

INTRODUCTION

MOVEMENT RHYTHMS, MOTLEY KNOWLEDGES

Bret Leraul
Haverford College

There is a Movement when it is *in movement*, when things are happening, when there is learning and thinking.

—Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados-Solano and Colectivo Situaciones

In the republic of letters, the fiftieth anniversary of 1968 has prompted a flurry of writing about those momentous events and their afterlives. In Mexico, the anniversary arrived early and unannounced. The 2014 disappearance of forty-four student-teachers from the Escuela Normal in Ayotzinapa could not but repeat the trauma of the student massacre at the Plaza de las Tres Culturas at the hands of the Mexican state forty-six years prior. Ayotzinapa reminds us that the afterlives of Mexico's '68 are found not only in the history books or testimonies of its aging activists. '68 is present in the students' absence, reincarnated in their disappeared bodies, alive in the fetid wound of the state's impunity. Recent academic reconsiderations of that year have sought to free the memory of '68 from the traumatic recurrence of the Tlatelolco massacre. They have sought to dislocate the sacrificial logic that sustains a melancholy leftism by returning us to the joyous months before the cataclysm.¹ But again, as the fiftieth anniversary of '68 arrived unannounced in the flesh before the word, so too was '68 before the massacre recuperated by the carnivalesque rupture of the #YoSoy132 movement that preceded the Ayotzinapa disappearances.

The flesh before the word, deeds before discourse. This all too familiar temporal lag between events and our knowledge about them—in

1→ Epigraph. Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados-Solano and Colectivo Situaciones, *El taller del maestro ignorante*, (Buenos Aires: MTD-Solano, 2005), 22.

See, Susana Draper, *Mexico 1968: Constellations of Freedom and Democracy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018); Susana Draper and Vicente Rubio-Pueyo, *México 68: Modelo para armar; Archivo de memorias desde los márgenes*, 2012, <https://mexico68conversaciones.com>. For the sacrificial logic that animates the Mexican state's narrative of the Tlatelolco massacre, see, Samuel Steinberg, *Photopoetics at Tlatelolco: Afterimages of Mexico, 1968* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2016); Gareth Williams, *The Mexican Exception: Sovereignty, Police, and Democracy* (New York: Palgrave, 2011). For melancholy leftism in the Latin American context see, Bruno Bosteels, "The Melancholy Left" in, *Marx and Freud in Latin America: Politics, Psychoanalysis and Religion in Times of Terror* (New York: Verso, 2012), 159-194.

another lexicon, between practice and theory—only betrays the possessive subject of “our knowledge” that jealously guards its class supremacy by policing the division between mental and manual labor, the head and the hand.² By virtue of this division, “our” colonial, university knowledge too often disappears those knowledges authored by social movements in their movement, not unlike the Mexican and other Latin American states that have disappeared so many.

In different ways the essays in *LÁPIZ N°4* address the knowledge practices³ authored by Latin America’s recent social movements. In doing so, the authors enter into a tenuous and fraught dialogue between the movement knowledges they describe and the university knowledges they, like so many of us, are compelled to produce. This has always been the promiscuous enterprise of *LÁPIZ* and the Latin American Philosophy of Education Society: to conjugate the experiences, practices, knowledges of activists, educators, and academics from across the Americas.

The articles included in this volume make no pretense to masquerade as non-university knowledges. Nor do they make indigenous, afro-latino, and peasant movements speak back to colonial knowledge. Much like the Quechua community that Vanessa Andreotti counts among her teachers, these movements “are not trying to dialectically negate modernity by offering a teleological pathway ‘forward,’” nor can they offer answers to the necessarily modern and colonial questions we pose ourselves.⁴ Whether the Zapatistas’ politico-pedagogical practices in Bruno Baronnet’s report or the *sentipensante* (feeling-thinking) pedagogies of the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais

2 → Emancipatory struggles of an older, vanguard cast reproduced this same division of labor between head and hand, conductor and conducted, teacher and pupil. The analogy of vanguard theory to education is already implicit in the etymology of the term “pedagogy,” which in ancient Greek literally means to lead (*agogos*) the boy (*pais, paid-*). For a critique of vanguard Marxism, see Michael Lebowitz, *The Contradictions of “Real Socialism”: The Conductor and the Conducted* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2013).

3 → I use the term “knowledge practices” to signify a double indifference, first, to the distinction between knowledge production (e.g., research, discovery, invention) and its reproduction (e.g., teaching, learning, education) and, second, to the arbitrary and deleterious distinction between knowing and doing, head and hand. I believe this move is warranted since both distinctions have been challenged by the Latin American social movements that inspire this volume.

4 → Vanessa Andreotti, “The Enduring Challenges of Collective Onto- (and Neuro-) Genesis,” 78.

sem Terra (Landless Rural Workers Movement)(MST), Vía Campesina Internacional, and other struggles in Lia Pinheiro Barbosa's article, it is clear that these movements move to their own rhythms. The horizon of *our* knowledge is *their* autonomy, where by autonomy we understand the isomorphic acts of exodus and affirmation,⁵ those everyday practices of emancipation from capitalist modernity in the form of self-determining self-governance.

For these reasons, the knowledge practices of social movements explored in this volume ask readers to attend to the politics of knowledge. What is the relationship between movement knowledges and academic ones? What would be the tenor of an equal encounter between their epistemologies and temporalities? I would like to believe that the articles gathered here are *relations* in the sense of stories that bind or else *recountings* of the beats of uncanny rhythms at once familiar and unheard. I would like to suggest that the resulting counterpoint telegraphs the image of a motley (*abigarrado*)⁶ or *ch'ixi*⁷ knowledge, one which combines without synthesizing these different modes and relations of knowledge production.

Committed intellectual Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar—who participated in the 2017 LAPES Symposium alongside Andreotti, Baronnet, and

5 → See John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power* (London: Pluto Press, 2002).

6 → René Zavaleta Mercado, "Las masas en noviembre," in *La autodeterminación de las masas*, ed. Luis Tapia (Bogotá: Siglo de Hombres / CLACSO, 2009), 212. The term "motley" is the standard translation for Bolivian social theorist René Zavaleta Mercado's idiosyncratic keyword *abigarrado*. Zavaleta used the term to underscore the coexistence of multiple modes of production—communitarian, feudal, and capitalist—that gave twentieth-century Bolivian society its disjointed character. For a situation of the concept in Zavaleta's body of work, see Sinclair Thomson "Self-Knowledge and Self-Determination at the Limits of Capitalism," introduction to *Towards a History of the National-Popular in Bolivia 1879-1980*, by René Zavaleta Mercado, trans. Anne Freeland (New York: Seagull Books, 2018), xxiii-xxv.

7 → Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, *Ch'ixinakax utxiwa. Una reflexión sobre prácticas y discursos descoloniales* (Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón 2010), 69-71. The term *ch'ixi* is a proxy for Zavaleta's *abigarrado* which Cusicanqui distinguishes from Néstor García Canclini's notion of hybridity. This Aymara term describes the merely apparent synthesis of distinct qualities, akin to the effect produced by a mosaic or a heathered fabric. Rivera Cusicanqui tells us that *ch'ixi* escapes the logic of the *tertium non datur*, which I would suggest, necessitates a linear notion of time in order to account for dialectical synthesis or sublation. She clarifies that this non-dualist worldview works within a temporality of indifferenciation (see below) incompatible with colonial modernity's progressive notion of history.

Barbosa—outlines an approach to this conundrum. *Rhythms of the Pachakuti* (2014) presents her method for analyzing the turn-of-the-century indigenous uprisings that have since ossified into Bolivia's plurinational state under the MAS government of Evo Morales. Against what she calls the “sociological” approach, which captures and contains movements by identifying subjects and categorizing concepts, Gutiérrez advocates a “critical” one that focuses first on the struggles themselves, their strategies, evolution, acts of meaning making, and “horizons of desire.”⁸ The sociological method's focus on *being* derives from a methodological individualism and the analyst's unconscious desire to harmonize the legal fictions of the state with an abstract, university knowledge about the social. By contrast, the critical method focuses on collective *action*, the polyrhythmic movement of movements that overflows individual and collective identities and the silos of categorical knowledge.

For Gutiérrez, “critical” refers more to crisis than to critique, that legislation of thought in post-Enlightenment, western philosophy, including its dialectical and historical materialist offshoots. Much like the motley society analyzed by Bolivian political theorist René Zavaleta Mercado, from whom she takes her cue, Bolivia's turn-of-the-century social movements cannot be apprehended along the model of a self-conscious, collective subject, that is, as identities. Instead, crisis reveals the movement's constituent moment—its moment of self-unification—but only in the form of a collective unconscious.⁹ The critical method is thus a way to think the movement of movements by accompanying their movement.¹⁰

As this inchoate multitude evades the epistemological capture

8 → Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms of the Pachakuti: Indigenous Uprising and State Power in Bolivia*, trans. Stacey Alba D. Skar (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), xxviii.

9 → Luis Tapia, *La condición multisocietal: Multiculturalidad, pluralismo, modernidad* (La Paz: SIBES/UMSA-Muela de Diablo), 303.

10 → Zavaleta lays the groundwork for Gutiérrez's critical method. “Critical knowledge of society is then a consequence of the way (*manera*) things happen. The form (*manera*) of society outlines its knowledge. In the meantime, the pretension of a universal grammar applicable to a variety of formations is often little more than dogma. Each society produces a knowledge (and a technology) that refers to itself.” Zavaleta Mercado, “Las masas,” 214; my translation.

of identity, so does it militate against the givenness of injustice.¹¹ Accordingly, the crisis method means “thinking in terms of emancipation ... choosing what is utopian, the future, *what remains to be clearly articulated* against and beyond the limit of what is presented as ‘possible’.”¹² Bolivia’s turn-of-the-century movements were constituted in the absence of the self-reflection that quarantines the knowing subject from the agent, knowing from doing, doing from being. Rather their rhythms were perceived as they were produced.¹³ Thus, only immanent thinking-in-the-crisis will be adequate to understand the movement of these movements.

Bruno Baronnet’s contribution to this volume works in a similar vein, focusing on the concrete practices of Zapatista educational promoters and their “political pedagogy” as well as the “pedagogical politics” of Zapatista autonomy in action.¹⁴ His anthropological perspective yields a kind of immanent thinking by approximating the author of university knowledge to the movement and its knowledge practices, that is, its educational projects, pedagogical strategies, and categories of analysis. Even more than Gutiérrez, Baronnet avoids metacommentary and the temptation to synthesize. Instead he hews close to the Zapatista’s “pedagogies from below,” allowing their meaning to issue from their description.

Vanessa Andreotti’s contribution articulates a critique of identity and categorical knowledge that resonates with Gutiérrez’ crisis method. Where the latter focuses on the politics of rendering Bolivia’s autonomous social movements intelligible to university knowledges, Andreotti turns her gaze to the western, colonial subject of those

11 → Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms*, 184.

12 → Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms*, 179; emphasis mine.

13 → Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms*, 188. Gutiérrez’s affirmation about the rhythm of these movements echoes French philosopher Henri Lefebvre’s claim that “Polyrhythmia analyses itself... . [T]he analytic operation simultaneously discovers the multiplicity of rhythms and the uniqueness of particular rhythms.” Henri Lefebvre, *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life*, trans. Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore (New York: Continuum, 2004), 16. For Lefebvre, rhythm connects the moments of a dialectical analysis that does not resolve into a synthesis, what he calls a triadic as opposed to a dualistic dialectic, a conception that resonates with Rivera Cusicanqui’s use of *ch’ixi*; see, note 7.

14 → Bruno Baronnet, “Pedagogical Strategies in the Struggle for Indigenous Autonomy in Mexico,” 50.

knowledges. Where Guitérrez and Baronnet assert the methodological primacy of *doing* over *being*, Andreotti troubles the Cartesian reduction of *being* to *knowing*, in her terms, the “epistemic certainty” that grounds “ontological security.”¹⁵ In order to meet the challenge to live otherwise posed by Latin American and indeed every social movement, she seeks to unbind the self-same Western subject, to dissolve this identity into historical multiplicity through the process she calls “collective onto-genesis.” We can think collective onto-genesis as an educational process: to change our lives is to become others, to become others we must rescue being from its caricature in thought. Thus we can transform who we *are* into something we *do*, and initiate the purposeful *becoming* that drives the kinds of education at stake in Latin American social movements.

Latin America’s autonomous social movements (re)produce acts of collective political subjectivation. In transforming the world, they transform themselves. Take for example the Zapatista practice of *Educación Verdadera* (Real Education), which Baronnet presents as a repertoire of territorialized knowledge practices for the construction and maintenance of collective autonomy through the formation of autonomous subjects.¹⁶ In contrast, on the one hand, to the schooling that formats atomized, alienated masses toward the ends of the capitalist state and, on the other hand, the idealist, self-realization of the bourgeois individual (*Bildung*), Real Education—like Andreotti’s collective onto-genesis—is the *doing of being*, a process of *becoming* directed by communities in autonomous Zapatista territories. Autonomy, as both practice and goal, binds this “political pedagogy” to the movement’s “pedagogical politics” so that political subjectivation moves the movement just as the movement fashions new political subjects.

Indeed, for Raúl Zibechi, Latin America’s autonomous social movements are “educational subjects” such that every action and relation is imbued with a “pedagogical intention.”¹⁷ In the case of the MST, Roseli

15 → Andreotti, “Enduring Challenges,” 66.

16 → Baronnet “Pedagogical Strategies,” 46.

17 → Raúl Zibechi, *Territories of Resistance: A Cartography of Latin American Social Movements*, trans. Ramor Ryan (Baltimore: AK Press, 2012), 23.

Salete Caldart affirms that the movement “materializes a specific mode of production of human formation.”¹⁸ Baronnet and Barbosa point out that autonomous education entails the production of movement knowledges, which articulate a collective self-concept and distinctive worldview. And as all three contributors to this volume make clear, education does not merely transmit pre-existing movement knowledges. Rather, in the tradition of Paulo Freire’s critical pedagogy, education is inseparable from knowledge creation, and both knowledge production and reproduction are fundamental to processes of becoming a collective political subject, what I have been calling the doing of being that animates the movement of movements. For this reason, I have preferred to speak of these movements’ knowledge practices, a term which captures the simultaneous production and reproduction of both knowledge and knowing subjects.

To inquire after the pedagogies of social movements is to seek to understand temporalities of struggle and resistance. Such acts of becoming not only result from events that rupture the ordinary state of the situation.¹⁹ They are embedded in the rhythms of everyday life. Education is, in the last instance, a form of reproductive labor that stabilizes cultures and communities *in time*. (Incidentally, *LÁPIZ* N°5 (forthcoming) focuses on the nexus of social reproduction and education.) Understood as reproductive labor, the pedagogies of Latin America’s autonomous social movements seek to transform events that puncture time into durations capable of shaping history; they seek to transform the extraordinary moments that rupture the “peace” guaranteed by state monopoly violence into those rhythms of everyday life neither captured by capital nor commanded by the state. These temporalities—rupture and duration—and modalities—the extraordinary and the ordinary—are not mutually exclusive. They are differentially related through the composition of collective subjects, that is, the process of becoming at stake in the Zapatista’s Real Education discussed by Baronnet,

18 → Roseli Salete Caldart, “O MST e a formação dos sem terra: o movimento social como princípio educativo,” *Estudos Avançados* 15, no. 43 (2001): 212; my translation.

19 → This language hails from Alain Badiou, *Being and Event*, trans. Oliver Feltham (New York: Continuum, 2005). We see Badiou’s influence on Gutiérrez in her use of axiomatic set theory to express the logic of political formations. Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms*, 194.

the various rural education and movement pedagogies discussed by Barbosa, and Andreotti's collective onto-genesis. In short, the pedagogies of Latin America's social movements reproduce difference in a bid to institute lasting and continual change.

In the cases of many indigenous movements, the rhythms of everyday life are inscribed in a cosmological dimension. Barbosa emphasizes how these movements recuperate traditional epistemic matrices, modes of production, and ways of being. By plotting their struggles in five hundred years of oppression, "Indigenous and peasant movements widen the referents that constitute their political identity without necessarily negating and contradicting others."²⁰ Similarly, Aymara activist and intellectual Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui tells us that Indigenous movements continually emerge from a "temporality of indifferenciation."²¹

The indigenous world does not conceive history as linear, and the past-future are contained in the present: regression or progression, repetition or surmounting of the past are at stake in every conjuncture, and they depend more on our actions than our words. The project of indigenous modernity will be able to flourish from the present, in a spiral whose movement is a continuous feedback (*retroalimentarse*) of past and future, a "principle of hope" or "anticipatory consciousness" (Bloch) that at once envisages and actualizes decolonization.²²

Citing Rivera, Barbosa calls this temporality by its Aymara name, the ñawpaj *manpuni* which she describes as "a revisiting of the past and projecting into the future that brings both together with the present."²³ This temporality corresponds to the Aymara notion of *ch'ixi* and

20 → Lia Pinheiro Barbosa, "The *Sentipensante* and Revolutionary Pedagogies of Latin American Social Movements," 29.

21 → Rivera Cusicanqui, *Ch'ixinakax*, 69.

22 → Rivera Cusicanqui, *Ch'ixinakax*, 55; my translation.

23 → Pinheiro Barbosa, "*Sentipensante*," 30.

its logic of the *included* middle²⁴ as it is actualized in the polyrhythmic movement of movements that overflows not only individual and collective identities and the silos of university knowledge but also the very space-times of western, colonial modernity.²⁵ The ñawpaj *man-puni*, according to Barbosa, expands collective memory and nourishes the vision of a decolonial future while its indifferentiation renders the present a field of action. Recalling Gutiérrez, in a moment of crisis, emancipation means choosing “what is not clearly articulated,” which means choosing utopia.

Educational practices for autonomy are a subset of autonomous social reproduction. Autonomous social reproduction is the common cause of Latin American social movements over the past thirty years. Autonomy here not only signifies a state of autonomy *from* the institutions of state, market, or church. Certainly, Latin America’s social movements practice autonomy as the *subtraction* of self-determining self-governance from colonial, capitalist modernity. But autonomy-from is little more than the negative liberty that has long been harnessed as the psychic motor of the capitalist social relations that organize market societies.²⁶ The Latin American social movements that inspire this volume are also autonomous insofar as they are ends in themselves. Autonomy in this sense is inseparable from reproductive labor, which produces the sociality of society by maintaining it through time. In short, the work of reproduction constitutes the movement of the movement, its quotidian rhythms rendered emancipatory practice.²⁷

24 → Rivera Cusicanqui, *Ch'ixinakax*, 69.

25 → Decolonial practices, like those outlined by Rivera and whose pedagogical facet concerns *LÁPIZ* N°3, offer another approach to the uneasy composition of academic and other knowledges. However, she cautions against divorcing decolonial discourses from decolonial practices. In her view, academic decolonial discourses produced in the North American academy and its Latin American client universities—by thinkers in past and future issues of *LÁPIZ*—have ossified into a postcolonial multiculturalism that neutralizes decolonial practices (68-69).

26 → Verónica Gago, *Neoliberalism from Below: Popular Pragmatics and Baroque Economies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), 163; Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, trans. Graham Burchell, ed. Michel Senellart (New York: Picador, 2008), 215-265.

27 → Although he does not use the term “reproductive labor,” the trends that Zibechi identifies as common to Latin America’s recent social movements—territorial rootedness,

In these struggles, education is both a means and an end of everyday emancipation. Barbosa points out, “if education is the point of departure for cultural subordination and political domination, the construction of another conception of education ... must be the first step in the process of liberation.”²⁸ As my formulation “everyday emancipation” suggests, we should understand emancipation less as a state of *being* to be achieved and more as a *practice* that continually realizes freedom in pursuit of the ever-receding horizon of a collective desire. According to Barbosa the “goal” of indigenous and peasant movements is *el buen vivir*.²⁹ The gerund form of “good living” reminds us that this goal is more collective practice than state or quality of being. For Baronnet, the objective of the Zapatista’s political pedagogy and pedagogical politics is “to learn to govern themselves,” that is to practice autonomy as a positive, collective freedom. According to Gutiérrez, at its most capacious, “social emancipation is an infinite, albeit discontinuous, ever-changing, and sporadic collection of shared acts of insubordination, autonomy, and, by extension, self-governance... . It consists basically in initiating a different space-time in economic, social, and political terms.”³⁰ To signify this event, Gutiérrez employs the Quechua term *pachakuti*. *Pachakuti* differs from the common understanding of revolution, a close English equivalent to Gutiérrez’s use of the term. Revolution foregrounds the emergence of new subjects, new regimes, new modes of production. The practice of everyday, social emancipation is less about newness than difference, less about the shape of the future than the very conditions of experiencing space and time. The emancipation envisaged and practiced by many Latin American social movements is revolutionary in both the political and

autonomy from the state and political parties, the formation of organic intellectuals, women’s protagonism, affirmation of cultural identity beyond citizenship, concern for the division of labor and our relationship to nature—all point us back to this capacious sphere of human activity that, although largely ignored by orthodox Marxism, has gained currency through the vehicle of resurgent Marxist and socialist feminisms (14-19). For an overview of social reproduction theory, see Tithi Bhattacharya, ed., *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression* (London: Pluto Press, 2017).

28 → Pinheiro Barbosa, “*Sentipensante*,” 34.

29 → Pinheiro Barbosa, “*Sentipensante*,” 88.

30 → Gutiérrez Aguilar, *Rhythms*, xl.

cosmological senses of the term. At once advance and return, rupture and continuity, extraordinary and everyday, it is revolution that issues from and returns to a temporality of indifferenciation.

Struggles for autonomous social reproduction are not limited to the indigenous, peasant, and rural movements treated in this volume. Latin America's urban proletariat—sectors really subsumed to the capitalist mode of production and directly interpellated by its state—have also prefigured alternative knowledge practices, political subjectivities, and space-times. In closing, I would like to add to the movements that inspire Andreotti, Baronnet, Guitérrez and Barbosa, the case of Argentina's *Movimientos de Trabajadores Desocupados* (Unemployed Workers Movements) (MTDs), a case that will return us to our point of departure, the politics of knowledge.

In the 1990s, as structural adjustment rendered whole populations precarious, unemployed workers organized into self-managed, mutual-aid societies. Rather than clamor for a wage, MTD adherents affirmed their identity as unemployed workers. They set up barter economies; cooperative workshops; community gardens; and, in the wake of the 2001 financial crisis, some even occupied and ran factories abandoned by their proprietors. Although the MTDs gained notoriety for their involvement in the *piquetes* (roadblocks) and other protests that rendered the country ungovernable for a time,³¹ their force lies less in this (counter)interpellation of the state and more in the struggle for everyday emancipation through autonomous social reproduction. Parallel to contemporaneous movements across the continent, the MTDs displaced politics from state space-times to the terrains and rhythms of everyday life. And like those movements, the elaboration of knowledge practices has been key to their autonomous reproduction.

The MTD de Solano (MTD-S) produced one of the more

31 → For the history of the *piquetero* movement and other forms of popular mobilization in the years surrounding 2001, see: Francisco Ferrara, *Más allá del corte de rutas: La lucha por una nueva subjetividad* (Buenos Aires: La Rosa Blindada, 2003); Miguel Mazzeo, *Piqueteros: notas para una tipología* (Buenos Aires: Fundación de Investigaciones Sociales y Políticas, 2004); Maristella Svampa and Sebastián Pereyra, *Entre la ruta y el barrio: la experiencia de las organizaciones piqueteras* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos, 2009); Raúl Zibechi, *Genealogía de la revuelta: Argentina, la sociedad en movimiento* (La Plata: Letra Libre, 2003).

sophisticated movement knowledges of this conjuncture. In this endeavor they were accompanied by members of a theory collective composed of young, university-trained sociologists. The texts co-authored by the MTD-S and Colectivo Situaciones exemplify the motley knowledge that emerges from an equal encounter between academic and movement knowledges.³² They call their mode of theory construction *investigación militante* (militant research or research-militancy), which they define as “theoretical and practical work oriented toward co-producing the knowledges and modes of an alternative sociability, beginning with the power (*potencia*) of those subaltern knowledges.”³³ Research militancy, like other forms of worker’s inquiry, not only mediates between academic and popular knowledges. It also mediates between the immanent thinking of different social contexts. Thus, research militancy renders movement knowledges doubly motley, now in the course of constructing networks of solidarity. Militant research not only troubles the division between head and hand it also complicates the standard view that we produce knowledges *about* an object. Its radical immanence to ever-shifting conjunctures means that research-militancy has no object. The resulting motley knowledge is at most an open set of axioms, an evolving “grammar of questions.”³⁴

Over the course of 2003 and 2004, members of Colectivo Situaciones and the MTD-S gathered in the periphery of Buenos Aires to read French philosopher Jacques Rancière’s *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*. The text was merely a pretext for refracting their experiences of popular education, collective autonomy, and the construction of counterpower. For MTD-S member Neka Jara, the motley knowledge practice of research-militancy constructs an ignorant collective subject—ignorant by virtue of its inseparability from the aleatory encounter of each and every relation. Deeply immanent thinking, in turn, prevents the ossification of consensus into laws or dissensus into hierarchies.

32 → Colectivo Situaciones and MTD de Solano, *La hipótesis 891. Más allá de los piquetes* (Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón, 2002); Colectivo Situaciones and MTD de Solano, *El taller del maestro ignorante* (Buenos Aires: MTD-Solano, 2005).

33 → Colectivo Situaciones, “On the Researcher-Militant,” trans. Sebastián Touza, in *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments Against Neoliberal Globalization*, eds. Richard J. F. Day, G. De Peuter, and Mark Coté, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 188.

34 → Colectivo Situaciones, “Researcher-Militant,” 189.

For the MTD-S, thinking must not determine collective experience. Rather it must emerge from the collective in the form of not-knowing, a process reminiscent of Andreotti's collective ontogenesis. By affirming ignorance, members of the reading group unground their epistemological certainty and unbind the self-sameness of their individual and collective identities inaugurating a process of collective becoming, whereby transforming themselves they transform their world. For the MTD-S, "there is a Movement when it is *in movement*, when things are happening, when there is learning and thinking."³⁵

In the same way that unemployment allowed the MTDs to subtract work from the wage, affirming one's ignorance subverts the givenness of the world and casts it as a problem. Collective member Diego Sztulwark elsewhere comments, "a problem is the production of an excess of reality that is there."³⁶ To produce this disadequation between thinking and the world transforms bounded reality into a field of potentialities; it makes that which *is* into something we *do*. When we posit the world as a problem, as always *becoming*, to know means accepting the challenge of collectively producing other worlds. The only sensible mode for contemplating becoming, our ignorance indicates that we are engaged in Real Education, the revolution (*pachakuti*) of our being-in-the-world.

From this example and the articles that follow, we can say that the task of constructing motley knowledges begins with empathy and solidarity, with listening for uncanny rhythms of movements that we may move with them. Motley knowledges begin when "la palabra se corazona," a Zapatista motto that Barbosa brings to our attention. This *double entendre* enjoins us to reason words together (*co-razonar*) which also means to take them to heart (*corazón*). We can only hope that the contributions to this volume incite readers to think and feel these words together. In doing so, we will have learned a lesson in everyday emancipation: Politics begins as an act of love. ■

35 → Colectivo Situaciones and MTD de Solano, *El taller*, 22; my translation.

36 → Diego Sztulwark and Silvia Duschatzky, *Imágenes de lo no escolar: En la escuela y más allá*, (Mexico City: Paidós, 2011), 16; my translation.