When visited by a representative of the Public Art Fund in New York, Marco Fusinato pointed to the plethora of monumental nineteenth-century bronze sculptures already placed throughout the city’s public spaces. In New York, individuals commemorated in this manner run the gamut from George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and General Lafayette, who adorn Union Square (along with a twentieth-century representation of Gandhi), to Samuel S. Cox, congressman and patron of United States postal workers, whose memorial can be found in Tompkins Square Park. Fusinato’s proposal was to set every such monument throughout the five boroughs alight at the same time. Although unsurprisingly rejected (and, perhaps, impossible to realize), Fusinato’s proposition was nonetheless consistent with his overall aesthetic project, which combines allegorical appropriation with an interest in the intensity of a gesture or event.

The image, if only conjectural, of flaming statues calls to mind Fusinato’s series Double Infinitives (2009), particularly Double Infinitive 2, in which a flame-engulfed automobile gives some indication of the general effect the sudden sight of burning sculptures might have had on passersby. Double Infinitive 2 is the largest, most dramatic, and, in many ways, most ferocious of the five works in the series, all of which depict similar motifs: scenes of riots or demonstrations in which an individual is captured in the act of hurling a stone before a backdrop of fire. For the participants, these moments likely had a profound effect, one akin to that theorized by the radical French collective Tiqqun (who, as we shall see, is a touchstone for Fusinato) in terms of the gesture: “In the commodity world, which is the world of generalized reversibility, where all things blend together and morph into each other, where there’s nothing but ambiguity, transition, ephemerality, and mixture, only the gesture cuts through. With the brilliance of its necessary brutality, it divides things into the insoluble ‘after’ and its ‘before’, which THEY will reluctantly have to recognize as definitive.”

By contrast, the aesthetic of the press photos used by Fusinato invariably works to decontextualize and depoliticize the depicted gesture in favor of imagery that, as commentators have rightly noted, is “primal, even Neanderthal.”

Fusinato explains, "what an editor chooses to present to the world and how similar, every time, that image is. The fire and the rock, you know, it’s quite elemental, kind of caveman stuff. I was surprised at how often that same image would be thrown up whenever there was a riot somewhere in the world."

The aesthetic consistency of Fusinato’s source images derives from at least two factors: the first, a preference for a certain visual typology on the part of editors and press photographers; the second, a visual identity forged by the global resistance movement itself: a taste for black clothing and bandanas to protect against recognition and, possibly, tear gas. “My selection was specific,” Fusinato noted further. “Each image is from a different part of the world, often years apart. Interestingly, all of the protagonists look the same: jeans, hoodie and their face covered. International style.”

Interestingly, the protagonist of *Double Infinitive 2* largely evades that style. Indeed, in contrast with the heightened drama of the flaming car, the figure caught launching a paving stone in *Double Infinitive 2* is perhaps the least striking of the entire series. Certainly, he is nowhere near as iconic as the Keffiyeh-clad rock thrower from *Double Infinitive 5* or the black-hooded teen with “punk rock” emblazoned on his sweatshirt in *Double Infinitive 4*. The latter raises her arms in a gesture of defiance reminiscent of the central figure in Goya’s *The Third of May 1808* (1814), a connection that makes Fusinato’s bid toward contemporary history painting clear. Wearing a white shirt and what could well be a sweater, rather than a bandana, tied around his neck, the young man in *Double Infinitive 2*, despite his manifest rage, resembles nothing so much as a typical French university student (which, as we will see, he may well be).

An obvious precedent for Fusinato’s *Double Infinitives* is Andy Warhol’s *Death and Disaster* series. The *Double Infinitives* recall the earlier works both on account of their use of enlargements of photographs of violent incidents, and for their deployment of semi-mechanical commercial techniques: Fusinato’s use of white UV halftone ink professionally rendered onto black aluminum updating Warhol’s photomechanical silkscreens on canvas. The larger of the *Double Infinitives* prove comparable in size to two-panel Disasters such as *Silver Car Crash (Double Disaster)* (1963) or *Black and White Disaster #4 (Five Deaths Seventeen Times in Black and White)* (1963), the ebony monochrome panel of which recalls the expanses of blackness at the edges of all of the *Double Infinitives*. The blazing automobile in *Double Infinitive 2* additionally calls to mind Warhol’s *Burning Cars*, a particularly shocking subset of his *Death and Disaster* paintings. Yet, comparison of this series with Fusinato’s *Double Infinitives* also makes important contrasts between the sensibilities of the two artists evident. In the image selected by Warhol, the driver of the burning, overturned car has been tragically, and terminally, impaled on a telephone pole, while another man is shown strolling across a suburban lawn with seeming indifference. Unlike this depiction of what Michel Foucault...


termed the monotonous “stupidity” of death, Fusinato’s work foregrounds a moment of agitated, spontaneous revolt, if not revolution (even if the action in Double Infinitive 2 is framed by a group of apparently passive onlookers).¹ Fusinato’s images of rebellion differ as well from Warhol’s so-called Race Riot paintings, which capture the civil rights struggles of African-Americans in the 1960s, but which focus on a moment when the “hero/victims” are repressed, not rising up triumphantly against their oppressors.

Already more than a meter wider than the next largest work in the series, Double Infinitive 2 was further monumentalized when Fusinato used it as the basis for Reproduction of Double Infinitive 2 (2012), a 7.3-by-23-meter photo enlargement installed in the Dunedin Public Art Gallery as part of the exhibition “Sound Full.” In that format, the picture attracted additional connotations, from those of leftist political murals to those of outdoor advertising billboards. As spectacular as it appeared in that context (which I had the good fortune to see), one could not help but notice how it evaded the central premise of the exhibition, devoted primarily to artists dealing with the acoustic. Despite the best attempts on the part of the gallery to finesse a connection – “Reproduction of Double Infinitive 2 ... makes imagined sound explicit ... [it] does not have an audio element but is full of noise ... the image cannot be comprehended without imagining the sounds this scene would create” – Fusinato’s piece remained starkly and impressively silent.²

On account of Fusinato’s long running use of musical scores (Mass Black Implosion, 2007–), his noise performances and recordings (including his in-store guerrilla guitar actions, FREE, 1998–2004), and his collaborations with musicians such as Thurston Moore (TM/MF, 2000), his work is routinely associated with music and sound, as was the case with his prominent inclusion in the 2013 exhibition “Soundings” at the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Equally evident, however, is the manner in which he consistently places himself in a refractory position in relation to the genre or label of “sound art.” In the case of “Sound Full,” Fusinato’s Reproduction of Double Infinitive 2 worked to foreground a set of terms—including politics, radicality, subversion, and activism, on the one hand, and reproduction, reification, commodification, publicity, commercialism, and spectacle, on the other— that exceeded and interrogated any overly simplistic thematic of sound.

Fusinato effected a similar shift in the series Noise & Capitalism (2010), in which he enlarged five cheap anarchist pamphlets (two of which contained images of insurrection very close to those in Double Infinitives), overprinted their contents onto a single plane (thereby foregrounding their visual covers and rendering their textual contents all but indecipherable), and framed them under glass. The title references Anthony Iles and Martin’s book, Noise and Capitalism, an anthology that approached the theorization of noise from a variety of perspectives.³ Despite a number of important insights (particularly in Bruce Russell’s discussion of Georg
Lukács and Guy Debord), when taken as a whole, the book oscillates between valorizations of the subversive possibilities of noise as a potentially unalienated, asymbolic, and uncatagorizable phenomenon and a marked anxiety over noise music as a commodity, however marginal to the market as a whole. Conceived as his contribution to the discourse initiated by Illes and Martin, Fusinato’s *Noise & Capitalism* pushes against both facets of their book’s overall argument, first by shifting from the aesthetic radicality of noise to actual anarchist theory (from Mikhail Bakunin to Tiqqun), thereby upping the political stakes, and second by transforming the appropriated tracts into gallery artworks, thereby implying that nothing, not even the most recalcitrant leftism, can remain inherently subversive and free of commercial taint. “In relation to capitalism,” Fusinato explains succinctly, “all the pamphlets are anti-capitalist, but I’m reframing and presenting them within a capitalist system and within the structure and context of the gallery. So there are a lot of paradoxes going on in the work.”

Despite what appears as an inherent skepticism, Fusinato’s outlook is far from cynical, and his appropriations act as much to redeem the material they address as to reify it. Such may be better understood by briefly considering the source for *Double Infinitive 2*. For whereas Fusinato’s work may appear to be a monument to direct action and political resistance, the two-page magazine layout from which it derives is anything but. Likely drawn from the popular French magazine *Paris Match*, the photo spread addresses the conflicts surrounding French college students’ protests against the latest round of European austerity measures, depicting the dramatic scene in full color only to condemn it all the more forcefully. “While the students want to build their future,” a bolded headline complains, “there are always *casseurs* [rioters, vandals, literally ‘those who break things’] to destroy it.” Although the textual portion of this feature amounts to little more than a paragraph, it manages to attribute the depicted action to “casseurs,” “provocateurs,” “anarchistes,” “militants,” and criminal “loubards” (“louts,” who, we are told, “profit from the crush [of the crowd] to steal young people’s cell phones”).

Against the abundance of invective directed against the solitary individual hurling a paving stone, the editors juxtapose a single term: “order,” which they manage to use twice in the brief text (“du service d’ordre” and “des forces de l’ordre”). In so doing, the magazine does not so much report on as redefine and implicitly discredit the depicted action. Order, we are informed, is threatened by anarchy, provocation, destruction, and crime. Even Daniel Cohn-Bendit, former student leader “Danny the Red,” is invoked to condemn the situation. “May 68,” he is quoted as saying, “was an offensive movement, having a positive vision of the future. Today’s protests are defensive, founded on the fear of insecurity and change.” As manifest in the source, the meaning of the depicted gesture is the exact opposite of how it appears in Fusinato’s work.

Far from insignificant, the *Paris Match* article exemplifies the production of “bad substantiality” by which, according to Tiqqun,
Avant même la fin du cortège, aux alentours de la place de la Nation, vers 18h30, des provocateurs semblaient surgir de nulle part, le visage masqué par une cagoule ou un foulard sous une casque. Ils sont de 150 à 200 et s'en prennent aux policiers qui tombent de pavés, de cannettes de bière, de toutes sortes de projectiles. Parmi eux, beaucoup de voyous mais aussi des anarchistes ou des militants d'extrême gauche. L'excitation aidant, des étudiants ne tardent pas à les rejoindre. Très vite, la confusion est totale. On voit mème des membres du service d'ordre de la manifestation en découvrant des loubards qui profitaient de la bousculade pour dérober des portables aux adolescents. Les heurts se soldèrent par 167 interpellations et 52 blessés : 34 du côté des policiers, 8 des gendarmes et des CRS, 18 chez les manifestants. Tous les véhicules ont aussi été incendiées et des arbustes, des cabines téléphoniques et des kiosques à journaux, détruits.

Si les étudiants veulent construire leur avenir, il y a toujours des casseurs pour détruire.

Près d'une voiture qui brûle, un jeune écrasé lance un pavé en direction des forces de l'ordre. Une image qui pourrait rappeler celle de 1968, mais la situation n'est guère comparable. « Mai 68, dit Daniel Cohn-Bendit, était un mouvement offensif, ayant une vision positive de l'avenir. Les protestations d'aujourd'hui sont fondées sur la défensive, la peur de l'incertitude et du changement. »
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subjectivities and their actions are subsumed within the contemporary regime of Spectacle and Biopower. “Biopower is shaping, more and more visibly, into a planned economy of subjectivations and re-subjectivizations,” they note in Theory of Bloom.11 “And since all organic life is missing from these premasticated forms, they never take long to quietly re-enter the general commodity system of exchange and equivalence, which reflects them and pilots them.”12 “Bad substantiality,” they conclude, “thus signifies that ONE has consigned all his substance to the Spectacle, and that the latter acts as a universal ethos for the celestial community of spectators.”13

Although this process may be more or less automatic for the vast majority, those who recoil at such an attribution of subjecthood (recoil, that is, at their subjection in this manner) are all the more forcefully submitted to it. “By compelling every singularity to regard itself as something particular, that is, from a viewpoint that is formal and external to itself,” write Tiqqun, once again in Theory of Bloom, “the Spectacle splits it apart from within, introducing a disparity, a difference, in it. It forces the self to take itself as an object, to reify itself, to apprehend itself as another.”14 The attribution of a particular label to one’s subjectivity, one that can be circulated, via media, throughout the Spectacle, entails separating the intensity (related, in Tiqqun’s writings, always to the potential for violence) of the gesture or action from the individual, thereby reducing the body to its most docile and controllable state (i.e., the norm). The terms deployed by Paris Match – casseur, provocateur, anarchist, militant, etc. – function in precisely this manner, and while they fall just short of the label “terrorist,” they operate analogously. “The call to denounce this or that person as a terrorist,” note Tiqqun in This Is Not a Program, “was thus the call to differentiate oneself from oneself as capable of violence, to project far from oneself one’s latent warlike tendency, to introduce in oneself the economic disjunction that makes us a [mere] political subject, a citizen.”15

Fusinato’s Double Infinitives separate the images of rock throwing youths from the apparatus of capture that is the popular magazine or newspaper, not solely to heroize or hagiographize them (which they do, but only at the cost of replacing them, as artworks, within the equally ideologically suspect space of the commercial gallery), but also to restore to them a certain measure of semantic ambiguity or ambivalence, “rais[ing] a number of questions without providing answers.”16 In so doing, Fusinato harks back to the earlier promise of the “Pictures” generation of artists from the late 1970s and early 1980s, whose appropriationist practices sought, in the words of their original champion, Douglas Crimp, to free “representation ... from the tyranny of the represented.”17 “For their pictures,” Crimp explained, “these artists have turned to the available images in the culture around them. But they subvert the standard signifying function of those pictures, tied to their captions, their commentaries, their narrative sequences – tied, that is, to the illusion that they are directly transparent to a signified.”18

---
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Fusinato’s consistent engagement with political subject matter of the radical left may be compared (as the equal opposite) to Pictures artist Troy Brauntuch’s appropriations of representations of the Third Reich. Appropriately, the affective valences of their work differ profoundly. Brauntuch counters and questions the charged nature of his subject matter, rendering some of the most notorious visual remnants of the twentieth century ambiguous, remote, opaque, and possibly banal.20 “[T]he result,” notes Crimp, “is only to make the pictures all the more picture-like, to fix forever in an elegant object our distance from the history that produced these images.” Ultimately, Crimp concludes, “That distance is all that these pictures signify.”21 If, in Noise & Capitalism, Fusinato does something similar by distancing and emphasizing the aesthetic of the political pamphlets, in Double Infinitives he seems to do precisely the opposite. Despite the ambiguity and distance afforded by the procedures of appropriation and enlargement, his images regain a type of immediacy and intensity akin to that which had been contained and detourned by their original discursive context.

The Paris Match article appropriated in Double Infinitive 2 proffers a story of students wanting to build “a positive vision of the future,” thwarted, not by the system of government-sponsored neo-liberal reforms, but rather by anonymous louts and casseurs. Yet, in its transparently treacly language, the article inadvertently invokes an entirely opposed perspective: an explosive, nihilistic cry of “no future,” exemplified by British punk band the Sex Pistols’ caustic 1977 single “God Save the Queen.” Opening the essay “How Is It to Be Done?” with an epigraph from the Sex Pistols, Tiqqun classed punk among the most consequential insurrectionary movements of the 1970s to challenge the emerging apparatus of subjective capture within Spectacle and Biopower:

Twenty years ago, there was punk, the Movement of ’77, the “area” of Autonomy, the metropolitan Indians and diffuse guerrilla warfare. All at once there sprang up, as if issuing from some underground region of civilization, an entire counter-world of subjectivities that no longer wanted to consume, that no longer wanted to produce, that no longer even wanted to be subjectivities.21

Punk also played an important role in Fusinato’s formation. “I wouldn’t say I came out of the punk movement because I was a bit young,” he explained to Lasse Marhaug. “However it was the first music I heard that got me interested. And really it was the political arm of punk that I gravitated towards. ... Well of course there’s the Sex Pistols and the Ramones, but I was more into the Clash and then SLF [Stiff Little Fingers], the Dead Kennedys.
The legacy of Crass forms the focus of Fusinato’s installation THERE IS NO AUTHORITY (2012), the central component of which, an immense 9.25-by-12-meter carpet, replicates a banner the group hung on stage during concerts. Proclaiming “There Is No Authority But Yourself” in stark, black-on-white, neoconstructivist graphics, Crass’s banner confronted the audience directly, most often flanked by the band’s readily recognized logo and an anarchy symbol with a broken machine gun or a peace-sign-endowed pennant reading “No War.” (The plethora of visual material, including the prominent use of film and video, betrayed the band’s artistic background.)
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and of course what really flipped me out was Crass. The music and the lyrics were great but I really enjoyed the interviews in magazines. These guys never spoke about girls, fast cars or music equipment. They spoke about personal politics and social change.”

We must not be intimidated by the authority that they appear to have.
We must be prepared to oppose them on every level, To fight back in the knowledge that if we don’t We will have failed in our responsibility to life itself.
[…]
You must learn to live with your own conscience, your own morality, your own decision, your own self. You alone can do it.
There is no authority but yourself.

In THERE IS NO AUTHORITY, Fusinato’s transformation of Crass’s anarcho-punk banner into a high-end wool rug effects a number of alterations: from concert venue to art gallery, from handmade to manufactured, from the adequacy of propaganda to the excess of luxury goods, and, not least, from the verticality of the wall to the horizontality of the floor. Within Fusinato’s oeuvre, an alteration of orientation and a resultant loss of legibility are recurrent factors, whether in Noise & Capitalism, where the anarchist pamphlets are transformed from table-bound to wall-mounted
and overprinted until they become a nearly unreadable morass of black ink, or in the various THIS IS NOT MY WORLD (2006-) banners, which fall from the ceiling into unreadable clumps on the floor. In THERE IS NO AUTHORITY, deciphering the message becomes difficult, not only on account of the rug’s horizontal orientation and vast size, but also because Fusinato installed it facing one-hundred-and-eighty degrees away from the gallery entrance, so that one initially encounters it upside down.

Elsewhere in the installation, the banner is uprighted and made fully legible on a video monitor, which depicts the rug from the perspective of a surveillance camera mounted high up on the wall. The camera, which captures time-delayed still images, records and archives the presence of visitors, who are able to see themselves on the monitor from a few moments earlier. If in Dan Graham’s video installations (certainly a reference point for this piece), time delay pointed to the possibilities of the viewer’s autonomous self-awareness (a development of the phenomenology of viewing associated with minimalist sculpture), THERE IS NO AUTHORITY seems to indicate the contrary position, pointing instead to the limitations of self-generated and autonomous behavior in an age of ubiquitous surveillance. Indeed, the confines of the screen lend the installation something of the impression of a prison yard. Such a perspective clearly problematizes the continued viability of Crass’s message of anarchist revolution — in much the same way, in fact, that Crass associate Mick Duffield points to the contrast between the period when the band conducted their clandestine graffiti campaign across London and the present-day profusion of electronic surveillance throughout that city.

THERE IS NO AUTHORITY’s verdict on punk, however, is not solely retrospective. Indeed, a knowledge of punk’s inauthenticity and outright commodification has been integral to it from the beginning, whether in the Sex Pistols’ self-reflexively situationist (and/or cynical) exploitation of the commercial music and fashion industries, or in Crass’s denunciation of the conformity and commodification that quickly gripped the movement’s nascent hardcore factions. “Anything and everything can be so easily institutionalised, a poor parody of itself,” proclaimed Crass in Yes Sir, I Will. “Punk has spawned another rock and roll elite/ Cheap Rotten Vicious imitations thinking they’ll change their world/ With dyed hair and predictable gestures.” “How many times,” they asked, “must we hear rehashed versions of [Crass’s own first album] Feeding of the 5000?”

Just as in relation to anarchist literature in Noise & Capitalism, THERE IS NO AUTHORITY seems, if not to confront, nonetheless to resonate with contradictions such as those between conformity and rebellion or commercialism and the punk ethos of “Do It Yourself.” As such, Fusinato’s perspective may be contrasted with that of an artist such as Steven Parrino, with whose aesthetic and interests — oscillating between art and music, object and performance, appropriation and intensity — he otherwise has much in common. For Parrino, punk represented one of the last redoubts of aesthetic autonomy. “Punk is total
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Like Parrino, Fusinato has developed a unique form of noise guitar performance, one that revels in a degree of sonic assault and aesthetic radicality. As noted musician Oren Ambarchi describes it, “Marco has completely reinvented a new language for the guitar via his unconventional use of homemade electronics ... combined with his punk (in the original sense of the word) aesthetic, he somehow manages to create awesome, all-encompassing, real-time guitar noise-concrète that is truly ecstatic.” Yet, even here, where the pleasure and intensity of the aesthetic gesture is most immediate (“the physical presence of the live experience”), Fusinato deploys the iconic and commercial status of the guitar as an important iconographic marker. As he explained, once again to Marhaug, “Well, ultimately the guitar has become capitalism’s entertainment tool. It sells cars, jeans and all sorts of ‘alternative’ lifestyles. I use specific guitars that have a certain cachet. At the moment an EGC, but I used a Gibson Les Paul for a long time. There’s a certain expectation even before I play a note. The intention is to defy that expectation.” In his series of Spectral Arrows performances, Fusinato takes the ecstatic experience of noise into the context of labor, setting for himself the task of putting in a full working day of noise production. In so doing, Fusinato reframes Parrino’s idea of DIY music’s total freedom as something akin to the affective and immaterial labor practices that form the forefront of contemporary capitalist production. Fusinato’s career-long engagement with the interrelation of intensity and spectacle comes to something of a culmination in Aetheric Plexus (2009) and Aetheric Plexus (Broken X) (2013). The art historical references are to late-modern constructivist sculpture and, particularly in Aetheric Plexus (Broken X), to minimalism. Although morphologically echoing one of Robert Morris’s floor-bound L-beams, the scale of Aetheric Plexus (Broken X) more proximately recalls the minimalist work of Ronald Bladen, whose massive The X (1967) stood two floors high in the atrium of the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. Aetheric Plexus (Broken X) takes Bladen’s spectacular sculpture down to the ground and fractures it into several parts, while also transforming it into the equipment of actual spectacle: the stadium or arena rock show, which manufactures enthusiasm (for even the most neophyte or aging bands) via spot lights and excessively large speakers. In the gallery, this equipment addresses the increasing conflation of art and entertainment, but it also connects to the legacy of participatory or

in its freedom because of the D.I.Y. thing,” he contended. “You want to make music, films, books, whatever: Do it yourself. Everything is cool as long as it’s honest. Hardcore, No Wave, Old School, New School, Garage, Electronic, Noise; however you choose to express yourself, just do it and fuck the system, fuck the industry. Be beyond politics, beyond society. Freedom at all cost.” Compare that to Fusinato’s more sober ruminations on punk rock. “I was aware how punk became a commodity quite early on,” he explained to Marhaug. “Crass spoke about it at the time. So I was aware how commercial interests had swallowed it. Because of that it made me seek out other references.”
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interactive art. Although sometimes situated at opposite poles of the 1960s avant-garde, both minimalism and participatory art originally carried a liberatory or utopian promise by which they were to engage and empower their spectators, delivering the means of activating the aesthetic experience over to them. Yet, as artists from Bruce Nauman to Angela Bulloch have long realized, such forms of “participation” have most often not been empowering, but rather ersatz, creating what sociologist Alain Touraine termed “dependent participation,” by which its audiences were limited rather than liberated.32 Janet Kraynak, “Dependent Participation: Bruce Nauman’s Environments,” Grey Room 10 (Winter 2003): 22–45.
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If Parrino styled himself, to some extent, as the last of the moderns, one who pursued the avant-garde legacy of negation into something like nihilism, Fusinato has forged an aesthetic that fully engages with the ambivalence of the contemporary post-postmodern condition, one in which, as Fredric Jameson long ago contended, there is no longer any outside to commodification, spectacle, and power, and where we can no longer rely on autonomy or a space of external critique from which to launch an opposition or attempt to effect radical transformation.33 Far from a primarily cynical position, however, and unsold to the type of nostalgic melancholy that suffused so much thinking about postmodernism in the 1980s, Fusinato’s work – and here, once again, Double Infinitive 2 is exemplary – consistently circles around moments of intensity in which the gesture or experience becomes such that it reaches toward the level of an “event” that, in the words of Tiqqun, “opens a wound in the world’s chaos and lodges its unequivocal shard in the center of the wound.”34

As Charlotte Day perspicaciously noted, “Fusinato foregrounds moments of disruption and impact in which lie the possibility of a shift in perception or change in the course of events.”35 Yet, Fusinato envisions such moments only with the clear eyes of the present situation, one in which the contemporary apparatus of control makes every such meaningful, radical moment fleeting and precarious. “We move in a space that is completely controlled, entirely occupied, by the Spectacle on the one hand and Biopower on the other,” write Tiqqun. “And what is awful about this control, about this occupation, is that the submission they demand of us is nothing against which we might rebel with a definitive gesture of rupture, but something that we can only deal with strategically.”36 It is such a strategic position that Fusinato pursues as well.