

On the Provenance, Areas of Concern, and Reasons for Infrapolitics Now: A Coda to the Issue “Film and Infrapolitics”

Gareth Williams
The University of Michigan
garethw@umich.edu
10.7264/4kqw7p16

I would like to begin by offering my thanks to Pedro García-Caro, the General Editor of *Periphērica: A Journal of Social, Cultural, and Literary Studies*, for kindly affording me the opportunity to provide a Coda for the collection of essays contained herein, compiled and edited by Daniel Runnels and José Luis Suárez Morales. In the pages that follow, I would like to present for the reader my understanding of the provenance and need for infrapolitical thinking now. What follows below in reference to the project's provenance is a slightly

modified version of a section of the book I published in 2021 on the question of infrapolitics, titled *Infrapolitical Passages: Global Turmoil, Narco-Accumulation, and the Post-Sovereign State*. The purpose of the first section is to provide the potentially interested reader with an initial bibliography and overall sense of critical engagement that might serve as an introduction. This then allows me to approach, in the text's second section titled "The Reasons for Infrapolitics Now", the specific conditions and need for infrapolitical thinking in the context of what Etienne Balibar referred to in 2019 as "Absolute Capitalism" and "total subsumption". I will not comment on the specific essays contained in this dossier nor on the specific relation between film and infrapolitics, since that might encroach on questions of individual sensibility or perhaps even academic freedom, and I am sure that the quality of each contribution to this dossier stands on its own merits.

The Provenance of Infrapolitics

In Alberto Moreiras's 2006 work *Línea de sombra: El no sujeto de lo político* [*Line of Shadow: the Nonsubject of the Political*]¹—a book that radicalized some of the conceptual propositions developed in the 1990s around the experience of the *Latin American Subaltern Studies Group*—the author provides a formidable critical response to *Empire*, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's influential and widely commented-upon tome of 2000. It is in this critical reading of Hardt and Negri's *Empire* that the infrapolitical begins to take shape not as a new or alternative philosophical or political concept, system, plan, school, or method hell-bent on overcoming other concepts from before. There is no dialectical or bureaucratic interest herein. Rather, it is a movement toward a quasi-conceptual attunement in thinking formulated in order to inquire into the determining power of our given conceptual systems and to propose the contours for an alternative (for example, non-subjectivist, non-transcendental, non-utopian, post-messianic) relation to the political in the age of total (that is, of planetary) subsumption. The reading in question is extended in particular reference to *Empire's* primary libidinal principle, which is the figuration

of emancipation even from within the fact that, according to the authors, Empire not only contains *counter-Empire* but *is* the container. In other words, global capitalism, or Empire, is the achievement of capital's own outer limit, while sovereignty remains the antagonistic container of the multitude, and also its boundary. It is from within this historical and conceptual conundrum that Moreiras begins to address the problem of the metaphysics of *counter-Empire* as a promised overcoming from within Empire's fulfillment of Empire itself. This is the question that dwells at the heart of Hardt and Negri's work, yet it remains largely un(re)marked, to the extent that it is presented merely as a transcendent given, or as the logical and inevitable outcome of Empire.

While *Empire*'s presentation of the totalization of subsumption is laudable (and is perhaps consonant with the overall diagnosis also contained in *Infrapolitical Passages*, though always with a divergent vocabulary, differential prognoses, and contrary hermeneutic responses), questions begin to emerge around Hardt and Negri's figuration of the biopolitics of the multitude as the always immanent, and therefore always potentially transcendent, *counter-Empire* to the biopolitics of global capital. How, asks Moreiras, can the conditions of a transcendent counter-biopower—the multitude—be thought from within the total subsumption that is Empire, when the latter is already bio-power at its absolute planetary limit? How could such a thing—the primacy of an immanent and future *counter-Empire*—bring an end to subalternity when “in *Empire* the end of subalternity is willfully and messianically affirmed while remaining theoretically unfounded” (213)? In other words, what price does thinking pay in the wake of Hardt and Negri's “frankly optimistic intellectual position” regarding *counter-Empire* as the subjectivist precondition for the surmounting and overcoming of Empire (215)?

Echoing Alain Badiou's *The True Life* and *The Rebirth of History*, in which the will of the militant subject is both the truth of “the Idea” and the dialectical rebirth of history simultaneously, what remains at stake in the

relation between Empire and the book's onto-theological prophesy of an emergent *counter-Empire* of the poor (Hardt and Negri 2005) is the specter of the Hegelian dialectic—and therefore the determination of philosophy as *the* science or absolute knowledge—as the un-marked and therefore overlooked and unexplained instrument of subjective consciousness and common sense that lies at the heart of the modern history of the political Left in the wake of the French Revolution.

In contrast, Moreiras advances in the direction of the infrapolitical by turning back, that is, by advancing backward for the purpose of clearing a way back, across, and out of the imperial ground of modern metaphysics. His reading achieves this in such a way as to emphasize (or, rather, to actively unconceal) the Spanish Inquisition as the underlying Latin Romanic onto-theological ground, or “infrapower” (prior, that is, to Foucault's modern determination of the biopolitical), upon which all subsequent ontological forms of modern Western imperial and nation-state sovereignty, including that of the onto-theological biopower that Hardt and Negri recuperate in their political understanding of both Empire and *counter-Empire*, are construed and understood.

Moreiras's calling into question (or destruction) of Hardt and Negri's excessively expedient dialectical overcoming of Empire prompts us to consider the extent to which, when thinking from within the modern politics of emancipation, we are in fact thinking from within (and in our quest for a positive politics, merely reaffirming) the unexamined onto-theological determinations of the historical processes by which emancipation entered the modern history of Western metaphysics as both biopower and counter-biopower, beneath the visibleness of the Christian imperial and national histories of state sovereignty. It is important at this point that the infrapolitical not be confused with the extension of the *infrapower* of the Inquisition itself in the imperial history of modern metaphysics. They are not the same, for the latter is a reference to the

working of biopolitics as the everyday naturalization of domination and the management of life, while the former strives to move in a different direction. Infrapolitics is not a biopolitics. Any confusion here would lead us to embrace (as in fact Hardt and Negri do) the nihilism that dictates that one can fight the biopower of Empire by mobilizing the biopower of *counter-Empire*, which is akin to fighting the metaphysics of subjectivity (*cogitatio*), in the age of the closure of metaphysics, with the will to power of a supposedly better metaphysics of subjectivity (the *cogitatio* of the multitude). Infrapolitics believes that it is necessary not to reinvent metaphysics in the name of a new politics, but to try to get out of the metaphysics of the West entirely “because it prevails and now carries on unchecked over the whole world” (Marion xiii).

The reinvention of a new politics is the fulfilled nihilism that overlooks its own onto-theological foundation in the name of political militancy and expediency, which is then consequently overlooked by the vast majority of modern and contemporary thinking on both the Left and Right. It is here, however, that the infrapolitical register in thinking assumes responsibility for the conceptual conditions of an exodus from the biopolitical itself. This is proposed by Moreiras not in order to fantasize about the possibility of freeing oneself from nihilism, but to confront the consequences of actively skimming over nihilism in the name of a transcendent, messianic counter-politics. Such a fulfilled nihilism is, after all, what Hardt and Negri extend in their emancipatory figuration of *counter-Empire*.

In 2006, the possibility of an alternative to a thinking fully determined by fulfilled nihilism was registered in the chapter’s concluding expression: “Infrapolitics is but the search for a non-biopolitical exodus” (Moreiras, *Línea* 238). Almost a decade later, in 2015, the possibility of an exodus from thinking in the shadow of fulfilled nihilism came to be delineated as “an exodus with regard to the subjective prison that constitutes an ethico-political relation ideologically imposed on us as a consequence of metaphysical humanism”

(Moreiras, “Conversation” 152).

The question of the distance between infrapolitical thinking and fulfilled nihilism was recuperated and extended in 2017 by Jaime Rodríguez-Matos in *Writing of the Formless: José Lezama Lima and the End of Time*. In this work, the author grappled actively with the realization that any step back now from the onto-theological affirmations of metaphysical humanism—such as those of so called revolutionary thinking—requires an entanglement with nihilism attuned to the possibility of doing something other than treating “the problem of nihilism as a mere pitfall or as an obstacle that can be simply surpassed” (100). In this work, Rodríguez-Matos addresses the demand for an instrumentalization of, and within, contemporary political thinking (for instance, via the revamping of Lenin’s programmatic question from the turn of the twentieth century, “What is to be done?”) in particular reference to two of the most prominent modes of political thought today, namely, “postfoundational thinking” (as evidenced, for example, in the writings of Oliver Marchart and Ernesto Laclau, in their mutual relation to Carl Schmitt) and “communist horizontal thinking” (as extended in the work of Alain Badiou and others).

Herein Rodríguez-Matos points out astutely that so called postfoundational thinking stakes a claim on the nonexistence of an ultimate ontological ground for thinking (politics, for example) yet addresses the absence of foundation by actively forgetting about being, or the beingness of beings, which is the originary void itself (*Writing* 104). So how postfoundational is postfoundational thinking? Rodríguez-Matos seems to ask. The answer, he suggests, is not very postfoundational at all, for the “absence of *arché* ends up being the very legitimating mechanism for the multiplication of finite foundations, which will take on the form of a decision—as was also the case in Schmitt” (*Writing* 103). Postfoundational thinking is therefore founded on the essential occlusion of the originary ontological question regarding the difference that (un)grounds political thinking in the first place. For this reason, postfoundational thinking

is “a rehabilitated form of modern thought as a whole” (*Writing* 104), to the extent that it is a revamped metaphysical humanism couched in the vagaries of contingency and the metaphysical oblivion of the question of being (that is, of fundamental ontology, or the thinking of existence itself). The problem stems from an ideologically determined unwillingness in both forms of political thinking to grapple with the legacies of so called Left Heideggerianism. It is this unwillingness that, in the case of both postfoundational and communist horizontal thinking, flattens out the problem of the ontological difference, thereby preparing “the way for the accusation of nihilism to be leveled at whoever does not forget what is essentially at issue in thinking the difference between being and beings as difference and not as a stratification of ‘ontic’ and ‘ontological’ levels... The fight against nihilism continues, but it is now a fight against those who think the problem” (*Writing* 104). For Rodríguez-Matos, however, thinking the political in the name of an instrumentalization, and this in the absence of an essential attunement to the nothing, that is, to the void, produces both the compensatory domination of dogmatic certainty and the glorification of what is essentially a poorly occluded yet fully fulfilled nihilism. Against the dogmas of occlusion, Rodríguez-Matos reminds us that:

The void is not an aesthetic or imagined supplement; it is the first evidence of modern political experience, particularly after the great political revolutions of the era... But the void does not pick sides; the day after the revolution that void is also there already gnawing at whatever new institutions are put in place. The paradox of historical materialism is that it is unable to come to terms with the materiality of this emptiness. (*Writing* 110)

For this reason, the failure or refusal to reckon with the void, and this in the name of a politics of emancipation against which nihilism is measured, “does not make choosing between evil and a lesser evil anything other than a forced choice for evil” (Rodríguez-Matos, “Nihilism” 46–47). It is with the

banal optionlessness of the political in mind that Rodríguez-Matos suggests a differential pathway for thinking, as he conjectures that “perhaps it is time to reconsider the problem of foundations from the perspective of the *ex nihilo* without any further qualifications, that is, from the perspective of a thoroughly a-principial thought” (*Writing* 121). In a companion introductory text (“After the Ruin of Thinking”), Rodríguez-Matos clarifies what a-principial thought might imply for certain understandings of political action today:

What does infrapolitics say when a militant asks what bearing can thinking the absence of foundations, the ontological difference, the structure of the question, the vigilance against the temporality of the present and of presence, what can any of this possibly have to offer to the group marching down the street protesting the real and massive injustices being carried out today at every level of existence? (“Introduction” 4)

The answer is twofold: Firstly, “The focus on politics runs the risk of blinding you to the problem of politics... What if the problem of politics is that politics always entails an instrumentalization, an illegitimate appropriation that is presented as legitimate? And further, what if this problem is only exacerbated by confronting it only politically?” (“Introduction” 4); and secondly, “Infrapolitical thought/action begins by affirming that what goes under the heading of politics can be contested as such, and also that what the standard meaning of politics excludes from its own reduced sphere of ‘action’ is more important in its politicity—even as this entails a retreat from politics in the business as usual sense of the term” (“Introduction” 5). It is for these reasons that infrapolitics is “not a politics otherwise” (“Introduction” 5–6). Rather, it is the “deconstruction of politics or politics in deconstruction” (Moreiras, “A Conversation” 144). It is a proposal for the deconstruction of every illegitimate appropriation and expropriation that is presented as legitimate, including, but not limited to, the sociological, the anthropological, and the cultural.

Infrapolitics can be understood as a significant withdrawal or retreat from the political field that touches nevertheless upon the political “to the extent [that] it seeks to glimpse and reflect upon a certain outside of politics” (Moreiras, “Infrapolitics: The Project and Its Politics” 9–11). The notion of withdrawal, or of difference from the political, has also been extended by Sergio Villalobos-Ruminott, who observes that infrapolitics “points toward a dimension of existence that has not dropped into the will of will... it supposes a relation of withdrawal [desistencia] from the political itself” (“¿En qué se reconoce el pensamiento?” 52). In the same vein, infrapolitics has been approached as “the non-place from which the place of politics is radically interrogated... infrapolitical questions are not *strictu sensu* political questions; they are neither questions that could be answered from within the political realm nor are they questions that interrogate politics exclusively for the sake of establishing another politics... infrapolitical questions lie and die as questioned questions that are incapable of mastering their own questioning” (Mendoza de Jesús 53–60). It is precisely for this reason that infrapolitics marks “the experience of the impossibility of the total conceptualization of experience. Therefore, infrapolitics is a form of negative realism that... prevents the onto-theological from taking hold of the various regimes of representation, identity and the totalizing power of communitarian politics” (Álvarez Solís 139). It therefore exists at a distance from “what was understood as politics throughout modernity, that is, since the foundation of political theory, as a so called science” (Álvarez Yágüez 23). In specific reference to the Heideggerian legacy, infrapolitics “insofar as it is an-archic thinking... occurs in the form of a kind of Heideggerian ‘backtracking,’ specifically concerned with retrieving traces of the previous heralding of the infrapolitical dimension. This is the hermeneutical effort of dialoguing with a certain ‘tradition’ of thinking involved in dealing with the end of onto-theological thought” (Cerrato 98). For this reason, infrapolitics resists becoming a paradigm or world image,

since its “questioning cannot be organized easily into the conventional history of paradigms, schools or structuring principles for the history of being or knowledge. On the contrary, conceived as infinite and irrevocable inquiry, infrapolitics is the question regarding the end, or the finality, of an epoch” (Villalobos-Ruminott, “El poema” 107). Finally, for Ángel Octavio Álvarez Solís infrapolitics inaugurates a modification in tone and, as such, “a change in the orientation of thought, a change in the fragile conceptual structure of theory, a change in the way in which discursive practices admit new horizons of experience... The politics of tone indicate a dispute regarding open ears” (124–27). The author then continues, “Infrapolitics is part of the history of deconstruction, but not of the American history of deconstruction” (131). It is, in this sense, a return to and a renewal of the legacies of deconstruction.

From all of this, one can discern that infrapolitics inaugurates a diagnosis of the epochal collapse of modern thought. However, rather than apocalyptic thinking, infrapolitics thinks from within the end, for it is extended in conjunction with the attempt to elucidate a turn in our inherited metaphysical legacies. It comes with a particular attunement to the ontological difference between beings and the beingness of beings and moves in such a way as to give language to the ontological difference’s relation to “the active infra-excess of the political” (Moreiras, “Infrapolítica y política” 56). This infra-excess of the political is the excess to the ontology of the subject, or the opening to existence itself. As Martin Heidegger named it, it is *ek-sistence*, or being-towards-death. It is the unconditional nonplace of politics in retreat, which is understood as the potential uncovering of what cannot be captured and remobilized from within the Hegelian metaphysics of absolute knowledge, political consciousness, subjective will, and the dialectic of experience.

In retreat, infrapolitics strives to clear a way toward a thinking uncaptured by the modern history of subjectivity, ethics, and politics. The act of clearing is therefore carried out in the name of freedom. In this regard, Maddalena

Cerrato has addressed the importance of the question of passage in the age of the end of metaphysics, which in *Infrapolitical Passages* I take up in conjunction with what Ángel Octavio Álvarez Solís has referenced as a modification in tone and as a change in the orientation of thought. In her reading of Heidegger, Schürmann, Malabou, and Derrida, Cerrato frames the question of the passage in the following terms: “The affirmation of the end of the hegemony of epochal principles, insofar as it is an-archic, also marks the end of epochality itself, but it is, at the same time, the beginning of a passage, of the time of the transition from the passing of ontotheology to a new historicity” (84). *Passage* voids the demand for a new topology from which to think: “An-archic thought loses its mooring, it is displaced, dislocated into tropologies without return. This is the condition of the passage. In the passage, thinking can just expose itself to singular tropes, singular displacements without any expectations of stability neither as return to an originary birthplace nor as relocation elsewhere... what is passing away in the passage is philosophy itself” (89–97). For this reason, infrapolitics, as a denarrativizing activity, “dwells in the passage” (98).

In 1931 Walter Benjamin denoted something analogous and referred to it as the work of the “destructive character”:

Some people pass down things to posterity, by making them untouchable and thus conserving them; others pass on situations, by making them practicable and thus liquidating them. The latter are called the destructive... The destructive character sees nothing permanent. But for this very reason he sees ways everywhere. Where others encounter walls or mountains, there, too, he sees a way. But because he sees a way everywhere, he has to clear things from it everywhere. Not always by brute force; sometimes by the most refined. Because he sees ways everywhere, he always stands at a crossroads. No moment can know what the next will bring. What exists he reduces to rubble—not for the sake of rubble, but for that of the way leading through it. (542)

Both Benjamin’s destructive character and infrapolitics seek to situate

themselves in the passage toward another beginning, though not in the onto-theological terms of surmounting, overcoming, or transcending, since they both spurn the dialectical movement of *Spirit*. However, this does not mean that Benjamin's destructive character and infrapolitics are entirely coincident, for in Benjamin the destructive character still derives from "the consciousness of historical man" (542). In the wake of the economic collapse of 1929, consciousness remains the ultimate *arché* of both subject and experience, and there is still present in Benjamin a residual romanticism in the delineation of the destructive character as the exercise and affirmation of the *ego cogito*.

As a result, both the rubble and the possible beyond are established by and for consciousness, with destruction as the self-conscious experience and consequence of knowledge and understanding. Herein experience can only be understood as the experience of (self-) consciousness, without anything cast off. In the "destructive character," then, we remain in the land of the self-certainty of mental representation, or of the "I think, therefore, I am" that was unmoored by Lacan throughout his intellectual trajectory and in his brief exposition of the capitalist discourse in 1972.

In a slightly different tone to that of Benjamin's destructive character, as we now inhabit fully the third decade of the twenty-first century, we can but strive to desist from romanticism, since we can no longer place faith in the determination of a way through the rubble or accede to an "other side" via the Enlightenment "consciousness of historical man." Now the struggle is to delineate a way to backtrack from the Hegelian metaphysics of consciousness—from the humanist metaphysics of the ontology of the subject—that helped accumulate the underlying rubble of modernity in the first place. This backtracking is the basis for the infrapolitical exodus from all the metaphysical legacies of the dialectic of consciousness and the politics of intersubjective recognition that we have inherited since the Enlightenment. Now our only task is to think in a relation of mourning to a

world of humanist promise now essentially obsolete. Infrapolitics in this regard is neither melancholic nor apocalyptic. Rather, it is a thinking that dwells in the closure of the metaphysical humanism that previously anchored our faith in “the consciousness of historical man.” Such is the negative realism of the infrapolitical register in thinking.

The Reasons for Infrapolitics Now

We dwell in an entire global economy propelled by an Artificial Intelligence to which, we are already told, we just need to adapt because it is unstoppable (urging “ever forward, ever unsubdued” as Mephisto put it, and as Freud recalled in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* in reference to the neurotic phobias underlying the ego [or death] instincts and the impulse toward perfection [53]). A.I.’s deepening and intensification of humanity’s neurotic phobias will underlie and help propel the greatest transformational force since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. That is the language already at play. Today’s “cognitive capitalism” (Celis Bueno), comprising consumer-humans uploading video content that nobody needs or asked for, with the hope of being able to monetize their time and entrepreneurial efforts via ads, subscriptions, and viewer attention span, together with the structural in-existence or relative in-existence of those who are not part of that economy, is the mere tip of the iceberg compared to what is on the horizon: “Without an economic function, society buries you before you’re dead”, Harper Stern coldly adjudicates in the opening episode of the fourth season of the HBO series, *Industry*. Harper understands and lives her life accordingly, unfortunately. If you thought the Internet was the most critical contribution to human consciousness since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, or if you think that the human is *the* commodity most in demand now as living currency, as Tiqqun put it in their *Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young Girl* (34-5), just wait until you see what the anxiety to come looks like. In the epoch of planetary climate

collapse, what is striking is its intimate co-belonging with the uniform technological domination of humanity on a planetary scale. Dopamine—that is, the human being itself as a living hormonal vessel and as a subject-object of attention span, adrenaline reserve, and expenditure—is now *the* post-territorial consumer product to be tracked, expropriated, and valorized repeatedly, incessantly, from milli-second to milli-second, whether we are aware of it or not. Algorithmic (cognitive) capitalism produces the biopolitical positing and domination of an always alien syntax that engulfs the entirety of individual and collective subjectivity, consciousness, will, and emotion, thereby making a mockery of consent and political hegemony, but not of coercion, boredom, expropriation, anxiety, value extraction, monetization, suffering, and domination. Algorithmic capitalism is a biopolitical absolutism—a new totalitarianism of individual free will and choice on a planetary scale always already dominated by the logic of the time of the *end*, permanently—that forces human attachment to technological presencing before all else. Any possible non-attachment is akin to non-existence, since “non-attachment to busy-ness is not an option placed before our free will” (Schürmann 100). Subjectivity—that is, Descartes’ “I think, therefore I am”—no longer legislates on all there is, as Reiner Schürmann has observed. Now the alien syntax of the algorithm does that, and we are expected to conform to its totalitarian logic. And we do conform, absolutely. It is almost as if we were built for it. Our neurotic phobias are the anchor for, and the guarantee of, our conformity, suffering, and enjoyment (*jouissance*). For this reason, one must take the negative entropy of Absolute Capitalism and total subsumption (Balibar) so seriously that one recognizes it as a destruction that, in the absence of any “neganthropic” bifurcation against “entropocenic” nihilism (Stiegler)—that is, in the absence of a turn and potential second commencement for a post-metaphysical thinking capable of guaranteeing the West’s abandonment of its own foundation and essence—the epochality of destruction built around the

negativity that is the human being itself merely deepens. Jean Vioulac (2024) voices his utmost pessimism in this regard by referring to the “Anthropocene” as the “Thanatocene”, that is, as the extension and deepening of capitalism’s entropocenic impulse toward destruction, war, death, extinction, and nothing else. Existence is what is at stake now more than ever. And that demands not more politics, but infrapolitics, understood as the absolute distance between politics and life (Moreiras, *Infrapolítica*).

Jean Vioulac begins *L’époque de la technique: Marx, Heidegger et l’accomplissement de la métaphysique* [*The Age of Technique: Marx, Heidegger, and the Accomplishment of Metaphysics*] by observing that with the planetary urbanization of humanity, as announced in 2008 by The United Nations, nature has disappeared and is now reduced to the status of “green space”, natural resources, and the environment (13-14). In the last two hundred years, Vioulac observes, the Greek distinction between nature and the artificial has succumbed before the advent of the planetary reign of technique/technology, thereby signaling our epoch as the inauguration of the definitive exhaustion of the metaphysical distinction between natural history and human history that Hegel upheld as the order of Spirit, and that was consequently bequeathed, in inverted form, to his disciple, Karl Marx. The collapse of the Greek distinction between nature and artifice (technique/technology) points in the direction of the radical singularity of our epoch: the universal terminal deployment of Greek rationality itself (Vioulac, *L’époque* 25). Vioulac has pinpointed the historical and conceptual magnitude of our epochal situation; a terminal gravity that makes a mockery of all university discourses regarding humanism, culture, and identity, together with all the sociological ontologies of its Area Studies paradigm. In recognition of this terminal deployment of our entire genealogy of political, social, and cultural vocabulary, contemporary thinking can only strive to be *post-* and *infra-*, in the name of our actual historical, geological, economic, technological and existential situatedness, or *Heimatlosigkeit*.¹

Thinking, which is not to be confused with calculation or instrumentality, is no longer of interest to our institutional age. Harper Stern and everyone like her know that, and they live their lives accordingly. In contrast, if you think there might be something wrong with that, and that what is currently at stake is the very question of existence, then infrapolitics might be something you're interested in exploring.

Sabarís-Baiona, Val Miñor
January, 2026.

End Notes

- 1 “A thinker can only go beyond the nation-state by becoming *heimatlos*, that is to say, by looking at the world from the standpoint of not being at home... *Heimatlosigkeit* becomes a standpoint from which to reflect on the planetary condition... not being at home allows one to know better both being at home and being in the world” (Hui 29).

Works Cited

- Álvarez Solís, Ángel Octavio. “On a Newly Arisen Infrapolitical Tone in Theory.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez- Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 123–41.
- Álvarez Yágüez, Jorge. “Crisis epocal: La política en el límite.” Special issue on “Infrapolítica y posthegemonía,” ed. Alberto Moreiras. *Debats*, vol. 128, no. 3, 2015, pp. 9–28.
- Badiou, Alain. *The Rebirth of History: Time of Riots and Uprisings*. Trans. Gregory Elliott. Verso, 2012.
- . *The True Life*. Trans. Susan Spitzer. Polity Press, 2017.
- Balibar, Etienne. “Towards a New Critique of Political Economy: From Generalized Surplus Value to Total Subsumption”. In *Capitalism: Concept, Idea, Image, Aspects of Marx’s Capital Today*, ed. Peter Osborne, Éric Alliez, and Eric-John Russell. CRMEP, 2019, pp. 36–57.
- Benjamin, Walter. “The Destructive Character.” In *Selected Writings, vol. 2: 1927–1934*, ed. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Harvard University Press, 1999, pp.

541–42.

Celis Bueno, Claudio. *The Attention Economy: Labour, Time and Power in Cognitive Capitalism*. Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017.

Cerrato, Maddalena. “Infrapolitics and Shibumi: Infrapolitical Practice Between and Beyond Metaphysical Closure and End of History.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez- Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 81–105.

Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. The Psychoanalytical Library, 1922.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hui, Yuk. *Post-Europe*. Urbanomic Media Ltd, 2024.

Lacan, Jacques. “Discours de Jacques Lacan à l’Université de Milan le 12 mai 1972.” In *Lacan in Italia 1953–1978*. La Salamandra, 1978, pp. 32–55.

Marion, Jean-Luc. “Foreword”. In Jean Vioulac, *Apocalypse of Truth: Heideggerian Meditations*. Translated by Matthew J. Peterson. U of Chicago P, 2021, pp. xi–xiv.

Mendoza de Jesús, Ronald. “Sovereignty: An Infrapolitical Question.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez- Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 52–80.

Moreiras Alberto. *Infrapolítica: La diferencia absoluta (entre vida y política) de la que ningún experto puede hablar*. Palinodia, 2019.

—. “A Conversation with Alberto Moreiras Regarding the Notion of Infrapolitics.” With Alejandra Castillo, Jorge Álvarez Yáguez, Maddalena Cerrato, Sam Steinberg, and Ángel Octavio Álvarez Solís. Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez- Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 142–58.

—. “Infrapolitics: The Project and Its Politics: Allegory and Denarrativization; A Note on Posthegemony.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez- Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 9–35.

—. “Infrapolítica y política de la infrapolítica.” Special issue on “Infrapolítica y posthegemonía,” ed. Alberto Moreiras. *Debats*, vol. 128, no. 3, 2015, pp. 53–73.

—. *Línea de sombra: El no sujeto de lo político*. Palinodia, 2006.

Rodríguez-Matos, Jaime. “Introduction. After the Ruin of Thinking: From Locationism

to Infrapolitics.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez-Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 1–8.

- . “Nihilism and the Deconstruction of Time: Notes Toward Infrapolitics.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez-Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 36–51.
- . *Writing of the Formless: José Lezama Lima and the End of Time*. Fordham University Press, 2017.

Schürmann, Reiner. *Modern Philosophies of the Will*. Diaphanes, 2022.

Stiegler, Bernard. *The Neganthropocene*. Edited, translated and Introduction by Daniel Ross. Open Humanities Press, 2018.

Tiqun. *Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young-Girl*. Translated by Ariana Reines. Semiotext(e), 2012.

Villalobos-Ruminott, Sergio. “El poema de la universidad: nihilismo e infrapolítica.” Special issue on “Infrapolitics and Posthegemony,” ed. Jaime Rodríguez-Matos. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 106–22.

- . “¿En qué se reconoce el pensamiento? Posthegemonía e infrapolítica en la época de la realización de la metafísica.” Special issue on “Infrapolítica y posthegemonía,” ed. Alberto Moreiras. *Debats*, vol. 128, no. 3, 2015, pp. 41–52.

Vioulac, Jean. *L'époque de la technique. Marx, Heidegger et l'accomplissement de la métaphysique*. Presses Universitaires de France, 2009.

- . *Métaphysique de l'Anthropocène II: Raison et destruction*. Presses Universitaires de France, 2024.

Williams, Gareth. *Infrapolitical Passages: Global Turmoil, Narco-Accumulation, and the Post-Sovereign State*. Fordham UP, 2021.