from the Tourist and the Traveller, two 'lesser' representatives of the adventure of European colonial expansion. Instead of the rationalist dominion of savage space embodied by the colonial traveller, the explorer has to defect partially to the opposite pole of 'savagery', encountered in the 'extreme' landscapes of excess and of emptiness, so as to re-assert a masculinity that is imagined to be as much on the retreat as nature itself, in the face of the advance of tourism and the commodification of space it supposedly entails.

In the final chapter, Mary Louise Pratt takes the bifurcations of Mexico's second-most important religious icon, the Virgin of Zapopan, as the departure point for a meditation on space, place, and community under the sign of transnational capitalism. As early as in the eighteenth century, a second version of the Virgin had emerged, called *la peregrina*, which was to travel through the adjoining parishes and thus to link the colonial city with the surrounding *campo* as a shared, and centred, ritual community. Towards the end of the twentieth century, yet another incarnation of the Virgin surfaced among immigrant workers in California, called *la viajera*: the two travelling Virgins, then, could be seen to indicate the opposite ends of the historical cycle of the modern nation-state, and to propose alternative experiences of territoriality as a negotiation between mobility and dwelling. To analyse these new forms of movement of individuals, communities, and the narratives, memories and ritual practices they bring along and re-adapt to their new surroundings, Pratt reminds us, means in the first place to criticise the metaphor of 'flow' as one of the most perfidious ideological figures of neoliberal rhetoric, one that is routinely used to denounce the solidity and solidarity of the social as 'encrusted old structures'. In fact, Pratt tells us, the nomads of the twenty-first century do not flow but they sometimes drown, and their 'movement' significantly takes place, more often than not, while caged into the back of trucks or the underbelly of ships and planes. Against these rhetorics of flow, as a supposedly multidirectional fluidity of commodities, culture, living and dead labour, Pratt opposes a vision of dispossession and accumulation, processes which, rather than a transnational reciprocity, generate uncanny narrative 'returns' in the form of the new 'monsters of globalisation' (killer bees, *imbuches*, *chupacabras*, etc.).

However different in aspect, these popular counter-images of globalisation as well as the stigmatised figures of illegal migrants to which they respond, recall in a strange way the typifications of colonial bodies in

their allegorical relation to pre-national forms of territorialisation, which Magali Carrera analyses in the opening chapter of this book. It would seem, then, that the analytical juncture proposed in the subtitle of this volume – iconography, culture, and the state – as a means of approaching the aura-laden, affectively and fetishistically invested figurations of the state and its image, and the ways in which they command our reverence and submission, is only becoming visible at the present moment because the spell of the state-form in its modern, enlightened national version is vanishing into the thin air, which had probably been its true substance from the very outset. But rather than to release us into a less 'idolatric' future devoid of the worship of images of power, it seems this crepuscular moment will only prelude the dawning of new images, some of which already take shape on the horizon. If the magic of the state, to use Michael Taussig's (1997) expression, seems to be on the retreat, nevertheless the power of images and their proliferation appear to be as vivid today as they have been over the course of much of what we now subsume, in a retrospective or even nostalgic mood, as modernity. It is the need to find the instruments to deconstruct and criticise the new images of a postnational global order, then, rather than merely the historical interest in the interpretation of past constellations, which informs the intellectual quest the chapters of this volume are seeking to initiate.

Notes

1. Mitchell (1994: 4) distinguishes between 'picture' and 'image', the former indicating the 'constructed concrete object or ensemble (frame, support, materials, pigments, facture)', the latter 'the virtual, phenomenal appearance that it provides for a beholder'. More generally, then, a picture is the result of a historical process of production, the components and phases of which remain visible, while an image confronts us as a self-sufficient monad which has effaced (or 'contained', in a Hegelian sense of the term) the traces of its own making.
2. Warburg's 'Lecture on Serpent Ritual' was first published in English translation in the *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2 (1939): 277–92. We are quoting from the reconstructed German version, translation J.A.
3. It is not a minor detail, in this regard, that one of Warburg's theoretically most ambitious renderings of the programme of iconography as a theory of human cultural memory, the 'Lecture on Serpent Ritual', was composed in 1923 during Warburg's internment at Ludwig Binswanger's – the founder of Gestalt therapy – psychiatrical clinic. The lecture, first given to a public of medical staff and fellow patients, was thus as much the expression of a programme of self-healing as an inquiry into the tense relationship between mythology and reason.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor W. 1970. *Über Walter Benjamin*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Althusser, Louis. 1971. 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Toward an Investigation)', *Lenin and Philosophy*, New York, Monthly Review Press.

Benjamin, Walter. 1969. 'Theses on the Philosophy of History', in: *Illuminations* (ed. Hannah Arendt). New York, Schocken.

Buck-Morss, Susan. 1989. *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Crary, Jonathan. 1990. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.

———. 1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gruzinski, Serge. 2001. *The Image at War: From Christopher Columbus to Blade Runner (1492–2019)*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mitchell, W. J. T. 1986. *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 1994. *Picture Theory*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Panofsky, Erwin. 1939. *Studies in Iconology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1955. *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Papers in and on Art History.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Taussig, Michael. 1997. *The Magic of the State.* New York, London: Routledge.

Warburg, Aby. 1988. *Schlangenritual: ein Reisebericht.* Berlin: Verlag Klaus Wagenbach.

Wind, Edgar. 1994. 'Warburgs Begriff der Kulturwissenschaft und seine Bedeutung für die Ästhetik', in *Ikonographie und Ikonologie: Theorien, Entwicklung, Probleme*, Ekkehard Kämmerling (ed.), Köln, Dumont.