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Chase Westfall: Our moment is, of course, absolutely—and appropriately—dominated by the COVID-19 narrative. Viewed through the lens of your research interests, what does this moment reveal about the myth of “First World” stability? The belief that the U.S., as one example, is in some way fundamentally immune to, or insulated from, the economic vicissitudes we often observe in the “Second” and “Third World”?

Mariana Parisca: We have to begin by acknowledging that this “First—,” “Second—,” “Third World” notion is a continuation of the structures of colonialism and imperialism, and that these worlds are not, in fact, completely separate things—that they co-create each other. The stability of the First World is actually supported by instability elsewhere. It is created and sustained by pushing instability and crisis out of the spatial imaginaries demarcated as the First World. Even, for example, going to a grocery store to buy bananas: in the U.S. many can just go to the store and buy them—to get that nutrition. But U.S. intervention in the banana industry, especially in Latin America, has started wars and created incredible amounts of violence.1 It’s similar with narcotrafficking: “party” culture here depends on and creates a lot of corruption and violence in other countries. But I think that that ability to push crisis out is limited. And I think we’re starting to see a lot of those limits. And now, of course, coronavirus. Coronavirus doesn’t follow social order. We see the social order in the way it’s handled and treated, but the virus itself does not. So the current crisis is, hopefully, a bit of that realization that it can happen here. And that vulnerability is an inescapable truth of life. We can manage it but— (shrugs). Modernism projected constant growth but life has cycles of growth and decay. So when we push, push, push

growth, it gets to a point that it can’t continue and has to collapse. And that’s where we see crisis. People have been saying we were ripe for a pandemic because of our food industry practices. People have been saying that something like this was likely to happen.

**CW:** Right. If history has taught us anything it’s that these things aren’t just *likely* but that they’re inevitable. And that inevitability keeps everybody nervous and reinforces our instinct toward those false divisions and boundaries you’re talking about.

**MP:** This points to one of the major contradictions in global neoliberal structures. Neoliberal ideology pushes for really porous boundaries in the case of free trade and free markets—and certain people are privileged with a lot of free mobility. But when it comes to issues of immigration, then all of a sudden people want to maintain strict borders and pretend that we’re all separate entities—that things aren’t really fluid.

The project I’m working on, using my art funding to buy hyperinflated Bolívares from Venezuelan immigrants in Colombia and then trying to bring those Bolívares over here to the U.S., is a way of pointing to and testing some of the porosity of these boundaries. Going back to this idea of pushing crisis outward, I think that in many ways the current immigration crisis in the U.S. stems back to long histories of U.S. interventionism that created a lot of violence in Central and South America. Now there’s a lot of immigration coming from those same countries—including Venezuela, Guatemala, El Salvador—escaping the violence and crisis that were exacerbated by American intervention. This is not to say that American interventionism is solely responsible for the circumstances in countries like Venezuela. That’s an oversimplification. But it’s also absurd to pretend like those are not the U.S.’s problems.
CW: You mentioned oversimplification: one of the challenges in addressing these issues, as I see it, is overcoming our tendency toward oversimplified narratives—and being willing to work for, or at least open to, a more complex understanding of these circumstances.

MP: One of the things that I carry with me, being from Venezuela, is that things are incredibly complex and that ideology doesn’t explain the full reality of the situations that are happening. Nobody understands what has happened in Venezuela—it’s incredibly complicated. It’s important to not be afraid of that complexity, or oversimplify things, or take a purely ideological stance on the situation. As an artist, I can be steeped in that complexity. And then art becomes a place where that complexity can be held.

CW: You mentioned in a previous conversation that the theories of Jean and John Comaroff have been very influential to you. The following quote is from the introduction to their book, Theory From The South: “What if we posit that, in the present moment, it is the global south that affords privileged insight into the workings of the world at large?” \(^2\) That statement was made in 2012. How does the logic of this question apply to the current global pandemic situation?

MP: It’s a big statement. With my current thesis project, I am very aware that this is a show about the Venezuelan economic crisis made for an American audience, and made by someone who identifies as both Venezuelan and American. That quote, and the broader theories from the book, articulate exactly why it’s so important to have these conversations about the Venezuelan
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economic crisis right now. And what the implications of that crisis could be not only for Venezuela but for the rest of the world. The U.S. is implicated in the issues being faced in Venezuela in many complex ways. For Americans, because the dollar holds so much power globally and its value is relatively stable in the U.S., it’s difficult to see the subjectivity of it or see beyond the construction of our currency and economic order. I hope that in talking about hyperinflation in this project, here in the U.S., it opens up that dialogue.

CW: In addition to the experiences of the South being theoretically or philosophically useful to the North at a time like this, the quote also suggests, to me, that populations that have already endured real instability might have developed solutions, survival or logistical strategies that could be of practical value—or even therapeutic value! — for persons who are experiencing a shared national crisis for the first time.

MP: Yes, and it even goes beyond that. The mentality of colonial order was that the North was a place for ideas and theories, while the South was used for its raw materials and resources, which then needed to be processed by EuroAmerica. In the 70s in Chile, for example, U.S. leaders saw Latin American countries as a place to experiment with neoliberal theories because, at the time, those ideas were too radical to be imposed on the U.S.³ Comaroff and Comarrof describe many examples in Africa. So for those reasons, Latin American communities have years of experience in creating modes for resisting radical neoliberal ideas—and living within the subsequent conditions of extreme inequality. It’s too idealist to say that there would be solutions, because I don’t think anyone has moved beyond any of the

problems. But there is social theory in the South. And it’s also about shifting perspectives to understand that theory and material, and theory and experience, are not separate things. And so anywhere that you have material and experience—including the South—is a place for theory to happen.

**CW:** Certain works of yours seem very focused on establishing the materiality of objects or institutions whose social operations are otherwise largely symbolic—like your work with currency or the Virgin Mary. You’ve mentioned an interest in the theories of Édouard Glissant. How does your strategy for investigating the materiality of symbols parallel Glissant’s approach to deconstructing language?  

**MP:** There are a lot of contradictions embedded in modernity about materiality. In so many ways, modernity is a material project, but there’s a sort of split—it’s the Cartesian dualism: the idea that we are bodies that hold our souls, and the idea that our soul and body could be separated and that they could exist in isolation. In so many ways, I feel like the project of modernity is a project that sees material and materiality as a problem that we have to overcome. It idealizes ideas without material. And so I think a lot of my work is about trying to remarry these two: understanding how intertwined these things are and how—when we control and shape the material world—that material impacts us. With the Virgin Mary, I think about immaculate conception and this idea that she became pregnant through a purely spiritual power, without any kind of material existence. And the suggestion that the truth of that physical reality would somehow make her unholy.
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**CW:** The idea that the beauty and the power of that narrative are all isolated from—that they happen *in spite of* rather than within—a physical reality?

**MP:** Exactly. The idea that materiality is just muckiness that we need to get past, that it’s unholy, and that we must surpass or suppress it. So that’s why I make her out of charcoal—carbon, the most basic element of life—in order to face that materiality and come back to it. (p.06) Through my word drawings I try to do this with language, too. I understand some of Glissant’s ideas in *Poetics of Relation* as his efforts to talk about language as material.\(^5\) I especially love spoken language because there’s the *word*, or the symbol, and then there’s the utterance of that symbol, which always comes with a sort of texture, or a certain manner of being said. Symbols and ideas are always situated. Ideology takes on forms, always in relationship to a situation. And through that relationship it’s always different. I think Glissant’s project—I think when we realize that every time you say a word it’s in a different context, and brings a whole load of new possible meanings—that’s when language becomes an incredible, creative force.

**CW:** There’s an essay titled “Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam?: From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern” by Bruno Latour where Latour introduces this idea of ‘gathering’ as the process through which ‘matters of concern’ arise.\(^6\) And it seems to have certain correlations with what Glissant calls ‘relation.’ Instead of working to break reality down into discrete, isolated, “more reliable” units—which Latour calls ‘matters of fact’—we need to be gathering reality into warm, complex, bundled ‘matters of concern.’ ‘Matters of concern’ are situated
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and they relate. That also speaks to our need to not be embarrassed by the materiality of something. Or, on the other hand, to not be squeamish about something’s existence as an idea—but to try to bring all those aspects together.

**MP:** This relates to some of the more political things we talked about earlier, like ‘imperialism,’ or the imposition of abstract ideals onto other places and contexts, which are then always in relationship to so many additional things that it makes for completely different realities. That’s part of why imperialism comes with so much violence. The imposition of these abstract ideas is not considered in relationship to those realities—to people living.

**CW:** Absolutely—the potential for violence when you pressurize a physical location by imposing an ideology which is foreign to, unfamiliar with, or misaligned with the material realities of that location.

In a preliminary conversation we had, you talked about the role and power of belief in maintaining the socializing and transactional mechanisms within society. Currency is a great example of one of these. Can you point to a few places where this idea of belief is explored or emerges in your practice?

**MP:** A big part of my project is understanding global capitalism as a belief system or religion. A lot of people say that we live in a secular society and I think that statement has so many implications and so much power.

**CW:** It suggests that something of our reality is fact-based! *(laughs)*

**MP:** Exactly! I think that’s really a problem. Capitalism is held up by so many beliefs. And I’m not against the idea
of believing in something, but when we think that our beliefs are truth—when we position them as absolutes or as knowns—it’s really problematic. There are so many things that we, as humans, don’t know. As an individual, I don’t know anything. But I believe in a lot of things! Where there are unknowns, we create narratives to explain them. These narratives have a lot of power, so they’re often abused and co-opted. I think that’s partially what happened in Venezuela. We needed change and to address the inequalities in the country. So people believed in [Hugo] Chávez and then there was an abuse of that belief.  

In my work the geodesic sphere represents hegemonic belief. As a small child in Venezuela, I saw the geodesic sphere at Epcot [Theme Park] at Disney [World]. It’s a hegemonic image. What hegemony does is make you believe in an image and an associated set of ideals. When I emigrated to the U.S., I was like, “Oh, I thought we were moving to Epcot!” I realized later on that that expectation wasn’t just childhood naivete, it was a product of hegemony. You know, in Venezuela for so long, everything American was idealized or seen as better than. And we were trying to model ourselves after the U.S. If we could somehow reap the benefits of oil to become developed like the U.S.—that would be better. So it’s this whole system of beliefs that we model our reality around, and is held up collectively. And I think that hegemonic belief functions similarly with the economy. Especially as we move away from things like the gold standard, where currency represents something physical. Removed from that standard, it’s actually only worth something because everybody believes it’s worth something. And in the current global finance economy, people have figured
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out ways to capitalize on that through speculative capitalism. I think of the way that the IMF [International Monetary Fund] predicted that in 2019 Venezuela would reach one million percent inflation. In many ways, that’s a self-fulfilling prophecy because if the IMF, which is this international, and very believed-in institution, says that it’s not going to be worth anything so many months from now, then everyone’s going to divest. And then the money is actually worth less. I think it’s very important to recognize moments of belief and the authority that those moments have. That recognition can give society the power to reconstruct and reorder things in different ways.

CW: And resituate things. You used the word situated earlier, and I think that’s a great way of speaking broadly to this set of more interconnected concerns. What happens if, rather than following along, the global community decides that they’re not going to listen to the IMF? What happens then with the life of that currency? As it is, it’s a bizarre situation to have a group of “experts” half a world away issuing decrees about the future buying power of a currency.

MP: But that’s what happens when we think that beliefs are truths. I think that part of the value in bringing this project to the U.S. is, because we’re so steeped in this system where the U.S. is the center of economic power, it makes it seem like value wouldn’t exist if it didn’t exist in this economy. Then COVID-19 happened, and the economy starts to fall apart, and it feels like all value could be destroyed. In a lot of ways, of course, there is real loss. In Venezuela, with the economic crisis, there’s been so much loss. But in that context my practice of

folding the Bolívares into wallets becomes a beautiful gesture. Because it demonstrates the ability to see this bill as something more than a bill. It’s paper. It’s material. We can do so many things with it. So you make something new out of it, like wallets. Or I make videos and then it has value in a new way. Then you start to see how value isn’t something that’s only held by this system—that it existed before and it will continue to exist beyond the collapse of this system—and that we have the power to shape how that happens.

**CW:** There are some really famous images that come from other instances of hyperinflation—I think they’re from World War I?—where children are bundling bills to make building blocks. I think most often those images are presented as tragic or as darkly comedic. But following your logic, there is the potential for something hopeful and beautiful in that gesture.

**MP:** That’s where optimism comes in: *I still exist! I still have a life!* There’s existence beyond the collapse of these systems. We become so dependent on them partially because these systems gain power through building dependence—like monopolies, or institutions that are “too big to fail.” That’s why it’s so scary and why there is so much suffering when these systems do collapse. Like, we *have* to go to the grocery store. Most of us don’t have sources of food at home. So the idea of not being able to go or, right now, of getting sick from going to the grocery store is really scary. But that’s not the way it always has to be.
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10 “Children Playing with Stacks of Hyperinflated Currency during the Weimar Republic, 1922.” Rare Historical Photos, 8 May 2018, rarehistoricalphotos.com/hyperinflation-weimar-republic-1922/.
CW: As a part of My Compulsory Promise, you built a geodesic dome—a structure that, as you mentioned, is very loaded with the symbolic and hegemonic weight of modernism. What alignments or connections do you see between narratives of modernism and narratives of the Americas as the “New World”?

MP: As part of my research I’ve been looking at the history of debt and the history of credit. And I became really interested in the way that colonialism and the “New World” actually played a huge part in developing the economic order that we live in today. Spain started to extract silver and gold from South America and ship it back to Spain. But it took a long time for the gold and silver to make that journey, and the royal family wanted to spend it before it actually arrived. So that created one of the first instances of national debt, because Spain was borrowing money from other nations and saying, “Oh, we’ll pay you back when the gold arrives from the Americas.” I also think about the automotive industry: cheap rubber played a big part in making the automobile industry possible—and that rubber was available through the enslavement of indigineous communities in the Amazon. I think about enlightenment ideals like “freedom” and how those ideas were developed through the leisure time and surplus created by slave labor. It’s so entrenched in the way that modernism has developed.

CW: Understanding that entrenchment—knowing that modernism is complicit with so much abuse, violence, and exploitation—do you see any room for continuing to work within, or in support of, the ideals and values of modernism?
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MP: That’s a hard question. The modernist project is a sort of projection—it was always talking about the future. I think that *My Compulsory Promise* is about now. And about saying, “Here I am!” I’m a woman who grew up in Venezuela and was able to move to the U.S. and go to college and pursue art. And it’s like: “Here I am; this is fifty years later; this *is* that projected future.” So I take the geodesic sphere, make it my size, and touch it. And read it a love letter to renegotiate some of those things. (p.15)

CW: Can you say more about this idea of the love letter as a renegotiation? And perhaps also an acknowledgement?

MP: It is—it’s an acknowledgement. Everyone believes in the ideal of freedom and still strives for it. So it becomes a project of detangling. A lot of the ideas we have about freedom or about love are problematic. Like, Disney creates so many narratives about love that are in so many ways problematic. But I can’t just throw away the idea of love—that’s not what I believe in either. And I’m still using that Epcot symbol because it’s what we have. It takes patience and labor to work through that tangle, and belief that is self-aware, and situated understanding, and slowness, too. My projects in collecting plastic are about looking at what modernism created. We *produce, produce, produce*—and all of this stuff still exists on the earth. So it’s about looking at it and sorting through it and figuring out how to build new futures that don’t rely on a standard of growth that’s dependent on exploitation. Modernism and capitalism are projects that absorb the things that we all really care about—and so it’s not simple.

CW: I love this idea of things being tangled. And that we have to perform that labor of love in doing the untangling. Or at least in engaging the tangle. I’m
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curious about if or how you think being bilingual and bi-cultural impacts your ability to do that work. Is there an advantage in being able to see that tangle from multiple perspectives?

**MP:** Being bilingual and being an immigrant at a very early age, I realized how much culture and language really shape the way you think. And how subjective and radically different things can be within different contexts. I think that made me really creative. You can start to play in the spaces between languages. Tensions are formed that can hold new things up, and where you can have space for agency. A lot of the titles for my pieces use words that have double meanings. The word *suelo,* for example, means ‘ground.’ The photograph pieces are called *Suelo,* partially because they’re photographs of the ground and things I find on the ground. *(p.17)* But *suelo* also means ‘I tend to.’ As in, ‘I tend to do this.’ I think about how things fall to the ground, where things start to break down: they get ground down and start to decompose, they stop being themselves, they stop holding their integrity and are then able to be recomposed into other things. This idea applies to me. I have a tendency toward something; I have a sort of integrity in a way of being but also the agency to reshape that. Spanish differentiates between *ser* and *estar,* which are different kinds of being. *Yo soy* and *yo estoy:* one in a fixed sense and the other in a temporary sense. And I think that that’s a really important distinction. *Estoy* allows room for people to be different in different contexts.

**CW:** *Estoy* is that situational component of things.

**MP:** Right. It allows people to reshape and recreate themselves in new ways and for things to be conditional. That idea carries through in a lot of my work, pushing toward a conditional way of thinking about things: about
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language, symbols, and even physical things. Like a lot of immigrant kids, after I moved to the U.S. I started to forget Spanish. Luckily, my parents really pushed for me to speak Spanish at home so I didn’t end up losing it. But there was a moment where I rejected Spanish. There was some internalized xenophobia, I think, because really I just wanted to fit in. Now, understanding language through these experiences, I make drawings of words that have both colloquial and economic meanings in English—like ‘interest’ for example—in serif fonts, then laser cut the drawings into acrylic and make light installations. (p.19) When you read them, there’s a feeling like you’re someone trying to pronounce the word for the first time. I remember learning English words as a child. These pieces consider the hegemonic and economizing power of the English language and the way it projects. So the idea references processes of assimilation and economization and the inherent erasure that comes with that, but also an unlearning that’s possible through the decomposition of the word—an unlearning of that particular economic meaning and a re-opening up of what that word could mean.

CW: This feels resonant, again, with your interest in Glissant. Through that lived experience of language acquisition, and through the work that you’re making now, how have you come to understand the relationship between language and power?

MP: English has strong hegemonic power. Language shapes the way you think and your possibilities. Even going back to the ser and estar example—English is a very direct language in many ways, which is why it’s so good and effective for business! I resist that in my work, by trying to literally slow language down—in my video, for example, with my speaking. As it slows down, that’s where all of the complexities exist. When you’re trying to get something done, you don’t want to open up space
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for different interpretations. You want to get to the point. That kind of efficiency has its place and value, obviously. But what happens when we bring that directness to all parts of life? Like, when we talk about things like love, there’s a beauty in the complexities and nuances in those things. So how do we slow that language down—make it less efficient—so that we can live in it and enjoy its complexities?

CW: Absolutely. There’s a text called *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* by Robert Pirsig. Consistent with what you just described, Pirsig points out that in Japanese, when someone asks you a yes or no question, there are actually three ways in which you can respond. You can say ‘yes,’ you can say ‘no,’ and then there’s a third response, *mu*. The way he explains it in the book is that by responding ‘mu’ you’ve signalled that there’s something insufficient in the question—that the question doesn’t speak accurately enough to the concern. As you talk about the transactional efficiency of English, I’m imagining all these courtroom drama scenes when that yes/no binary is leveraged as a way of disrupting a more nuanced reading of the situation: “Just answer the question - yes or no!” You’re very trapped. You have two options in responding, but either way, we’re moving forward, whether to the left or to the right. Our political system bears that out. And maybe it’s no coincidence that a language that doesn’t have that space for nuance is a language that ends up being globally dominant, simply through its own inertia.

Getting back to the video work you mentioned a moment ago: there’s a moment where you say, “Pero, donde sacan tantos ceros?”, which is translated in the caption as “But, where do they extract so many
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zeros?” (p.21) It happens during a sequence of very, very macro shots of the Venezuelan money. A zero is created out of mathematical need, not out of natural need. It’s a purely theoretical, utilitarian structure. So this question of, “Where do we get all these zeros from? Where do we get these nothings from?” is, to me, very funny. But in the context of ongoing hyperinflation of the Venezuelan currency it’s also heartbreaking.

MP: It’s absurd—that, first, we add all these zeros, and then we take all these zeros away. How is that the national currency? It’s something and then it’s nothing. And yet it has so many implications. People are losing their life savings or retirement funds—people are losing everything. You can’t even maintain the value of the labor that you did today. It’s a reflection of speculative finance and the financial order of the world. Someone is making money by speculating that Venezuelan currency will be worth nothing. It’s kind of crazy. And you have to question that sort of nothingness. It’s a play with numbers that makes profit for some, but which has no relationship to social value or material value in the world. Where do we extract the zeros? Where are they coming from and how is that real? That’s part of the decision, in the video, to look close-up at all of the landscapes that are depicted on the Venezuelan currency—because Venezuela has relied heavily on extractive industry to develop. Venezuela was so rich in oil and hoped that the money from the oil industry would help develop and invest in the future. Those dreams have started to vanish—so it’s about that sort of nothingness, too. In the video I say “nada,” which means ‘nothing’ and also means ‘to swim.’ Then I talk about Parakupá Vená, which means ‘fall from the highest place’—a waterfall in Venezuela which is supposedly the highest waterfall in the world.14 It’s so high that the water turns into mist on
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the way down—a floating nothing.

**CW:** It seems like such a cruel manifestation of the imperialist logic you mentioned earlier, where theory comes from EuroAmerica and raw goods come out of the global south: The Venezuelan currency, which is intended to reflect the real value of those local raw goods, materials, and landscapes, is now the victim of a global banking construct. Without having really altered the material facts of that landscape, the currency has been toppled by this game of zeros.

**MP:** Yes, but the actual production of oil in Venezuela has decreased significantly. That’s part of the complexity of it, too—that it can’t be only attributed to the global financial order. And there’s something that needs to be kept in mind regarding the Venezuelan situation—or, as an artist, there’s something I feel that I need to address: Chávez’s dream was to fight inequality and the grievances of capitalism through socialism. But his was an old, authoritarian, and state-ordered form of socialism. And things are changing. Chávez’s model of national socialism doesn’t work anymore. We’re not so isolated. Our economies are so interconnected.

**CW:** I think that perspective is really important, and goes back to an early moment in our conversation about avoiding the trap of the simple narrative. Unfortunately, within the mainstream discourse of the U.S. you’re mostly going to get two takes on Venezuela’s socialism: a sympathetic take from the left or an antagonistic take from the right. But of course the reality is so much more complex. This also goes back to your comment about the violence that happens when there’s a presumption that ideology is stronger than materiality.

**MP:** You have to get past the belief that you can predict or control local outcomes while implementing an
ideological structure that was developed in other places and under other conditions. The world that we live in now is so drastically different from the world [Karl] Marx lived in. This doesn’t mean that Marx’s theories can’t be useful in the fight for equality today, or that we should jump on the bandwagon blindly with neoliberal capitalism—which, I think, is what a lot of people take away from it. But it tells us that we need to create new forms of resistance—that we can’t simply use old forms.