

THE EDITORIALS

Issue #4.

but the froward tongue shall be cut out.

Proverbs 10,31

In response to the siege, XUL felt it necessary to beseige the same question from two different and corollary perspectives: translation and illegibility.

To translate is to work in one language from another. Translating is the linguistic exercise that most privileges the breach between two texts because it is actually a previous reading that produces a new text in which writing claims to make a former text legible even as it disrupts and obfuscates one text by subtracting from it a legibility that it confers on another.

A translation that in practice tries to suppress this breach between two texts by basing itself in the rigor of a system of equivalences acts as a mirage. In its wish to decant spirits, it leaves off where it began: trying to demonstrate its efficacy in mediumistic sessions, good and far removed from the texts, functioning only as a diversionary technique. Translation only acquires significance, as far as XUL is concerned, when it affirms itself as a writing process that voluntarily exhibits its relation to other texts.

Illegibility, always partial, makes it impossible for the reader to produce the meanings of a text. But absolute illegibility does not exist and, besides that, it in and of itself is not about a definite, final situation. No text is illegible forever. Decodification and analysis, concrete experience with the text, reverses the situation.

XUL's commitment to reality is actually a commitment to language: to again make legible that which has been used for coercion and deception. Language belongs to everyone. Moreover, its ever changing form is the product of the community's collective efforts. Nonetheless, the community cannot make certain uses of the product of its efforts. It has no voice with which to give meaning to the vote. The discursive practice is monopolized.

Under the state's direct or indirect dominion and perpetuating the military autocracy, the mass media (if the analogy is valid) produced its translation in order to make its reality illegible. Similarly, with the end of assuring that the mechanism of this illegibility would not be discovered, it proceeded to protect the official translation from other versions of reality. It suppressed all translations with which it was in conflict.

But the illegibility of a text, or its suppression, are not eternal. Finally, at the same time that the media's triumphant discourse came apart little by little due to the contradictions between facts and utterances, the trick of the intentional cover-up was uncovered. The great symptom of the decomposition of a discourse, as a reading of reality, is produced when its lie becomes legible.

"Who shut the gate on words?" XUL murmured, without seeing that inside was don Fierro and with him...

tr: K.A. Kopple

Issue #6

Were So Many Lobotomies Necessary In Order To Quell So Little Flabby Content?

A contemporary publication puts out an issue about Girondo just like an issue about the mechanism of ex-xul-tation, that is to say, an issue of Xul: constructions and deconstructions of some ex-xul-ted bodies, open textures. The ex-xul-ted, product of the mechanism of ex-xul-tation, reproduces itself. It spins and spins the pedal and stoics, lotus eaters, sychophants, pass through the sieve, reflecting and speculating like the law of the Literary Arcadia. Deep within our flabby selves, we're all Egyptians; therein lies Girondo, not only in the flabby content. The ex-xul-ted is a false remedy against Egyptophobia. The spynx of exile feigns an enigma but cannot feign (exist) within the apodictic mode that affirms its reason for existing in that which, although subjects can be inverted or changed, forms part of the same predicating order, the same syntax of days gone by and combative metaphors which become more and more pronounced. With a shift, the enigma vanishes; the enigma stops feigning. What the enigma obfuscates is the discursive battle for the occupation of a territory