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**[Intro slide: the script for this talk is available on my personal website, caitlinfrancesbruce.com if you wish to follow along. Image descriptions are in the script.]**

I want to start by thanking our hosts at KU, Dr. DeTar, Dr. Christa Olson and Dr. Karrieann Soto Vega. I’m honored to share this project among colleagues whose work I find so inspiring. I’m sorry not to be able to make it in person: if anyone has further questions or comments and wants to get in touch with me, please feel free to send me an email.

The parts of this project that are smart are due to the support of my mentors, the LDP writing group, and students for continually teaching me that we are in this together. Special thanks to Kimberly Singletary, E Chebrolu, Corinne Sugino and Paul Elliott Johnson for detailed feedback on the chapter from which this talk is derived. I want to dedicate this talk to the *banda* in León who shared so much of their worlds with me and taught me to pay attention to *desmadre* --- disorder and generational dissent as well as world building.

This presentation comes from a book project, *Voices in Aerosol: Institutional Attunement and León’s Graffiti Worlds.* The book started with a pretty simple question: how did a city government in central Mexico that had carried out a war on graffiti in the early 2000s end up sponsoring one of the largest permission graffiti programs in the world by the 2010s? **[slide 3-q1—slide4 cero tol image- shows the police chasing young writers painting tags in a riverbed—slide 5 mayor tour of malecolor 2017- shows the mayor of León and his entourage in the same riverbed, admiring a permission based aerosol work, a green logo of a shoe]** After several years of research, as is the case with these things, the question got a little more complex.

*Voices in Aerosol* is a rhetorical ethnography of graffiti and of institutions. It tells a story of the shifting terms through which graffiti is audible as voice, offers forms of worlding, and elucidates and refuses frameworks for value through practices of attunement.

After several years in conversations with practitioners in the scene in León who wove in more history, context, and their own questions the book now asks: **[slide 6]** How do institutions change and youth transform as they tune into each other’s expectations and values? How do these processes of attunement shape what counts as voice and how is voice heard? What happens when the state become the primary sponsor for a formerly subcultural practice?

To answer these questions, I make two primary arguments, one conceptual and one empirical. First, attunement offers a helpful framework for understanding how cultural expressions circulate, are given saliency, or are refused, and allows for more complexity in attending to processes of cultural communication than, say, cooption/resistance or authenticity/inauthenticity. Attunement is a concept which already has some purchase in rhetoric but can provide conceptual and methodological space to attend, in a multimodal way, to power dynamics, especially in the context of youth culture and aesthetic practice. Second, empirically, the institutionalization of subcultural expression is not a straight line from exclusion to inclusion but rather attunement helps us listen, look, and feel for the oscillation, unification, disagreement, static, amplification, frisson, noise, harmonization, susurration occurring as different subjects claim or inhabit modes of voice. **[slide 7 argument of book]**

Institutional attunement describes the ways that cultural practitioners and institutions of various sorts (media, education, government, cultural) navigate and seek to produce frequencies for recognition, shared vibrations, audibility, and attention, but also, relegate certain voices to noise, static, or interference, requiring inattention at best and expulsion at worst.

Attunement is something that is practiced both by municipal agents, who seek to “tune into” youth cultures and help the broader citizenry hear writers’ visual expressions as civic voice, but who often also demand that youth align their voices and practices with the needs and norms of adult and capitalist society and occupy the right frequency. Institutional attunement also speaks to the ways that youth have their own practices of modulating their voices so that they are audible within institutional frequencies, or, in the case of some writers, refusing to let the noise of their art be heard as speech: insisting on maintaining dissonant forms of expression. Attunement is rhetorical insofar as it is about transforming capacities for reception, persuasion, and attention, through aesthetic practices that activate and modulate public emotions (affects).

I define attunement as the process by which voice is identified, attended to, made audible and amplified, contoured to fit within resonant circuits, and redistributed through recognizable frequencies: the making of what might be considered citizen voices and worlds. Attunement is what Kathleen Stewart names a “tuning up to something, a labor” freighted with the stuff of the world it is “living through” and making.[[1]](#endnote-1) Attunement is a synesthetic metaphor for the communicative and rhetorical processes that accounts for affective dynamics of receptivity, interference, and engagement that takes place between subjects, publics, and worlds. Attunement unfolds in multiple arenas (interpersonal relationships, institutional plans, aesthetic practices) but I attend to visual culture as a particular register through which individual, collective, and geographic imaginaries are transformed in the wake of different aspirations about the good life.

**[slide 8 def of inst attunement]**

This history coincides and emerges from a neoliberal conjuncture—globalization, the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the global export of Zero Tolerance policing in the service of making cities attractive spaces for international capital investment. Leonese graffiti was also shaped by and commented upon national and international political and cultural moments—the aftermath of the Zapatista movement in Chiapas, the end of the Institutional Revolutionary Party’s authoritarian hold on the presidency and the growth of musical subcultures like punk, rock, ska, and hip hop also had an outsized impact on youth cultures in the city.

The book takes up six moments from 1999 to 2018 that marks different ways that graffiti connects to voice and argues that the increasing support for “artistic” graffiti—later renamed “arte urbano” or urban art—simultaneously rewrote practitioners as viable civic agents or entrepreneurs.

Today’s presentation comes from a chapter about a high point of explicit state violence and repression, that of Zero Tolerance. I will start with some definitions; a little bit of context about the case study; then I will move to discuss how graffiti was transformed, into a “social problem” through “framing stories” by media agents supported by corporate and municipal entities; I conclude with a discussion of practices of youth dissent in this period, how they participated in a politics of noisy *desmadre* to name a transnational conjuncture and illuminate alternative possibilities for collective life and the good life. **[slide 9 roadmap]**

1. **Definitions: [slide 10- illustrations/text of writer, tag, throw up, piece, voice, right to the city]**

* **Writer-** graffiti practitioner. Graffiti is a practice of publicly writing one’s name, usually a moniker (or pseudonym).
* **Tag-** the name or moniker, written in public space
* **Throw up/*vomitado*-** the tag but enlarged and in two colors, painted rapidly and often with the goal of covering the most space possible
* **Burner/Piece/*pieza***- a more elaborate work often in multiple colors usually involving images
* **Crew**: the collective of writers
* **Banda:** gang, collective, group, often has connotations of criminality

Having set up some of these technical terms, I’ll now turn to the case study.

1. **Context: León as Exemplar and Ordinary [Slide 11 – leon maps]**

León is a massive city in the Bajío region of central Mexico. A center for agriculture and silver mining in the colonial period, and later shoe production and leather, it has also been a stronghold for the family-values oriented National Action Party, hereafter, PAN, while the PRI (Institutional Revolutionary) and the *Partido de la Revolución Democratica* (Party of the Democratic Revolution, hereafter, PRD*)* have been more prevalent in Mexico City.[[2]](#endnote-2) Activism in León is most often connected to PAN politics and/or movements connected to the Catholic Church, like the Sinarquismo and Cristero movement which argued against the secularization of politics and nationalization of church lands in the early 20th century. León is a key site for the PAN’s attempted pivot from PRI-style corporativism which incorporates dissent to cultivating entrepreneurial civic engagement—creating spaces for citizens’ participation as well as individual demands. León is also a city with notable inequality: there is great affluence, and deep poverty. It is in a state with the second highest rate of femicide in the republic.[[3]](#endnote-3)

Much of the graffiti in León happens in its popular settlements—informal neighborhoods that mark a kind of contact zone between the rural and the urban, reflecting Mexico’s larger history of informal urban development. León is a bellwether for contemporary *arte urbano* projects that harness public art to initiatives like public security, urban revitalization, and youth activity[[4]](#endnote-4) that have been used in civic, commercial, and youth initiatives across Mexico and the world.

1. **Youth Geographies and Temporalities:**

Graffiti is a global movement that was popularized in the United States in the 1960s-1970s, in Europe in the 1980s, and in Latin America in the 1980s and 1990s. Graffiti came to León in the early 1990s due to a mix of influences: zines, movies, music, and the travels of young people. During this period the city was finishing a transition from primarily agronomic to an industrial and service-based economy with international stakeholders. Politically, the PAN was consolidating its power in the region, and winning significant victories even as the PRI retained its hold on the presidency until 1999. As graffiti spread young people began to form collectives, crews, and to gather in public space—in the Central Plaza of the city which has long been crucial for political and cultural life. From the Plaza Principal they would plan excursions, share new work, and spend time together. As in New York, graffiti existed in León for years before it was rhetorically transformed into a social problem.

1. **Graffiti Becomes a Social Problem: Journalistic Crisis Frames and the Demonstration Image:**

Graffiti’s framing as a social problem is inextricable from shifts in national politics. In 2000, the unthinkable happened: Vincente Fox, nominee for the PAN party (Partido de Acción Nacional) won the presidential election, becoming the first president in 70 years to come from a party other than the PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional). His victory came six years after Mexico signed onto NAFTA and the National Zapatista Liberation Front’s revolution in Chiapas. In political theory and historical analyses, the election has often been framed as an epochal shift from an authoritarian system to a moment of democratic possibility: Mexico’s “democratic transition.”[[5]](#endnote-5) At the same time, it can be understood as a moment of economic opening and consolidation of Mexico’s membership in a global economic system defined by neoliberalism. In the early 2000s, the nation was undergoing serious economic and cultural transformations with substantial impact on its global public image. A key part of that transformation played out in the built environment and social organization of cities in the development of “Zero Tolerance” policies. Marxist urbanists like David Harvey have framed such urban transformation as a “neoliberal spatial fix”: shaping landscapes to be more amenable to capital investment while eliminating or shifting the places where the poor and working class eke out survival. That spatial fix also involves, per Loīc Wacquant, more punitive policies towards the poor, like street vendors.[[6]](#endnote-6)

Zero Tolerance is a tough on crime, order-based approach to policing informed by the “broken windows” theory—the idea that visible disorder can snowball into violent crime, justifying aggressive regulation. “Broken windows theory” was coined in a 1982 article in the *Atlantic* by social scientists James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling and taken up by police Chief William Bratton and Mayor Giuliani in New York to create a “Zero Tolerance policy.” Zero Tolerance uses metaphors of contamination and cleanliness to understand public space. The government and corporate sector’s War on Graffiti in New York in the 1980s used broken windows as its ideological infrastructure.[[7]](#endnote-7) They exported this framework globally in subsequent years. The way that Zero Tolerance was deployed and resisted in Guanajuato, and León in particular, contributes an additional layer to the story of securitization and neoliberalism offered by scholars who primarily focus on the capital. I understand neoliberalism as a structural political and economic posture of reduced welfare policy but also an ideology that informs social practices and shapes subjectivities valorizing entrepreneurialism, individual freedom, risk, and autonomy.[[8]](#endnote-8)

Graffiti became an urban problem in León in August of 2001. Joe Austin, following Stuart Hall, argues that the transformation of graffiti into a social problem is the effect of power relations that use frames for intelligibility, belonging, and acceptance: “Framing stories.”[[9]](#endnote-9)The way graffiti was framed came from a combination of newspaper, radio, and television networks. Residents, policymakers, and scholars urged support for Zero Tolerance in opinion pieces in popular periodicals like *A.M.* (Antes Meridiano). One of the most high profile detractors was president of business lobby COPARMEX, Jorge Videgaray, who called for a stop to graffiti and headed a “Don’t Dirty It”/ “No Manches” campaign. Those discursive framings had serious material effects: writers were beaten, sexually assaulted, detained, and harassed by police. Journalists and citizens forged associational linkages between graffiti and criminality or violence on the pages of newspapers, constituting an order-based imaginary for the desired “urban image.” What the accounts reveal is a delineation of the value of public space, concern about youth as a social and political category, and larger worries about life in an increasingly globalized world. **Youth,** per Jessica Greenberg, can be understood as a “socially resonant category,” a genre that constrains and enables particular frames, and is mobilized by youth activists and student leaders, but also by the state and media elites.[[10]](#endnote-10) **The “urban image**” emerged as a trope used to characterize both the threat and promise of graffiti. The urban image is an aspirational concept, but also a form of attachment that emerges in debates about the role and function of graffiti and who has a right to the city.

As a scene for debate about the so-called graffiti crisis, *A.M.* can be understood as enacting **cultural journalism,** which uses public media to define culture is for audiences.[[11]](#endnote-11) As a result, *A.M.* was a crucial venue in shaping consensus about graffiti’s role in public culture in León, as threat and later as asset.[[12]](#endnote-12)*A.M.* also set itself apart by an “eminently visual” approach to journalism, using photography as a means for publics to tune into collective issues in León.[[13]](#endnote-13) W. Patrick Wade argues that “visual narrative conventions are important … make the action of depicted agents comprehensible and coherent in changing times and contexts. They thus articulate the kinds of social knowledge that, according to Hariman and Lucaites, present a ‘model for civic life’ that can ‘offer performative guides for public judgment and action’.”[[14]](#endnote-14) The visual conventions that *A.M.* utilized created frameworks for making sense out of graffiti, often to the detriment of youth who were situated as “**other than” citizens**.

**[slide 12; Angélica Anguiano, *A.M.* B/1 “Dejan Vándalos Huella por Todo López Mateos.” Image of newspaper article with two images, one of a man pointing at a red wall covered in throw ups/bombs in blue and white, a second image below the text, of a colorful primarily green piece with a white skull next to it. A man in a business suit walks by the wall. ]**

On August 1, 2001, the front page of *A.M.* was marked with the lament, “Vandals Leave Their Mark on All of López Mateos.”[[15]](#endnote-15) Boulevard Adolfo López Mateos is one of León’s major thoroughfares connecting the city center to the airport. The newspaper subheading cried, “There is no bench, abandoned space, or large wall on Boulevard Adolfo López Mateos, in the stretch from Malecón del Río to avenue Miguel Alemán that does not have graffiti on its façade or a mark on its sideboards.” A table below the story in red and tabloid style noted goes on to delineat the “geography of abuse.[[16]](#endnote-16)

**[back to Slide 11- map of leon with lopez mateos and madero identified with a line, and the malecón also underlined]**

Boulevard López Mateos figures prominently in articles about graffiti because it symbolized León’s capitalist modernity and was quite literally the terrain in which global business elites would convene, dine, and lodge.[[17]](#endnote-17) The boulevard was constructed in 1964 with the support of then-Mexican president Adolfo López Mateos and Guanajuato state governor, Juan José Torres Landa. It was “a symbol of development and growth in the city.”[[18]](#endnote-18) López Mateos Boulevard’s namesake was also known for his work on the cultural committee for the 1968 Olympics during and after his administration. He saw the cultural realm as a way for Mexico to set itself apart from other developing nations through what Jennifer Josten describes as “international mid-century modernism.”[[19]](#endnote-19) The construction of the boulevard reorganized the city, creating a clean line running from east to west, linking the historic center to the regional industrial corridor of which León was a major hub. For Leonese residents who hoped that the city would become the next London or New York in terms of business dealings, the appearance of graffiti signified a disorderly threat analogized to the scourge of street food vendors “on every corner…multiplying wherever they wish,”[[20]](#endnote-20) an invasion and a “plague.”[[21]](#endnote-21) The street vendor analogy would have resonated with an upper middle class audience, since vendors have been a target for urban cleanup campaigns in the capital of Mexico since the 1980s. To politicians and pundits, vendors signified disorder and made visible the failures of national projects for mestizaje (racial mixing) and modernization.[[22]](#endnote-22)

If López Mateos signified León’s capitalist future, the other street mentioned in the article, Madero Street, represented León’s traditionalist heritage. The street runs through the Historic Center connecting the majority of the city’s monuments. On August 2, 2001, *A.M.*’s front page of was emblazoned with the headline: “They Destroy Madero Street,” with a demonstration image of a shop owner pointing to white and red tags covering the blue facade of his store. Another article lamented how a store worker was “menaced daily” with graffiti by “cholos who have nothing to do but paint.”[[23]](#endnote-23) The lede was in all capitals: “Nothing is sacred: temples, businesses, homes, and garbage cans alike are destroyed by vandals who lack respect and paint and mark [these surfaces].”[[24]](#endnote-24)

As a tuning mechanism for public sentiment, heavily reliant on images, *A.M.* featured a particular visual convention around graffiti that I name the **“demonstration image**,” which attunes viewers to graffiti as problem that works visually, haptically, and aurally as a call for redress. **[slide 13-demonstration image definition and image of article with two photos, one in black and white of a woman in a white t shirt pointing at a tag on a wall under a Corona Extra sign, the other photo of a piece on a broken wall, the photo is in black and white but the piece is clearly multicolored]** The demonstration image has a core structure: the victim of graffiti referencing to the damage, the trace of the crime, and the action of pointing it out. The demonstration image becomes a repeated trope in *A.M.* articles about the scope of the graffiti issue over the course of three days. The demonstration image is gratuitous as an indexical reference since graffiti already is its own form of reference to the writer “I was/am here,” and the site. Yet the repeated indexing of presence— graffiti is here— is productive because it suggests the reactions that viewers ought to have. As a form of “deixis...the pointing figure, directing attention onto a present object,” the demonstration image attunes newspaper readers to the plight of wounded wall-owners or workers, calling for response.[[25]](#endnote-25) Photographs, I’ve noted, following Wade, are forms of public sensemaking and conduits for sensation, frequencies for affective attunement. As what Paul Frosh calls a “gestural image,” the demonstration image elicits “kinesthetic sociability” through a “techno cultural circuit of corporeal energy.”[[26]](#endnote-26) Sociability, however, is not a warm and fuzzy thing: it also delineates bad subjects and objects. The “kinesthetic sympathy” that the demonstration invites only cuts one way— it invites attunement to the figure of the body of the pointer (property owner or worker), while it urges vitriol towards the absent graffiti writers.[[27]](#endnote-27) Indeed, later articles continue to assert that graffiti is something that “persecute[s] the citizens,” and that writers are “aggressors” that leave “lesions” on the city’s fabric.[[28]](#endnote-28) Public intellectuals like Mariano González Leal, a scholar of León’s history, called for a “firm hand (*Mano dura*)/heavy fist” in response to the damage graffiti creates on “dignity, aesthetics, and common sense”[[29]](#endnote-29) and other articles urged a return to a “clean city.”[[30]](#endnote-30) Thus, the demonstration image motors what Zizi Papacharissi calls, “affective attunement” plugging into a “structure of feeling” characterized by intense anxiety about the so-called graffiti problem[[31]](#endnote-31), and functioning as an affect generator for broader anger, anxiety, and fear.[[32]](#endnote-32)

Here, writers are cast as cognitively and ethically deficient and dangerous to the urban image as they are **‘other than’ citizens**. **[slide 14- animation 1]** In the public denunciations, an entire sociology of the graffiti writer is presented, a diagnosis of an individual who is a member of a gang (*banda*), without scruples or judgment, without work or school, and who creates a negative “city image.” The writers who attempt to “mark” and claim public space, then, are not worthy citizens, if they are considered citizens at all. They fail to exhibit piety, productivity, and respect, values supported by the paternalistic PAN party and upheld through neoliberal ideology. Often called, c*holos*, a term for gangsters, when used in Mexico rather than the United States, the term functions to exile youth from the bounds of proper Mexican citizenship. Gilberto Rosas explains that “cholos and cholas speak to criminal desires and delinquent possibilities, to pathological urbanizing criminal youth, to migrations gone afoul …”.[[33]](#endnote-33) The image of the cholo is a general signifier of “marked transgression” that “connotes illegality.”[[34]](#endnote-34) They are the uneasy underside of economic globalization.

In sum, the ‘other than’ citizens are youth who are seen as what Alexis Shotwell calls “revolting subjects” and what I name subjects enacting a **noisy politics of desmadre**,**[slide 14-animation 2]** of disordering, riotousness, and unparenting a hierarchical society. Desmadre can be understood as a kind of noisy, disruptive subjectivity—an extension of the working-class politics of relajo (unseriousness).[[35]](#endnote-35) Desmadre translates as un-mother or de-mother, but also as disorder or unruliness. The term was popularized in the 1950s around adult anxieties about rock n’ roll music. In the 1990s/early 2000s, for youth, graffiti offered a sonic and visual frequency for apprehending a globalizing world in transition, a form of visual noise.

Michele Holling has argued that violent media frames justify violent reactions from the state.[[36]](#endnote-36) What the articles in *AM* leave out are the manifold reasons young writers felt rancor—neoliberal adjustment came with austerity measures that drastically impacted public services, educational opportunities, and social infrastructure that impacted their lives in different ways. In protests against stigmatization and Zero Tolerance policies youth named this conjuncture and identified the way the media, state, and corporate entities were conflating vandalism against property with violence against people by simultaneously denying youth personhood and voice. **[blank slide]**

1. **Asserting Voice: Youth Protest and Oppositional Attunement**

“The Zero Tolerance law proposes to punish delinquency with an iron fist, but what kind of delinquency does it punish? Is the simple act of being young a crime? Is being different a crime? A popular theme is that of the *grafitero*/*as* and the supposed goal of the zero-tolerance law is to end graffiti. These are pure pretexts—it wants to end all forms of expression, all forms of organized resistance/rebellion, as such, what they want (the rich and the government) is a robotic people for easy control...”JOCOCA[[37]](#endnote-37)

Youth were well-aware of the ways that dominant media like *A.M.* sought to frame youth cultures as delinquency in the service of promoting Zero Tolerance, and youth writers and anarchist activists sought to provide another vision of what the good life could be.

Zero Tolerance resulted in criminalizing many youth cultures based purely on their appearance. Wes, one of the first-generation writers in León, recalls “the fact of just wearing baggy pants or a sweatshirt that was black, or a cap, was synonymous with being a grafitero. If you had a backpack, you are a grafitero, and the police would stop you,” take art supplies away, and beat youth. He lamented that “hundreds” of writers stopped painting.[[38]](#endnote-38) Toby describes unmarked white vans that prowled about the Centro Histórico, detaining youth who fit the profile” of a writer. Though graffiti was the supposed justification for such policies, it wasn’t just writer youth who were surveilled. Toby added: “everyone…metal heads, rockers…punks…the root of the problem is that Zero Tolerance was derived from trying to stop graffiti, trying to stop all the disorder that existed in the city and ending delinquency, but it was also a desire to control the unions and the graffiti writers were used as a pretext.”[[39]](#endnote-39) Youth felt unsafe gathering in public spaces.[[40]](#endnote-40)

Protest against Zero Tolerance largely involved a coalition between some writers and some anarchist youth.[[41]](#endnote-41) Starting in early 2002, a group of anarchist youth created the Jovenes Coordinados Contra la Autoritianismo collective (hereafter, JOCOCA, Coordinated Youth Against Authoritarianism). Toby explained that the acronym came from a beverage “made from fermented milk, like yogurt, called Jocoque.”[[42]](#endnote-42) JOCOCA organized marches, created zines, organized dialogues.[[43]](#endnote-43) They were a horizontal organization that rejected a leader-based model. Many members were harassed, surveilled, and detained by police on the street and at their respective high schools.[[44]](#endnote-44)

JOCOCA sought to attune Leonese publics to the realities of neoliberal authoritarianism, calling out Zero Tolerance not as a war on delinquency but simply being young or different. They saw Zero Tolerance as an attempt to align public sympathies with corporate entities making writers scapegoats. In a zine JOCOCA states “what they want (the rich and the government) is a robotic people for easy control.”[[45]](#endnote-45) By situating the good subject as a robot, they articulate how criminalizing graffiti is really about eliminating public voice.

Here’s a longer quote from Toby, JOCOCA member: **[slide 16]**

[T]he *grafiteros* were the ones who gave a voice to the youth, at least in this moment. The majority didn’t have a really elaborate ideological question like anarchist things but they had a very clear idea: that if we don’t do something, that if we don’t unite, at least the *chavos*, the government is going to continue doing what it wants. Here in Mexico, for example, it was still a country traumatized by 1968…the 2nd of October…so we had people afraid of the government making them disappear…and while this was a government that supposedly was for change, here was where they began to behave the same way as they did in the times of the PRI. And because Fox…had invested a lot in his city…they were going to create a big convention center…they didn’t want to see social problems here. And it exploded where they least imagined it would.[[46]](#endnote-46)

Youth calling out the hypocrisy of the so-called democratic transition by linking it to PRI violence in 1968 illuminates how León was a symbolic center of power for Fox. The massacre at Tlatelolco Plaza in Mexico City came as the PRI’s legitimacy was in crisis but also as it was assembling a visage of international modernism through the Olympics.[[47]](#endnote-47) While Mexico had not fully entered into global markets in 1968 it was about to embrace the neoliberal policies of Presidents de la Madrid and Salinas de Gortari, which eroded youth access to free or affordable education. There are clear resonances in 2002 in Guanajuato, which was a theater for Fox’s pro-privatization, security, and family values policies to make Mexico an attractive site for international investment.

JOCOCA’s internal communications evidence a careful attunement to Zero Tolerance’s emergence from a neoliberal and authoritarian conjuncture. They asserted that President Fox and Governor Carlos Romero Hick’s policies confused cause and effect, arguing that the war on delinquency ignores the “real problem, which is social injustice, for one of its effects, public insecurity.”[[48]](#endnote-48) **[slide 17 Boletín interno, JOCOCA, 2003.]**

León signifies for the political-business elite the archetype of the ‘secure’ city and investors make this a mandatory condition. The problem is that they do not seek public security or the well-being of the people. They seek private security…to preserve the interests of the elite. Repression is just one of many of the maladies that hurt this country. So our group is fighting specifically against the fascism that is euphemistically called ‘democracy,’ but also against everything the neoliberal project signifies…what some call PAN and what others call PRI. The bourgeois parties do not challenge power, they share it among themselves, they are the same thing in reality.[[49]](#endnote-49)

I want to focus for a moment on some of the images included in a draft of a 2002 zine by JOCOCA, to explore how they offer a mode of voice that is polyphonous and resonant at different geographic and social scales: visual noise as oppositional attunement.

[**Slide 18- zine images]**

A cartoon of the police with the placard “Service for the community” is written over with the word “impunity” in font evoking blood. Another image shows a police officer standing over and choking a punk laying on the ground. A drawing of pigs further underscores the critique of the police. A grainy photo of a cop arresting a bleeding youth is captioned: “Your terrorism against our freedom,” “It will not pass! Your silence is complicity! Military, police, the same piggery!“[[50]](#endnote-50) By connecting local policies to national and international forms of oppression, JOCOCA engaged in the labor of producing what Karma Chávez has named “coalitional moments.”[[51]](#endnote-51) Following María Lugones, coalition works against a “logic of boundedness…a logic of binaries that produces hard-edged, ossified, exclusive groups.”[[52]](#endnote-52) It attunes the viewer to the voices of youth across space and time. The images in the zine challenges “the listening ear”[[53]](#endnote-53) that reduces the experience of oppressed peoples to static, positing possibilities for listening across experiences to enable solidarity or becoming attuned to the roar of violence beneath official emissions about public order. Toby recalled how the anarchists started dialoguing with the graffiti crews about Zero Tolerance as writers “began to realize that [Zero Tolerance] was …propaganda to scare people.”[[54]](#endnote-54)

In Spring of 2002, frustrations with government impunity and repression came to a boiling point in a series of protests in Guanajuato and León. The protests varied in size, makeup, and relative levels of planning, but all took aim at Zero Tolerance and the criminalization of youth.

On May 21 2002 in Irapuato, the Federal Preventative Police detained a group of four graffiti writers; they forced the three young men to strip and sexually assaulted the young woman.[[55]](#endnote-55) In a protest on May 25th, youth gathered in the Plaza Principal (Central Plaza), marched through the city center down Madero Street and occupied the Malecón, a concrete riverbed that bisects the city and has been a crucial location for writing in graffiti history. In a statement, JOCOCA named state violence and articulated youths’ right to public space, framing the Malecón as a site symbolic of youths’ exclusion from public space, as well as a potential locale from which they can assert their right to the city.

We reject the presence of the Federal Preventative Police (PFP) in our streets, we stand in solidarity with all of those who have suffered any type of human rights violations, and we urge the punishment of the police who humiliated and raped three of our *grafitero* compatriots in Irapuato…the JOCOCA symbolically takes part of the Malecon to use it as a space of expression to express their repudiation of the act mentioned, a space that is for all, where all belong and from which we cannot be excluded.[[56]](#endnote-56)

In the Malecón, where they painted phrases like “Zero Tolerance no more.” In response to the group of 60 to 70 protesters, a helicopter, anti-riot squads in full body armor, and the police were called in. A sixteen-year-old named Kaos was arrested while he painted “Attention police, you know the uniform…”.

In the wake of the protests, there was massive newspaper coverage that continued to frame youth as non-citizens: belittling their demands, critizing them for being rude and disorderly, or for wearing face coverings. [[57]](#endnote-57) [[58]](#endnote-58) On the one hand, images of the protests offered visual resources to consider youth’s use of voice and resistance to violent state power. Against the “demonstration image” the protests offered an image of bald state repression- the might of riot squads against unarmed writers. These images make visible the vulnerability of youth bodies. However, absent from such images are the corporate entities like COPARMEX president Jorge Videgaray responsible for promoting Zero Tolerance. Images of the protests either presented youth as a threatening force against “proper” civil society or simplified them into a drama between the state and youth.[[59]](#endnote-59) [**slide 19**]. Paul Elliott Johnson has extended Michael Warner’s argument about mass publicity to propose that in critiques of the state, the political right occludes their indebtedness to capitalism by prominently featuring the body of the state while leaving invisible the bodies of capitalist agents.[[60]](#endnote-60) After the protests a cartoon appeared in *El Sol* of a large, flat hand titled “Delinquency”, which descended to crush the police, inverting the embodied dynamic that occurred at the Malecón and positing youth as oppressors. It also obliquely responded to JOCOCA’s slogan “Remove the hand from on top of us.”[[61]](#endnote-61) **[slide 20- “Delinquency” *El Sol.* 7967]** Property and propriety are conflated rendering youth voice inadmissible due to its disorderly and noisy character.

In the wake of youth protests there was continued repression even as the state denied that oppression existed and made overtures of inclusion.[[62]](#endnote-62)

Some entities in Youth Institute, a municipal department charged with channeling youth energy and supporting proper activities, began to ramp up their sponsorship of “artistic” graffiti.[[63]](#endnote-63) Toby noted that in 2003 JOCOCA fizzled out due to too much *desmadre.*

1. **Concluding Thoughts:**

The anti-Zero Tolerance protests were an ephemeral moment of desmadre that refused media attunement to graffiti as problem. They were acts of what Catherine Chaput names, which includes practices like *parrhesia* wherein subjects are invented who can challenge “hegemonic truths” using “embodied practice” and “moral courage to speak publicly against prevailing norms…even at great personal risk.”[[64]](#endnote-64) Graffiti projected a criticism of good life fantasies of broken windows theory that articulates the disorder wrought by neoliberal restructuring and urban fragmentation through the chaotic aesthetic of tagging and bombing, and JOCOCA’s proposals as an alternative, more redistributive model of collective life.[[65]](#endnote-65)

These moments of activism are but a small part of how public memory is projected around graffiti in León, yet, exploring this temporary moment of radical political organizing is important. Dilip Gaonkar notes of dissent, following Benjamin Arditi: “the enacted ‘we”’ is fugitive and contingent, always destined to dissipate and disappear.”[[66]](#endnote-66) Though temporary, the “we” enacted by youth provided a momentary resource for solidarity and sense-making, a form for noisy voice. They responded to framing stories and demonstration images that conflated property with persons and vandalism with violence by asserting the importance of graffiti as a form of voice that lays bare the dislocations and structural violence wrought by neoliberal authoritarianism.

A form of *parrhesia*, graffiti might have been framed as incoherent in media pages, but its persistence and its mobilization of coalitional youth opposition revealed that it offered a fecund mode of tuning into a global situation and forms of collective belonging and action.[[67]](#endnote-67) To understand the way that desmadre might work requires a longer temporal accounting that moves away from the success of demands and attends to the more granular work of sustaining (or the breaking) of forms of collectivity and transformations in public space and who is understood to have the power and right to shape such spaces. It requires attention to the slippages and forgetting in public memory and memorial infrastructure for protests.[[68]](#endnote-68) Though iconic photojournalistic images of protest might mobilize civic reflection, in the case of Zero Tolerance, such images were vehicles for exclusionary media attunement that rendered some actors “other than” citizens.[[69]](#endnote-69)

Voice is about dialogic process tied to what Eric King Watts characterizes as “*addressivity* and *answerability,*” or acknowledgement and response.[[70]](#endnote-70) Building “shared acknowledgement” is laborious, and subjects sometimes must “interrupt ongoing conversations that do not make room for them in order to be acknowledged.”[[71]](#endnote-71) JOCOCA and the writers performed this interruption spatially, visually, and physically through a noisy politics of desmadre.

A politics of desmadre makes visible the slow death that is built into systems of disposability and economic logics that privilege profit and property over people, but such performances are often framed as illegible in media outlets that condition much public reception. The cultural contexts and framing stories that conditioned the recirculation of those images often capitulated to the “cholo” or ‘other than’ citizen reading. A politics of desmadre requires new forms for subjectivity and collectivity, resonating with important scholarship on forms of leaderless protest that refuse respectability politics and renegotiate dominant frames.[[72]](#endnote-72)

Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to hearing from you. **[closing slide with contact information]**
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