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ABSTRACT

Living ghosts sit, talk and pass the time on the steps of the 1968 commemorativ placard waiting for the sun to come down. The space of the "Plaza of the Three Cultures" in Tlatelolco is not only deeply related to the Killing of 1968, one of the greatest catastrophes of Mexico’s modern history, but also to other histories and spaces of Mexico as a nation and as a city. "In" and "out" of Tlatelolco, changes have been narrated and represented by different social groups over time. The analysis of when and by whom meanings are ascribed may serve as a tool to approach how significance of space and uses of history are constructed and reproduced. How can we try to understand the construction of social and physical spaces in a place that has been greatly impacted by trauma and transformed from different angles throughout the years? How can space be approached when tragic events have happened on the site? Along this thesis I will try to make use of different fragments, thresholds, heterotopias and ghosts to analyze the official and unofficial memory of Tlatelolco, the place of a mega-housing complex in Mexico City, to talk about the official and unofficial memories that are appropriated and negotiated by different entities such as the government, a cultural center, and local groups. I try to show how memories and imagination play into the different uses, construction, and representations of space. Through an ethnographic and archival recollection and encounter of material (landscapes) and symbolic (stories) fragments, the identification of thresholds (traumatic events and ruptures in social history that create spatio-temporalized heterotopias), and the awareness of ghosts, twilight zones, and haunted spaces I analyze the urban and social spaces of Tlatelolco and its different representations in the contemporary socio-political arena in Mexico and beyond.
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CHAPTER 1

Fragments, Thresholds and Ghosts: An Introduction

A tale begun in other days,
When summer suns were glowing--
A simple chime, that served to time
The rhythm of our rowing--
Whose echoes live in memory yet,
Though envious years would say 'forget'.

-Lewis Carroll (1965)

Living ghosts sit, talk and pass the time on the steps of the 1968 commemorative placard waiting for the sun to come down. At night, Don Carlos Antonio Beltrán Maciel stays there and tries to sleep, hoping no policemen or rain will come and force him to move to another place. Others, like the musician and historian of art Roberto Tello, go home and return every weekend and on every national holiday to sell his music and recount his story of the massacre of October 2, defined by him as an unforgivable genocide.

After 43 years in prison, Don Carlos Beltrán Maciel returned to what he says is the only thing he has left, the 1968 commemorative placard in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas (Plaza of the Three Cultures) where officially 43 people were killed and unofficially hundreds during a student protest meeting, in the mega housing complex of Tlatelolco in Mexico City. According to him, his wife and kid who he has
lost all contact with lived in the second section of the housing complex in Tlatelolco, in the buildings that had to be dynamited after the 8.1 Ritcher scale earthquake in 1985. He recounts that after being arrested and tortured on the night of October 2 in 1968 he was then transferred to the Prison of Lecumberri and then to the island Islas Marias federal prison. Don Carlos relates his leukemia illness, a cancer that arises in the bone marrow and is the most common radiation-induced cancer (Cancer Org 2010), to the long hours he had to work under the sun on the island when imprisoned.

Don Carlos has been sitting and waiting, talking to visitors, tourists and neighbors since he was let free, in the beginning of 2011, telling his story. He is waiting for his real biological death, since he claims that he has been dispossessed from his life, and even counted as dead. With no I.D. or papers to proof his story, he affirms his name is on the '68 commemorative placard and on some of the official lists of the dead of October 2. He is officially dead. Don Carlos or Professor, as the people call him and neighbors that help him survive each day, is a chemical engineer graduated from the Instituto Politécnico Nacional and was a professor in the Prepa 7. He clearly remembers all the names, places and events of the 4-month student protest in 1968 in Mexico City. He says he was one of the leaders and founders of the Comité Nacional de Huelga de 1968 (National Strike Committee of 1968), and that he closely worked with Sócrates Campos Lemus, one of the most polemical figures accused of being a provocateur and infiltrator from the government during the student movement (Perez Silva 2004). Figures 1, 2 and 3 picture Don Carlos sitting on the steps of the placard in the Plaza (Figure 1, 2 and 3).
Figure 1. Don Carlos (in the middle) sitting and waiting on the steps of the '68 Commemorative Placard. (Photo by the author.)
Figure 2. Don Carlos talking about his life on the steps of the '68 Commemorative Placard. (Photo by the author.)

Figure 3. Don Carlos passing the afternoon on the steps of the '68 Commemorative Placard. (Photo by the author.)
The musician Roberto Tello has been going to that same place, the 1968 commemorative placard to perform the songs that were chant in the plazas, in the meetings, during the marches, and in the streets in the '68 student movement in Mexico City. He sings and sells the music and some artistic memorabilia every weekend and holidays for over 5 years now. Before that he participated every October 2 in an unofficial commemoration in the Plaza of the Three Cultures, in what he defines as an act to "rescue a tradition" that consisted of young people and kids asking the old "sixty-eighters" if they have been here: "They would approach the people that had some white hair and ask: Where you here? And that was the magical phrase... the sixty-eighter started to communicate with the people around" (interview with Roberto Tello, July 2011). He noticed that people started coming not only every October 2, but also during the weekends. Roberto affirms he has been recuperating information about the killing and investigating it for over more than eleven years now. He affirms that on the afternoon of October 2 he just passed by on his way to another meeting with his brigade: "This was not a very important meeting, so I only walked by and went to inform my brigade about it. I saw a lot of soldiers, there were between five and seven thousand people, back then that was not a big important number, the important meetings had hundreds of thousands, no? Even got to one million in that other very important protest" (interview to Roberto Tello, July 2011). Figure 4 and 5 shows Roberto getting ready to sell his music and Figure 6 shows Roberto telling part of his story (Figure 4, 5 and 6).
Figure 4. Roberto Tello getting ready on a Sunday morning. (Photo by the author.)
Figure 5. Roberto Tello selling his music and memorabilia of the ’68. (Photo by the author.)

Figure 6. Roberto Tello telling his story. (Photo by Daniel Vallejo Caliz.)
The space of the Plaza of the Three Cultures in Tlatelolco is not only deeply related to the Killing of 1968, one of the greatest catastrophes of Mexico's modern history, but also to other histories and spaces of Mexico as a nation and as a city. The creation of Mexico as a state has had a long relationship with the appropriation of symbolic places and histories towards its own territorialization (Alonso 1994; Brading 2001; Thomas 2002; Alonso 2005; Dixon 2010). Also, Mexico as a city has functioned as a symbol of order, progress and modernity within Mexico's history and geographic location (Cisneros 1993; Cantu Chapa 2000, 2005, 2009; Gallo 2010). The material and discursive spaces of the public urban space of Tlatelolco have tremendously changed over the years. Just a phew of these changes can be traced back from it being a pre-Hispanic commercial city founded in 1337 (Matos Moctezuma 2008, 29); the last bastion of Aztec resistance against the Spanish Conquest in early 1500's (Matos Moctezuma 2008, 32); a philosophy and Latin school for the construction of an Indian elite in 1536 ordered by Spanish Franciscan clerics (Escalante Gonzalbo 2008, 59); a prison during the Independence fight in early 1800's (Bicentenario 2010, CCUT 2010); a train station and custom office for pulque during the late 1800's and early 1900's (Márez Tapia 2010); a modern urban project during the 1960s (Carrillon 1964.); and a neoliberal cultural hub in the 2012 (Arroyo García 2008). (Also see the 7 volumes of Barlow 1989).

These changes have been narrated and represented by different social groups over time. The analysis of when and by whom meanings are ascribed may serve as a tool to approach how significance of space and uses of history are constructed and reproduced. How can we try to understand the construction of
social and physical spaces in a place that has been greatly impacted and transformed from different angles throughout the years? How can space be approached when tragic events have happened on the site? Along this thesis I will try to make use of different fragments, thresholds, heterotopias and ghosts to analyze the official and unofficial memory of Tlatelolco, the place of a mega-housing complex in Mexico City, to talk about the official and unofficial memories that are appropriated and negotiated by different entities such as the government, a cultural center, and local groups. I try to show how memories and imagination play into the different uses, construction, and representations of space. Through an ethnographic and archival recollection and encounter of material (landscapes) and symbolic (stories) fragments, the identification of thresholds (traumatic events and ruptures in social history that create spatio-temporalized heterotopias), and the awareness of ghosts, twilight zones, and haunted spaces I analyze the urban and social spaces of Tlatelolco and its different representations in the contemporary socio-political arena in Mexico and beyond.

**METHODOLOGY**

As a methodology for finding or uncovering local stories in the urban public space of Tlatelolco I used the ideas of critical ethnography (Thomas 1993), writing a field journal, photographic record, participant observation (Devereux 1985). My methodology is greatly influenced by "critical ethnographies" (Thomas 1993) and "emergent methods" (Nagy Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006). Critical ethnography is a way to think of the relationships among knowledge, society, and political action and
it criticizes the constructs of "culture" and the role of research (Thomas 1993). In ethnography the "researcher" studies, writes, thinks and talks to other people. Critical ethnographies try to go beyond that and involve with the analysis of processes, identify problems and recognize the production through the everyday. Being critical has to do with beginning with the premise that "all cultural life is in constant tension between control and resistance [and it] is reflected in behavior, interaction rituals, normative systems, and social structure" (Thomas 1993, 9) in space. One of the most important parts of critical ethnographies is to incorporate the research subjects in different degrees into the project in order to transform knowledge into a collective enterprise "in which its production and use are to be shared by those who are its focus. Researchers also become active in confronting explicit problems that affect the lives of the subjects - as defined by the subjects - rather than remain passive recipients of ´truth´ that will be used to formulate policies by and in the interests of those external to the setting." (Thomas 1994: 28-29). My intention was to approach the public space in this way.

This methodology is greatly influenced not only by the "critical ethnographies" (Thomas 1993) previously presented but also by the "emergent methods" described by Nagy Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006). There are recent debates on how to treat and transmit knowledge, on the "emergent methods" defined by Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Leavy as "the link between epistemology (a view on how knowledge is constructed), methodology (the theoretical question[s] that informs our research and how it is carried out), and method (the specific tools used to carry out research)" (2006: xii). These methods
question authority and power and are defined as being hybrid in the sense that they are also cross disciplinary and adapted to each discipline. These methods require the researcher to engage from a multidisciplinary position and they disrupt traditional positivist ways of know to create new meanings (Nagy Hesse-Biber and Levy 2006: xii). This perspective takes the researcher into becoming both the insider and outsider and to be able to simultaneously negotiate different identities or multiple subjectivities. Through the use of systematic journal entries, photographic records, listening methods (Arne Undheim 2006: 13-42), conversation analysis (Maynards 2006, 55-94), participant (Deveraux 1985), direct observation, open interviews, different narratives, and in depth conversations to capture the daily lives of the people involved in the construction of the social and public space, I practiced a critical ethnographical method of Tlatelolco. Also I continue to practice the activity of "reflection" which refers "to the act of rigorously examining how this involvement affects our data gathering, analysis, and subsequent display of the data to an audience" (Thomas 1993: 46). Through critical ethnographies and multi-method fieldwork research, my research examines the contemporary role of the people in Tlatelolco and a local project in the production of spaces, history and identities, as well as the creation of places and subjects.

The people who with I talked and engaged do not represent a majority or a general representation of the people who live and use that place, it is only a subjective experience situated within a place that can help us understand the complex net of relationships, the context, and the different meanings that a place
has within the social and physical construction of place, history and identity. It is a
narrative of fragments and assemblages.

During my fieldwork, I also use the reading of landscapes approach, a
photographic record and a field journal to document my observations. These
observations, as proposed by Georges Devereux (1985), are far from being
“objective”, since being strictly objective is impossible. According to Devereux, the
observer must place herself in the middle of the process, knowing that what is
observed is always influenced by one’s own activity of observation. Also this position
is influenced by the idea of Stuart Hall: "We all write and speak from a particular
place and time, from a history and a culture which is specific. What we say is always
'in context', positioned" (Hall 1994:392).

Memory and Imagination: Fragments, Thresholds and Ghosts

The stories of both Don Carlos and Roberto are one example of the existing presence
of the past in the public spaces of the urban housing complex in Tlatelolco. Stories
are like mirrors. We like to hold stories of the present, to perhaps see a reflection of
the past. But like mirrors, stories are distorted; they reflect imperfectly both the
present and the past. Stories are also contested; when the mirror breaks, it shatters
into innumerable fragments. Hence each story becomes a fragment, each an
imperfect and impartial reflection. Stories become a representation of the past, a
fragmented past that has the capacity to be faithful to its ruins (Herzog 2000).

Lets pretend, just like Alice did, that each fragment of the mirror "glass has all
soft like gauze, so that we can get through" (Carroll 1965, 10). Accordingly, stories
can be seen as 'thresholds', which "both symbolize and concretize the socially meaningful act of connecting while separating and separating while connecting...

[Thresholds] are constructions present mentally as well as materially" (Stavrides 2007, 2). Stories become thresholds for interacting within the city. Thresholds have received tremendous attention in recent years, largely through the writings of Agamben (2004), Stavrides (2007, 2010) and others. Thresholds perforate boundaries and construct a porous space. They are spatial artifacts that symbolically and literally regulate the passage of the in between material or symbolic spaces. Their material permanence may include a doorframe, an alley, a bridge or squares; while when temporal and symbolic they can be identified as an act of ephemeral appropriation of a space, a discontinuity or a traumatic event. These thresholds exist at the interface between in-and-out, coming-and-going, here-and-there. When you 'cross' a threshold, you are simultaneously entering and exiting. These in-between-areas that separate while connecting, relate rather than separate, create an urban porosity.

When one considers both fragments and thresholds, we have the parameters of Lefebvre (2008[1974]) and Foucault (1993) forwarding of heterotopias. Recognizing the presence of thresholds in a place, or through history, ruptures or traumatic events, is a way into identifying the discontinuities, or turning points and the creation of the heterotopias of a place. By perforating space we can encounter and connect with separate others and recognize the interdependence of identities and spaces. The encounter with the others conducts us to heterotopias, "places where differences meet" (Stavrides 2007, 4), where there is an emergence of a new
order and it can contain moments of rupture in social and spatial history.

Heterotopias, "a different place, an other place" (Lefebvre 2003[1970], 37) are produced through thresholds. The threshold character of heterotopias is that they are both "present and absent in different time, existing both as reality and potentiality" (Stavrides 2007, 4). Through the unexpected connections of thresholds, heterotopias are form, an "otherness emerges, not only as a threat but also as a promise" (Stavrides 2007, 3).

Through the identification of thresholds in the urban public spaces of Tlatelolco I delve into a series of heterotopias in historical time and space. These in between spaces or places, these twilight zones, produce ghosts that are trapped representations. 'Ghosts' inhabit these spaces; they become the presence of absences in haunted spaces and can sometimes be found through official and unofficial memories or through urban explorations. Urban explorations can be defined as "interior tourism that allows the curious-minded to discover a world of behind-the-scenes sights" (Ninjalicious 2005, 3 cited in Garret 2010). These practices can take us further into the "narratives of psychogeography, material culture, heritage management, artistic expression, nostalgia, haunting and landscape history" (Garret 2010).

The living and dead ghosts of Tlatelolco both encountered through the analysis of the heterotopias and from my urban explorations are part of the present experience of the spaces in Tlatelolco. Ghosts are part of the contemporary reality and if we want to understand social life we need to talk about the invisible presences (Gordon 2008). Ghosts then become "real and imagined, intensely personal and
emotive, and haunt our social spaces when we are open to their presence" (Gordon cited in Till 2005, 13). Ghosts lie in between the close and open, the real and unreal, they are captured in between imaginary spaces. We become witnesses of their presence and if open and available, we might embody their needs and desires. We then become haunted by their presences and absences. As witnesses we become both the perpetrators and victims of their existence.

Tlatelolco can be analyzed as a fragmented space where different stories interact in the public spaces of the housing complex. These fragments, sometimes come along in the form of stories from the neighbors and users of that place, but other times they take form by simply walking and experiencing its different spaces. These incomplete stories and landscapes, what some might identify as decadent spaces, are pieces of other stories and thresholds of the present and of the past. These stories are linked to a series of thresholds and traumatic events that produce heterotopias; and to concrete spaces, "places of memory" (*lieux de mémoire*) (Nora 1989) that produce an official memory of Tlatelolco.

At the same time, the stories of the neighbors and the users of the place represent their memories, an individual memory, located inside, that can be linked to a social memory, in the outside, in the form of a narrative constructed through myths, histories and stories (Halbwachs 1994[1925], 1997; Till 2006) producing unofficial memories. Their stories show "the real nature of history, which consists of catastrophes" (Benjamin in Herzog 2000, 5), a fragmented wounded past displaying the absences, or ghosts, and invisibility of others. It is not important if their stories are "true", in the sense that they happened in the exact way as they are recounted,
because "memory is also a representation of the past in the form of an image" (Lavenne et al. 2004, 4n24), it is part of the imagination, and it must not be devaluated. Imagination is a faculty to make present what is absent and can be more comprehensive than memory; it can help us see the "truth" of things beyond appearances (Herzog 2000, 17). Imagination is made by the de-formation of existing forms, images and stories that arise as de-formation takes form and it never destroys (Benjamin 1997[1996], 280-281).

The importance of identifying thresholds can help us understand and experience differently multiple heterotopic spatio-temporal spaces of Tlatelolco. They may reveal encounters between different social groups, life courses and memories in space. Ghosts are trapped in the in between spaces or thresholds of the past, in heterotopias and twilight zones. They become represented through the fragmented stories and landscapes of the present, in the official and unofficial memories of the past. They can both emanate empathy for those of the past and trauma for those in the present. Ghosts, when disembodied entities "can provoke memories that are strangely familiar, conjuring up a half-recognizable world through the empathetic contact it makes; but it can also provoke a sense of the ineffable and mysterious which is unavailable to representational fixing" (Edensor 2005, 835). In that way, ghosts, contrary to fix spaces of memory or sites, are fluid and evanescent entities that disturb the stories that want to be fixed in space. The encountering of ghosts is tied with the politics of remembering the past and with the spatialisation of memory and "how memory is sought, articulated, and inscribed upon space" (Edensor 2005, 829).
Through the recollection and encounter of material (landscapes) and symbolic (stories) fragments, the identification of thresholds (traumatic events and ruptures in social history that create spatio-temporalized heterotopias), and the awareness of ghosts, twilight zones, and haunted spaces I analyze the official and unofficial memories in Tlatelolco; and how these are used and represented by different entities such as the government, a cultural center, and local groups.

Memory has been greatly analyzed from different disciplines and perspectives, and it has become a critical aspect of study in the social sciences and on its cultural representations. "Modern memory, as self-conscious representation of the past that has been transfigured by history, is archival and relies on the materiality of the trace and the visibility of the image" (Till 2003, 291). Through this thesis, I will be exploring the visibility and invisibility of memory and its different representations according to different groups. The recuperated fragments of the different representations of Tlatelolco will show the official and unofficial memories and how heterotopias emerge from thresholds as well as the presences, visibility, and absences, invisibility, of ghosts that inhabit different spaces.

The material and discursive representations of history from the government practices translates into the construction of an urban project of utopia that can be read as a dystopia where a series of thresholds created a diversity of heterotopias will be discussed in Chapter 2. After the inauguration of a mega housing complex in 1964, Tlatelolco was deeply hit by trauma, thresholds of ruptures and change, creating a series of heterotopias such as the killing of the students in 1968, the different social and physical spaces created by the earthquake in 1985, and the
disuse and decadence of its public space during the 1990s. In 2007, the emergence of the Centro Cultural Universitario Tlatelolco (CCUT, University Cultural Center of Tlatelolco) inaugurated with the Memorial '68 marks an attempt to heal a wound and create a new heterotopia in the urban public spaces of Tlatelolco. The official memorialization of one of these heterotopias with a threshold characteristic will be exposed in Chapter 3 by analyzing, through a "biography of a site" methodology (Till 2006, 327), how is the massacre of students of 1968 remembered and forgotten today.

The official representation of memory exposed in that chapter will be compared and contrasted to that of Chapter 4, which will show the unofficial memories that also exist in Tlatelolco's mega housing complex. Through fragments and ghosts from what I will call twilight zones and haunted spaces, and with the stories of Vivir en Tlatelolco (Living in Tlatelolco) - a local monthly publication-, and a "workshop of memory" elaborated by the art group Memoria Migrante (Migrant Memory), the different attempts to represent and remember Tlatelolco's daily life and memories will be analyzed. This chapter will delve into personal and individual memories (Halbwachs 1994[1925], 1997; Till 2006, 2012) from people of Tlatelolco providing an "autobiographical narrative of my experience" (Kruse II 2003), with walking techniques to travel through thresholds between heterotopias (Stavrides 2010) and urban explorations (Garret 2010) in order to encounter haunted spaces (Edensor 2005) with other memories and stories. "Taking walking as a practice [...] exposes someone to the experience of otherness in the city" (Stavrides 2010, 19). The "spatial quality" of porosity and the "spatial artifact" of passages (Stavrides
2010, 19) are used to cross in between heterotopias producing or through existing thresholds. This took me to be aware of other unmark sites (Tyner et. al 2012) defined as existing landscapes usually related to violence, "that have not been placed within their geographical or historical contexts; places that remain unmarked and un-remarked and yet continue to have an impact [...] that are 'hidden in plain sight' [...] that are not commemorated through official channels but are in fact experienced on a day-to-day basis" (Tyner et. al 2012); and other accidental monuments (Studio Beirut 2006) defined as highly visible landscapes that are not an official site but represent a decadent or failed part of history in the urban public spaces of Tlatelolco. Finally in Chapter 5 I present the ideas of nostalgia, counting and remembering as well as the ideas of Marc Augé (1998) of oblivion, as a way to show the different thresholds and heterotopias of today created by official and unofficial memorialization from the different urban and social spaces of Tlatelolco.
CHAPTER 2

Wounded City of Thresholds: Tlatelolco

In 1965, the Mexican Society of Geography and Statistics (Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística) sued the anthropologist Oscar Lewis for writing the book Los hijos de Sánchez (1964[1961], The Sons and Daughters of Sánchez, personal translation) by condemning it to be "obscene and denigrating for our country" (Luis Cataño Morlet cited in Lewis 1964[1961]). The Procuraduría General de la República (Attorney General of Mexico) accepted and investigated the inquiry but abstained from exercising any penal condemn for not finding any crime. Los hijos de Sánchez was a type of narrative ethnography in which the Sánchez family talked about their private life and daily experiences living in a neighborhood, located in the downtown of Mexico City, within a "big Latin-American city that is going through a rapid social and economic change" (Lewis 1964[1961], 5-6). Lewis met the Sánchez family in 1956 in the neighborhood of Bella Vista (Pretty Sight), today known as the Colonia Guerrero (Neighborhood "Guerrero"). Bella Vista was located between the streets Marte and Camelia (Lewis 1964[1961], 28), only one block away from the space where the new buildings, parks, open spaces, and halls of the urban mega housing project of Tlatelolco was being constructed. Tlatelolco's mega housing complex was
inaugurated in 1964. Figure 7 shows how close was Bella Vista to Tlatelolco (Figure 7). Oscar Lewis can be taken as a good example to show the differences between the two traditions of Mexican Anthropology, the so-called "conflict of fiestas" (Roseberry 1994[1989], 2) that refers to the study of culture seen as "an expression of folk society, based in communitarian values [and] solidarity" vs. "a village torn by conflict rooted in differential access to land as well as a history marked by profound at times bloody political struggles" (Roseberry 1994[1989], 2). Lewis's ethnographical research during the 1940's of the village of Tepoztlán in Mexico was a contestation to the analysis of that previously done by Robert Redfield during the 1920's in Tepoztlán (Lewis 1951). Contrasting the neat tight homogenous community and well-integrated society Redfield had described, Lewis's more political economy oriented ethnography showed the individualism of Tepoztlán's institutions, the politics, the quarrels, the fears, the superstitions, the magic and the spirits, and most importantly the economic life of the people of Tepoztlán (Lewis 1951).

Following this train of work, he became interested in the study of rural immigrants into Mexico City. His critical approach, qualitative methodology, and innovative use of a tape recorder, placed him as a polemical anthropologist studying poverty in times when modernity and development models were favored, and poverty could only be analyzed as a macroeconomic structured but not as an embodied day to day experience (Aceves Lozano 1994; see also Lewis 1964[1961]). I intend to place myself within the debate of a place torn by conflict with a wounded history of profound and at times bloody political struggle; as well as a focus on what is considered decadent or forgotten urban spaces in times when neoliberal
Figure 7. *Bella Vista* was located between the streets Marte (B) and Camelia (A), today this space is part of the Colonia Guerrero. The Sánchez used to live only one block away from the construction site of the mega housing complex of Tlatelolco (Sections 1-3). (Google Maps.)
revitalization projects in Mexico City and their contestation are being greatly analyzed (see Crossa 2006, 2009, and 2011).

Lewis became one of the pioneers of urban anthropology in Mexico. He was interested in the effects of industrialization and urbanization. His perspective that the hierarchical Mexican society impeded any communication between different classes, and that Mexican writers and anthropologists were more interested in the "indigenous problem" made him think that the interest for poor people in the city was greatly understudied (Lewis 1964[1961]). He was deeply interested in analyzing the "culture of poverty" created by the modern narrative. The "culture of poverty" was defined not only as a lack of economic capability, unorganized life or absence of something, but as something that can be positive in the sense that it has a structure, a logic disposition, and defense mechanisms that without them, the "poor" would not be able to continue living, a type of organization passed on generation by generation (Lewis 1964[1961], 8-9). Lewis stated that the "culture of poverty" has been present in Mexico since the Spanish conquest in 1519, just when the "de-tribalization" process started and the migration of farmers increased its movement towards the city" (Lewis 1964[1961], 10).

**Cities: Wounds and Thresholds**

Today there is still a need to create different ways to understand the urban socio-physical processes and the spaces of a city. The "critical analysis of urban space privilege representation of the city as a property or according only to development trajectories" and the "complex spatialities and temporalities of the lived city" are
ignored (Till 2012, 4). The new cultural, political and urban geography must, just as Lewis started to do, study "the individual experiences in urban settings, the development of new forms of sociality, [and] the symbolic dimension of city life" (Claval 2007, 163). There is a need of a deeper understanding of the lived realities of the inhabitants of the city, including their "cultural identities, dynamics of the everyday and symbolic worlds" (Till 2012, 4).

The urban is usually analyzed as a space divided into "corridors for circulation, public spaces for encounters and working, shopping and residential areas" (Aitken, Staeheli and Mitchell 2003) without acknowledging that these lands are full of memories that arouse feelings and that they are territories (Claval 2007, 160). To avoid solely understanding urban space as a property, the concept of "wounded cities" can be useful when talking about a city like Mexico. If individuals and neighborhoods are wounded by displacement, material devastation, particularly violent or difficult pasts, so too is the city and its inhabitants (Till 2012, 6-7). Cities must be understood as "wounded" defined as "densely settled locales that have been harmed and structured by particular histories of physical destruction, displacement, and individual and social trauma resulting from state-perpetrated violence [...] and continue to structure current social and spatial relations, and as such also structure expectations of what is considered 'normal'" (Till 2012, 6). Spaces where memory is visibly inscribed or invisibly experienced. Through this chapter, I will try to show the wounds of Mexico City through the thresholds of displacement, traumatic violent events, material destructions, and abandonment; as well as the
emergence of heterotopias from these thresholds and an intention to heal spaces of pain and shock within the mega housing complex of Tlatelolco.

Mexico City must be studied as a space made out of process of changes, turning points, discontinuities, porous spaces and wounds with "[m]emories that seek out traces" (Stavrides 2007, 12) from the past. Rather than a continuous chain of events culminating in the present, the history of some of the neighborhoods in Mexico City is marked by discontinuous and shifting flows influenced by critical turning points. These turning points can be understood as thresholds that connect while separate and separate while connect, that perforate space and create heterotopias, "places where differences meet" (Stavrides 2007, 4). To understand a "city of thresholds" (Stavrides 2007), we must analyze its material and social constructions and affections. Some thresholds may create wounds in the city. Wounds that leave fragments, pieces of information that seem to be disconnected from space, and traces that expose "the scars of history, as well as the contemporary consequences of destruction to the ideal of the nation" (Till 2005, 98-99). The wounds of the city can be traced through fragments and memories represented through stories and through other material constructed physical spaces of the city.

Since the fifteenth century, with the arrival of the Spanish conquistadores, Mexico City started its cycles of demolition and rebuilding. Since then, Mexico City's urban space has intended to "clean" and build a new path for the future: "entire areas of the city [were] periodically 'laundered' and 'liberated' to make room for a new generation of urban planers and their project for modernizing and improving the urban fabric" (Gallo 2010, 54). In the 20th century, Tlatelolco embodies many of
modernity's pathological disease (growth, cleanliness and functional) based on a "scientific neo-positivist ontology of urbanism and architecture founded on functionalist principles" (Zamorano Villarreal 2007, 77). Modernity is "inseparable from image production and circulation", thus the representation of the city must be considered as an "imagined city, from urban imagination to urban imaginaries" (Prakash 2010, 2). Modernism relates to a metropolitan phenomenon representing "the high-culture expressions of the city" (Prakash 2010, 3) where architecture and urbanism becomes a function, the extension of the state, and a tool to imagine the modern future.

The construction of the urban housing complex of Tlatelolco emerges from this ideology's limitations and forms of imagining the world. Tlatelolco is one of the greatest and most important modern urban housing complexes made in Mexico City. Urbanism in the middle of the twentieth century in Mexico City was considered as a way to trace a new path, to have the capacity to be original without copying other cities, to create a city that could last throughout history and that it could become universal (Aragón Echegaray 1974, 40-41). Architecture would give a utilitarian function to art, which contains in each piece a "vibrant unity of memories and cults, an aesthetic greater constant value" (Aragón Echegaray 1974, 70). Mexico City was trying to create, represent and imagine the physiognomies of the city with

---

1 Tlatelolco was not the first modern housing project in Mexico City. The Colonia Michoacana (Neighborhood "Michoacana") was one of the first housing projects in 1936 with the construction of 800 houses inspired on Bauhaus architecture (Zamorano Villarreal 2007).
"meanings, essences, structures and expressions" for the future (Aragón Echegaray 1974, 1).

**Tlatelolco: From Utopia to Dystopia**

The utopist monumental project of the mega housing complex of Tlatelolco is a concretized turning point, a threshold, in the housing history and urban planning of Mexico City. The construction had as a consequence a displacement of more than one hundred thousand families living in that area (SRE 1964). The utopist character of the housing complex was based on modern ideas of cleanliness, happiness, function, order and control that would replace the "disordered" and "unorganized" growth; it would also "ameliorate" the living conditions of the habitants of Mexico City and erase the "poor" environment of living (SRE 1964). The utopian dream, inspired on a Corbusierian model, was inaugurated in 1964 but ended shortly after what became one of the worst wounds and nightmares of Mexican modern history: the killings of peaceful protestors and sympathizers on October 2 in 1968 on the Plaza de las Tres Culturas (Plaza of the Three Cultures) in Tlatelolco. Followed by this heterotopic appropriation of space, seventeen years later on September 19, in 1985 one of the greatest earthquakes in recent memory hit Mexico City. The 8.1 Richter scale earthquake highly damaged and collapsed pieces of Tlatelolco’s physical and social construction. After these events a 2-decade period of other revitalization projects in the city’s downtown’s Centro Histórico (Historic Center) followed, this lead to a great abandonment and disuse of some of Tlatelolco’s buildings. Nonetheless, there is still a dynamic public, apparently unorganized dirty fuzzy
boderlike, physical and social space in Tlatelolco. In 2007, adding to the mosaic of the diverse "cultural experiences" in the housing complex, the recently inaugurated Centro Cultural Universitario Tlatelolco (CCUT, University’s Cultural Center in Tlatelolco) opened its doors with a Memorial commemorating the traumatic event of 1968 and heterotopic appropriation of space, simulating an attempt to heal, clear out and erase some eerie shadows of the past. Along this chapter I will expose how these thresholds changed the physical and social spaces of Tlatelolco as well as how they created different heterotopias in the public urban spaces of Tlatelolco.

**Government's Perfect Planning of Displacement**

The modern Conjunto Urbano Nonoalco-Tlatelolco (Urban Housing Complex Nonoalco-Tlatelolco) was use as an antidote by the state's government to combat what was considered an "urban problem" and to serve the growing population of the city. The scientific project had a series of planning steps towards its construction and resulted in the displacement of more than a hundred thousand families (SRE 1964). Nonetheless, officially the inauguration was seen as a modern success of from the government because it marked a new époque of urbanism and management in the urban planning of Mexico City.

Modernity in Mexico can be traced back to the Constitution of 1917 within the context of the Mexican Revolution initiated in 1910. The Mexican Revolution followed an era or "optimism and utopian dreams [...] from education to architecture, and from farming to urban planning" (Gallo 2010, 53). The housing complex of Tlatelolco was a "monumental project designed to introduce the most
modern - and utopian - urban planning concept into Mexico City" (Gallo 2010, 53).

Gallo resumes this époque:

Between the 1950 and 1968, Mexico City underwent the most radical transformation in its history: a postwar economic boom, combined with mass migration from the countryside to the city, resulted in a population explosion that took the city's population from about three million in 1950 to almost seven million in 1970. To cope with this exponential growth, architects and urban planners embarked on an ambitious project to redesign the capital, building ring roads, expressways, and even a subway system (Gallo 2010, 53).

During these years, the Mexican government was engaged in a mega urban program of modernization. Such projects of urbanism, architecture and social planning were based on what Henri Lefebvre would define as a 'science of space': a political use of knowledge that embodies a technological utopia (Lefebvre 2008[1974], 8-9). This utopist character and engineering of the possibilities of the future is embodied in the urban mega housing project of the Urban Complex Nonoalco-Tlatelolco, and it became one of the main emblems of modernity and urban regeneration in Mexico City in the 1960's. Known generally as Tlatelolco, or for local neighbors as La Unidad (The Complex), the complex was inaugurated in 1964 in light of the Olympics of 1968.

Merged in the ideas of progress and development, the intention of the époque was to eliminate the "anachronic markets", garbage dumps, unused or open empty spaces, huts and slums into "modern buildings", new districts and low cost housing centers to "meet the demands of the population" (SRE 1964, 19-27). Tlatelolco was an attempt to create an urban solution to the challenges of an emergent international cultural metropolis. The problem of the growing population
in the city, and the "decadent construction of huts [...] occupied by the railway yards, shops and a train station" was "fixed" by spatially replacing it with the new urban housing complex. Trying to erase and destroy what was considered and described as decaying neighborhoods, old central railroad station, warehouses, storage houses and slums, 11,908 apartments were constructed in 102 buildings in an area of one million square meters in 2.5 kilometers in length (SRE 1964 and Cisneros 1993).

The project greatly supported by the state's government, was inscribed in the narrative of advancement and growth. The government stated that: "Everything will begin on a large scale" (SRE 1964, 34). A total transformation, as described by the official book of presentation:

The invaluable wealth of this grandiose civilization is exalted everywhere. Technique displaces improvisation and efficiency mediocrity. And, although with the inevitable defects of every city's size and antiquity, it advances with a sure pace toward its extraordinary transfiguration (SRE 1964, 34).

This intention translates into a clear purpose of an engineered, planned and control growth within the context of managing the population and using its "open", "unused", "irrelevant" and "natural" spaces by being highly scientific and utilitarian. Officially the first idea was to relocate the people living in the zone, which accounted to more than one hundred thousand families, but since they needed to apply and gain a credit, many of the families were forced to leave.

The study made previous to the construction of the housing complex, although they auto-classify it as having economic, social and human characteristic it was highly focused on the material information of the place such as the physical appearance of the sites in place (huts or other type of housing), number of floors,
heights, land values, services, open yards and "patches for clothes lines" (SRE 1964: 35-65). The "social and human" realm refers only to demographical and physical characteristics, leaving out local stories, faces and narratives of the actual people who lived and used that space. A series of maps were created depicting the area of interest. To justify the new construction site, the previous study designated and mapped the area of "slums". Figure 8 shows the area of interest of the site. The red area shows the parts where the construction was going to be made, while the yellow areas where the sites that were also going to be transformed due to the new construction (Figure 8). Other images used to analyze the site were photographs. For example, figures 9 and 10 are photographs of what was called and categorized as "slums" in that same area. Figure 9 shows the slums in and around the area of Tlatelolco, while Figure 10 shows parts of the railways that were also on site (Figure 9 and 10).

Maps were also used as a tool to analyze and plan the site. For example, the map shown in Figure 11, from the same study shows the structures on place that could be demolished, those that could be repairable, those conservable and other empty spaces in the zone of interest and its surroundings (Figure 11). The surrounding area was also relevant because the project contemplated the renewal of adjacent streets making them wider and longer to open a communication between the center and the northern part of the city.
Figure 8. Area of interest. (SRE 1964, 50.)

Figure 9. "Slums" around Tlatelolco. (SRE 1964, 55.)
Figure 10. Railway in the areas of Tlatelolco. (SRE 1964, 92.)

Figure 11. Official map showing the study's result of what could be demolished, conservable and reparable. (SRE 1964, 60.)
The area also had an archaeological site, a colonial church, a convent and a park\(^2\). Figure 12 shows the Park of Santiago and Figure 13 is the depiction of how the archaeological site was going to be seen within the urban housing complex (Figure 12 and 13). Although the name and meaning of Tlatelolco (place of the sand mound in Nahuatl) comes from this ancient time (Matos Moctezuma 2008, 30), the pre-Hispanic place of Tlatelolco and its historical surrounding areas were barely mentioned in the previous study or on the book of the housing complex official presentation.

The surrounding neighborhoods had also pre-Hispanic names. Figure 14 shows the pre-Hispanic name depiction of Tlatelolco and adjoining neighborhoods in that same area (Figure 14). The government’s urban planners and the architect Mario Panni transformed these places, an Aztec pyramid, a XVII century church and the building of the modern housing complex, into what is today called the Plaza of the Three Cultures. They also served as symbols of Mexico’s heritage and territoriaziation. Figure 15 shows what is today called The Plaza of the Three Cultures (Figure 15).

The construction of the mega housing complex started as a materialist functional utopia with a series of thresholds and emerging heterotopic spaces. The characteristic utopist part of Tlatelolco is seen in the architecture inspired by Le Corbusier in the 60’s. Attuned with the most contemporary architectural and urban international projects, the architect Mario Panni was greatly influenced and inspired

\(^2\) The archaeological site of Tlatelolco was founded by an Aztec dissident elite in 1338 and became the richest and most important market during its time in Mesoamerica. The Spaniards then conquered it in 1521. Tlatelolco is officially the last stand of Aztec resistance.
Figure 12. Park in Tlatelolco. (SRE 1964, 213.)

Figure 13. Depiction of how the archaeological site and colonial church would be inscribed within the housing complex. (SRE 1964, 118-199.)
Figure 14. Sand Mound Depiction for Tlatelolco and other pre-Hispanic names and places around. (SRE 1964, 221).

Figure 15. Plaza of the Three Cultures: archaeological site, colonial church and modern buildings in the housing complex.
by the modernist ideas of the famous well-known French architect Le Corbusier. Le Corbusier has been analyzed as "working towards a technicist, scientific and intellectualized representation of space" (Lefebvre 2008[1974], 43). The Le Corbusier model met the architectural requirements of state capitalism and a "utopian" and "ideological" perfect way of living.

The president of that time, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, described the project as a "peaceful revolution" (SRE 1964, 2). This was seen as the first step towards the urban regeneration of the metropolis that would "contribute towards the resolution of the low-cost housing problem in the city" (SRE 1964, 35). The project believed that the disordered growth was wrong and unprogressive and that it consequently produced a "detriment of community living" and "the minimum unity of urbanism, which is the barrio [neighborhood]" could be lost (SRE 1964, 45). Utopias are considered as a consequence of modernity. The architecture of that period turned out to be in the service of the state, "and hence a conformist and reformist force on a world scale [...] despite the fact that its advent was hailed as the revolution" (Lefebvre 2008[1974], 304).

The official name of the housing complex was "Presidente López Mateos (Nonoalco - Tlatelolco)" named after the president in turn. The housing complex consisted of three different types of buildings: the "economic", for people with less economic sources; the "second" with bigger spaces and better quality finishes; and the "luxury" also larger and with high quality finishes. On Figure 16 there is a photograph of a family inside one of these apartments in the housing complex (Figure 16).
Figure 16. Photograph of a family in one of the apartments of Tlatelolco. (SRE 1964, 141).
Tlatelolco was divided in three sections and could house about seventy thousand people. The design of the three sections of the housing complex is shown on Figure 17 and Figure 18 shows a Google image of how even today the physical spaces of Tlatelolco can be identified (Figure 17 and 18). The urban construction of sections intended to recreate the lost barrio (neighborhood) containing the basic necessities within a walking distance area. This design was intended to make life more practical, comfortable and fast: less expensive because there is no need to use a car or a bus and time saving because basic necessities are near and close to each other. The design mapping walking distances in Tlatelolco are shown in Figure 19 and on Figure 20 the imaginary space of what was going to be the housing complex secure and clean public urban spaces is depicted in Figure 20 (Figure 19 and 20).

Schools, commerce, sports, entertainment and green open spaces could all be found within (SRE 1964, 78-79). There were 13 nurseries, 2 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 technical school, and one technical high school; there were 3 different types of clinics (general, specialist, and dental); and other social and sports clubs with Olympic swimming pools, gyms, auditoriums, theatres, movie theatres, bathrooms, game rooms, living rooms, reading rooms and cafeterias (SRE 1964, 180-205). The complex had an emblematic building shown in Figure 21, the building of Banco de Obras Públicas, (BANOBRA, National Bank of Civil Engineering), which was the one in charge of building the site (Figure 21). Also, another building that can also be considered emblematic due to its physical appearance and "importance" at that time was the building of the Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores (SRE, Ministry of Foreign Affairs) which is also shown in Figure 22 (Figure 22).
Figure 17. The depiction of the housing complex’s three sections. (SRE 1964, 112-113).

Figure 18. Today’s image of the housing complex three sections can be still clearly seen. (Google Earth 2011.)
Figure 19. Map showing the walking distance planning. (SRE 1964, 71.)

Figure 20. Depiction of a Modern Family in what is going to be the public spaces of Tlatelolco. (SRE 1964, 97.)
Figure 21. Depiction of what was going to be the shiny BANOBRA building. (SRE 1964, 125.)

Figure 22. Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (SRE 1964, 214.)
Both the building of BANOBRA'S and SRE were emblematic due to their material uniqueness and expressive significance representing the state. They were both the highest buildings guarding each extremity of the complex. The metallic triangular shape, shown in Figure 23, still distinguishes it from any other building in Mexico City (Figure 23). As described by Lefebvre: "Verticality, a height erected anywhere on a horizontal plane, can become the dimension of elsewhereness, a place characterized by the presence-absence: of the divine, of power, of the half-fictional half-real, of sublime thought" (2003[1970], 38). Contrasting these spaces was the archaeological site of Tlatelolco. Again, as Lefebvre explains: "Similarly, subterranean depth is a reversed verticality" (2003[1970], 38) symbolizing its opposition. An image of the archaeological site can be seen in Figure 24 (Figure 24).

**Heterotopia and Traumatic Killings of Space**

A couple of years after its inauguration, Tlatelolco was part of one of the most violent contemporary events of Mexico's modern history, a horrible nightmare. The terrible killing and disappearance of students in October 2, 1968 by the army and a special group of the governmental forces on the Plaza of the Three Cultures in the urban mega building complex of Tlatelolco has been one of the most shadowy and difficult episodes in Mexico. This threshold episode was a traumatic event in the social and physical spaces of Tlatelolco, the wounds can still be seen and felt. A photograph of the massive protest on the Plaza of the Three Cultures is shown in Figure 25 and another photograph of some of the repressions on the night of October 2 can be found in Figure 26 (Figure 25 and 26).
Figure 23. Banobras overlooking Mexico City’s valley. (Skycrapercity 2007.)

Figure 24. Tlatelolco Archaeological site in the underground. (Skycrapercity 2006.)
Figure 25. The student protest on the Plaza of the Three Cultures in Tlatelolco in 1968. (Batres 2008.)

Figure 26. Student repression in Tlatelolco the night of October 2, 1968.
Following a four-month period of protests and meetings, the Mexico student movement in 1968 unraveled into a dreadful state crime. More than 40 years have passed and there is still no clear account of how many people were killed and disappeared, and up to today there has still not been any convictions yet. The movement had its roots on the "confrontations between university administrators, government security forces, and students at numerous campuses [that] had escalated around the country since [the] student participation in the massive union strikes of 1958 - 1959" (Zolov 1999, 119). The student movement of 1968 demanded a public political dialogue to avoid governmental cooptation. Six demands, concerning both local and national concerns, framed the students' official petition (Zolov 1999, 121):

1) Freedom for political prisoners
2) Elimination of Article 145 of the Penal Code
3) Abolition of the riot police (*granaderos*)
4) Dismissal of the Mexico City chiefs of police
5) Indemnification for victims of repression
6) Justice against those responsible for repression

Some of the strategies used by the students was their attempt to communicate to all the Mexican society by giving out flyers and information to all the population during their 4-month long marches and protests. For example, the Silent March on September 13, where tens of thousands of people marched in silence, had placards that stated "'To The People of Mexico: You can see that we're not vandals or rebels without a cause - the label that's constantly been pinned on us."
Our silence proves it” (Zolov 1999, 126). At first, as other students around the world, they used the images of Che Guevara and Mao Zedong, but when the press criticized their international references, they turned to national revolutionary symbols such as Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa and other national heroes (who in the imaginations of Mexicans represented the state). Figure 27 shows a photograph of the student protest in Mexico City using images of Che Guevara while on Figure 28 the photograph shows the use of local and revolutionary Mexican heroes (Figure 27 and 28). This action was

"a direct challenge to the PRI’s monopoly of the symbolism of Mexico’s revolutionary heritage. By parading images of Villa, Zapata, Juárez, and others the students implicitly questioned the government’s right to speak in their name, while suggesting that they instead had the right to do so. [This re-appropriation suggested that now] the nation’s revolutionary heroes were being used against the government itself” (Zolov 1999, 127).

The repression by the riot police (granaderos) was growing, as well as the government’s attempt to continuously pay other people to provoke the students, and create riots and confusion with infiltrated federal security agents among the students. On October 2 in 1968, a march had been planned to protest the continued occupation of the Polytechnic Institute by the army forces, at the last moment the leaders decided to cancel the march because of the highly military presence along the planned rout, and instead hold a meeting at the Plaza of the Three Cultures in Tlatelolco. Between 5,000 and 10,000 people attended, many were simply residents of the apartment complex (Zolov 1999, 129). A helicopter circled overhead, and just after two flares were dropped, army troops filled the plaza from the street blocking the only entrances (and exits) of it. "Soldiers began to fire point-blank at the crowd,
Figure 27. Students protesting during the 4-month period of the student movement with the images of Che Guevara. (Henley 2008.)

Figure 28. Students during a protest re-appropriating national hero images. (La Ciudad en el Tiempo 2012.)
killing and wounding men, women, and children at random" (La Jornada y Canal Seis de Julio 2005).

Since the killing of 1968, just a couple of days before the inauguration of the 1968 Olympics in Mexico, there has been a level of denial, confusion and secrecy around the event. Some parts of the government said that the students were the first to fire against the army and that the army had to defend itself, there are also some statements, videos and interviews that contradict this version. The number of deaths has always been one of the major secrets leading to confusion. At first the government said there were 20 deaths but along the years new evidence has shown more. Although the government and mass media tried to hide the killing in official history, many artists, writers and journalists continue investigating and writing about it; and since then every October 2 there are different social groups that gather and march in remembrance of the dead. Still today, October 2 is remembered as: 2 de Octubre No se Olvida (October 2 Will Not be Forgotten). On the next chapters this threshold will be further explored.

**Social and Physical Destrucions**

The 8.1 Richter scale earthquake is one of the most traumatic events in the collective imagination of the Mexican City's population (Suárez and Jiménez 1987), and specially the one in Tlatelolco. The earthquake left more than 6,500 deaths and more than 30 thousand injured. The media greatly covered the case of Tlatelolco because of its extensity and conglomeration of buildings, and because many of the buildings, especially from sections 2 and 3, were severely damaged. One of the
tallest buildings, the Nuevo León building in Figure 29 (3 towers with 16 floors, a total of 280 apartments), was almost completely destroyed (Figure 29). But the earthquake did not only cause physical damages and deaths. There was a social rupture and its traces can still be seen in the public spaces and memories of Tlatelolco.

The 1985 earthquake brought to Tlatelolco many changes, and not only physical ones. Many people who I spoke with said that the "real social deterioration" of Tlatelolco was after the earthquake. People even referred to the 1985 as a greater tragedy than that of 1968. A considerable amount of neighbors left while many people from adjacent neighborhoods arrived. People identified "them", the new people, as having a different type of life: usually "vendors" (street informal vendors usually) greatly contrasting the idea that people from Tlatelolco, the "real Tlatelocans" were bureaucrats, professionals or teachers. "Not like them we come from hard working well educated families, we know what it means to earn our daily life" (interview with one of the neighbors of Tlatelolco, June 2011), assuming that "vendors" are from a "lower class" and do not know what it means to have a "real" job. People say that those who had the means to leave in 1985 left, and that those who did not have enough money had to stay. Also, the neighbors in Tlatelolco pre-85 had been organizing themselves to self administrate the complex; these same groups were the ones that post-85 had the power to organize more neighbors and fight for insurance payments, relocations and the remodeling of some of the buildings. "Even other neighborhoods came and asked us for help, asked us to show them how had we organized" (interview with one of the neighbors of Tlatelolco,
Figure 29. Nuevo León building almost completely torn down in Tlatelolco in 1985. (Villesca 2010.)
June 2011). "After all of that, I could not continue in politics, it was so intense that I fell into depression after it" (interview with one of the neighbors of Tlatelolco, June 2011).³

This difficult moment of politics in Tlatelolco left the social tissue very divided and unbalanced. Antonio Fonseca describes his point of view of that time (note how he diminishes the physical building collapse and heightens the rupture of the social tissue):

The earthquake did not only collapsed some, or well, only a small part of the building of Nuevo Leon, but also a lot of people left, a lot of our leaders left, [before the earthquake] there was a kind of structure that converted into organizations. The neighbor movement does crystallizes itself in some buildings; but just as it happens in other places, people that linked to political groups, what later became the PRD, finish all in decomposition, in corruption. They call themselves social leaders, buy they do not have any capacity to govern but only to become corrupt.

Disuse and Abandonment

During the 80's and 90's Tlatelolco begun to have more and more social problems. After the '85 earthquake many parts of Mexico City were severely damaged. In Tlatelolco several buildings from the second section had to be dynamited and in the third section buildings high buildings were reconstructed with less height. Some of the most important buildings in Tlatelolco fell into disuse; for example, the emblematic triangular tower shown in Figure 30, once the second highest building in Mexico City that housed the main offices of Banobras (National Bank of Civil Engineering) was abandoned after the '85 earthquake (Figure 30). The famous carillon inside the emblematic building show in Figure 31, was made with 47 bells,

³ For a detailed documentation on the neighborhood organization after the '85 earthquake see Cantu Chapa 2001.
Figure 30. Banobras building abandonment. (Photo by the author 2012).
imported from Belgium lied on the peak of the building. The carillon stop being frequently used after the earthquake and it was completely out of function in 1993. Figure 31 shows the inside of the carillon (Figure 31). The carillon "hand in hand with the abandonment and deterioration of the urban center" (Savage 2000) was originally destined to promote a better quality of "social" life for the inhabitants of Tlatelolco. Figure 32 shows the inside and size of the carillon (Figure 32). In 2000, what was left of Banobras decided to sell the building and its carillon. Today the BANOBREAS building, after being bought in 2008 by a U.S. real state agency Cushman & Wakefield, is being thoroughly remodeled and will soon function as an office building (Edemx 2011). This was also greatly impacted by the recent regenerative projects near the tower such as the Metrobus new line, the Suburban Train station and new mall, and the Library José Vasconcelos. Figures 33, 34 and 35 show the Metrobus new line stop, the suburban train station and mall and the new José Vasconcelos library respectively (Figure 33, 34, 35).

Another very important building that also abandoned the Urban Complex was the one used by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (SRE), since its construction in 1966. After the 1985 earthquake the building was greatly damaged and constantly repaired until the late 1990's. In 2005 the building showed a certain degree of abandonment and in 2006 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs moved out and occupied another building in the freshly renewed Mexico City downtown Historic Center. The Gobierno del Distrito Federal (GDF, Mexico City's Government) granted the SRE building to the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM, National Autonomous University of Mexico) together with 60 million pesos in order to create
Figure 31. Carillon in the peak on the Banobras building. (STRE 1964, 130.)

Figure 32. Carillon originally destined to promote a better quality of life to Tlatelolco. (SRE 1964, 133.)
Figure 33. Metrobus new line, the Banobras building can be seen behind the bus. (Photo by author 2012.)

Figure 34. Suburban Train station and mall project, the Banobras building can be seen in the left upper corner of the image.
Figure 35. The new José Vasconcelos Library and the banobras building at the back. (Brewster 2010.)
the Centro Cultural Universitario Tlatelolco (CCUT, University's Cultural Center Tlatelolco). The front entrance of the Cultural Center can be seen in Figure 36 (Figure 36).

**Simulation of Heal: A new Cultural Center**

The University's Cultural Center Tlatelolco (CCUT) was opened in 2007 with the inauguration of the Memorial ‘68 -this will be further analyzed in the next chapter. The Cultural Center, which housed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs office, purports to promote 'culture' through an on-site school of art and art shows, international exhibitions, and film festivals. Some of the past temporal exhibitions made by the Cultural Center had to do with the earthquake of 1985. The main visitors of the Memorial 68 are tourists. Its permanent exhibition is the Colección Blaisten (the Blaistein Colection) that contains a collection of Mexican art from the Spanish Viceroyalty up to the last decades of XX century. In 2008 the Cultural Center opened the Unidad de Vinculación Artística (UVA, School of Art), described as an open school where people "no matter what level of art knowledge they have can take classes" (interview with Ignacio Plá director of the UVA, June 2011). The classes vary from Dance, Photography, Story Telling, Yoga, Painting, Singing... All the workshops have a cost per semester, and they give a discount to the habitants of Tlatelolco.

The cultural center was created "with the objective to develop a cultural space that would enrich the community life of the northern part of the capital of the country, which is a social space with large gaps of cultural infrastructure [and] it
Figure 36. New University Cultural Center in Tlatelolco (CCUT) in what used to be the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (SRE) Building. (Wawis 2009.)
retakes the image of Tlatelolco as a formative and diffusion axis of art and history” (Arroyo 2008, 72; director of the CCUT). The cultural center as well as its school of art UVA has appropriated the images of Tlatelolco urban housing complex to promote the new cultural space. For example the UVA made a flyer containing the famous stone bridge that crosses and connects from section 1 to section 2 of the housing complex with some of Tlatelolco’s buildings to promote its image and connect with the neighborhood. Figure 37 shows the famous stone bridge in one of the flyers of the UVA school of art (Figure 37). Another appropriation of meanings and an attempt to connect with the people in Tlatelolco is the installation of light in the form of crystals titled "Xipe Toté" by Thomas Glassford on what used to be the SRE building, today property of the Cultural Center. Xipe Toté ("Our Skinned Lord" or "Night Drinker", in nahuatl) is the name of an Aztec god who excoriated himself to feed humanity symbolizing the peeling of corn and a new season. The installation, in a "cyclic profane and defined urban space" where "pieces of history converge", symbolizes "the convergence of cultures [and] the re-birth of health and life" (CCUT advertisement pamphlet). "Tlatelolco is dressing up with a new skin which shines to commemorate a new life as a Cultural Center, a symbolic visible lighthouse that can be seen from any strategic point of the valley of Mexico City" (CCUT advertisement pamphlet). Figure 38 shows XipeTótec instalation on the CCUT building (Figure 38).

The director of the UVA explained to me that one of the objectives of the art school is to create a dynamic community where neighbors and other people around Mexico City can get closer to the Cultural Center exhibitions and special events through the UVA's ongoing workshops and classes. He showed me how the designs
Figure 37. One of the flyers of the UVA using images of the urban complex. *(Source: Author’s collection.)*

Figure 38. The art installation of light on the ex-SRE building, today the Cultural Center *(Source: Author’s collection.)*
of the flyers for the UVA’s semesters workshop had to do with the idea of movement a: "we want to symbolically show that there is something new, something moving in Tlatelolco" (interview with I. Plá, director of the UVA, June 2011). The symbolic images are a little car used in 1960 by the vendors of the housing complex to show clients the areas and new apartments around Tlatelolco, a circus bicycle on the Plaza of Tlatelolco, and a kite flying among the buildings of Tlatelolco Figures 39, 40 and 41 show the flyers for the first three semesters of workshops in the UVA school of art, the three have symbolic representations of movement: a car, a bike and a kite respectively (Figures 39, 40, and 41.)

**From Materiality into Different Representations**

Thresholds, wounds and stories make up the urban space in a city in constant change. The identification of thresholds is an opportunity to start deepening on the wounds that create the city. Tlatelolco is the creation of an urban place that embodies values and practices of the state and its contradictions. By recognizing the thresholds of its history and geography we may understand the social and physical spaces and not only rely in the official narratives or cliché remembrances of progress and development. It is a way to understand the creation of social and physical spaces, the ways that they are legitimized, achieved, justified as well as their consequences. Tlatelolco may be analyzed as the creation of a place with contradictions and dominations that embody modernity ideals and neoliberal practices. The recuperation of fragments becomes the pieces of the thresholds and traumatic events that produce heterotopias.
Figure 39. Flyer of the UVA for the first semester of workshops and classes: Little car used in 1960 by the vendors of the housing complex to show clients the areas and new apartments around Tlatelolco. (Source: Author’s collection.)

Figure 40. Flyer of the UVA for the second semester of workshops and classes: A circus bicycle on the Plaza of Tlatelolco. (Source: Author’s collection.)
Figure 41. Flyer of the UVA for the third semester of workshops and classes: A kite flying among the buildings of Tlatelolco. (Source: Author’s collection.)
The state techniques are a way to understand the heterotopias and contradictions such as in the public spaces of Tlatelolco. The state can choose to displace population or kill them if they are defined as "unorganized poor" or as a "threat": as in the inauguration of 1964, and in the killing of 1968. Also, at the same time the state can attempt to give good housing or "security" to its people.

Everything is done in order and justifying a modern and progressive state. Different entities can explain their presence in space through different means in order to appropriate the history, spaces and memories of Tlatelolco.

According to Karen E. Till, "political and urban geographers need to do more work in theorizing and teaching about the city in ways that are recognizable to the inhabitant of the city" (2012, 5). Not only the government's materiality and discourses make up the meanings of space, also other institutions such as the cultural center and the memories of neighbors participate in this imagination. This makes Tlatelolco's space a product of social relations, because just as Lefebvre (2008[1974]) said, space is always in the process of becoming, it is negotiated, performed, appropriated, dominated and contested. Space, like identity, "is never fixed, monolithic, and bound, but is open to interventions" (Natter and Jones 1997, 142). Space is open, it is a quotidian negotiation and we must engage with it to better understand the world (Massey 2008[2005]). How can we engage in the different spaces and identities of Tlatelolco? We must identify the production of space of Tlatelolco and the different ways it has been appropriated and negotiated through memories and imagination.
The fabric of a city is not only in visible constant change but also it is subtle and invisible at times. It becomes part of a collective memory that can be found on "both informally and in the written and rewritten official and unofficial histories of cities" (Wilson 1997, 126). This change, rather than erasing the past, may intensify the memory of what is no longer there (Wilson 1997, 127). Today diverse agents are representing the existing presence of the visible and invisible past in Tlatelolco's public urban space through different ways. The recuperation of fragments of the official and unofficial memories is a way to study the urban space of wounded cities.
CHAPTER 3

Engraving Fixed Memory: The Killing of 1968

"In the dawn, I was curious, I peaked out in between the curtains to see what was going on. It was a Dante's spectacle. There in front of us where we have the ceremonial space of the archaeological site, precisely there where that man is now standing next to the fence, there, there was body. I was impressed, I started to look around and I not only saw one but many other bodies lying. The plaza was full of shoes. Curiously, even though it was raining that night, there were people, firemen washing the esplanade. There in front, what is today the Foreign Affairs Library, there, against the wall was a line of young women and men all naked - Completely naked. Then, I saw tanks and buses of the army and soldiers lifting up bodies, just as if they were sacks of potatoes throwing them into the cars. It was not only one or two, there were many bodies..."

Neighbor of Tlatelolco 2005

Since the killing of 1968, just a couple of days before the inauguration of the 1968 Olympics in Mexico, there has been a level of denial, secrecy, confusion and deliberate postponement of actions by the government to fully recognize and explain what really happened. Meanwhile, abundant investigation, representation, struggles and documentation has been created by other sectors of society such as poets, novelists, journalists, artists, activists and intellectuals to communicate and denounce the unjust and tragic episode. They have produced essays, novels, poems, documentary texts, movies, and video-documentaries being faithful to one of the most famous sayings related to the event: 2 de Octubre No se Olvida (October 2 Will

4 Cited in La Jornada y Canal Seis de Julio (2005).
Not be Forgotten). October 2 goes beyond the Plaza of the Three Cultures, further than Mexico City's fuzzy borders and across countries, ideologies and historical times. Consequently, the stories, photographs, video recordings, accounts and diverse documentation of what happened, these fragments and ghosts can be found throughout society, cross disciplinarily, and in different historical times and diverse places. The continuation of hiding and unveiling stories and documentation has been a long struggle; therefore, some social and physical spaces have been achieved. Official memorialization sites have been planned and inaugurated, cases have been taken to court, and a national date for commemoration has recently been institutionalized.

**Politics of Memory**

Space plays an important role in the process and politics of collective memory (Dwyer and Alderman 2008). In geography, there is a large literature engaged in identifying the interests, struggles, conflicts, discourses, symbols and metaphors related to the creation of sites to remember and forget both triumphant and tragic events in urban spaces (Lowenthal 1985; Alderman 2003; Foote 2003; Bosco 2004; Dwyer 2004; Hoelscher and Alderman 2004; Till 2005; Bosco 2006; Dwyer and Alderman 2008; Savage 2009; Alderman 2010). The textures, processes and meanings of a place, as well as their materiality and symbolic qualities have been noted.

---

greatly studied in the formation of place, self and identity (Young 1993; Adams, Hoelscher and Till 2001; Hoelscher and Alderman 2004, Post 2009). Also, the significance and use of artifacts that link experience with awareness and continuity have been explored (Tuan 1980; Alderman and Campbell 2008). It is believed that the creation of these spaces of memory views the past influencing the creation of a possible future (Lowen 2000), these sites are use to re-interpret and appropriate space (Dwyer 2004; Alderman 2010), and become a tool to discuss the benefits, advantages and threats of the past (Lowenthall 1985) or of the present.

The literature on the politics of memory goes beyond geography: anthropologists, philosophers, artists, historians, and architects among other disciplines have studied and created different strategies towards its analysis, production, recuperation and reach. The most common and traditional way of analyzing wounded places is based on a historical approach to examine political situations, a dissecting of political actors, and a lecture on symbols and metaphors that represent the needs, desires and fears of the present. Such an approach is defined by Karen E. Till as a "biography of a site" (2006, 2012), which analyzes issues of identity politics and political transition (Forest, Johnson and Till 2004; see also Bosco 2004, 2006). It provides detailed descriptions of how national histories are shared, produced and remembered. This politics of public memory focuses on how and by who the past is created in the present. It uses notions such as 'lieux de memoire' (places of memory) (Nora 1989), 'counter memory' (Alderman 2010), 'invented traditions' or places of memory that analyze why, where and when
memory emerges and in what forms: memorials, "museums, postcards, annual parades, or temporary artistic spaces" (Till 2006, 327; also see Savage 2009).

Past tragic events may be a difficult disputed mission to memorialize, especially if it uncovers dark historical actions related to the state and its population. Memorializing landscapes in urban geography must be analyzed because one of the main focuses of monuments and memorials is the idea to create public spaces with a collective memory and history relating it to local events. Some scholars have argued that the creation of "public" is impossible due to rapid urban restructuration (Aitken, Staeheli and Mitchell 2003, 249). Some others even recognize that public space is no longer a democratic space (in the case that it ever was) where diversity of people and activities are tolerated, but that "public space" is a political and cultural economy that express social power and shape social relations (Low and Smith 2006). Therefore, the creation of memorials in urban public space must be investigated in relation to the creation of these.

Memory is embodied within the material and symbolic city. Its wounds and ghosts are trapped in the concrete, in the "lieux de mémoire" (places of memory) that refer to memory as fixed on material physical places (Nora 1992). Memory is not only found in the materiality of a city; social memory is encountered in sites and in "archives, memorials, objects, narratives, or cultural practices" (Till 2006, 330). These different representations create a geographical imagination (Gregory 1994), which refers to the ways the world is "made present, re-presented, [and] discursively constructed" (Gregory 1994, 104). This representation is also directly related to a
"political meaning that has to do with giving voice to the concerns and situations of others" (Gregory 1994, 104-105).

How have wounds and ghosts of Tlatelolco's tragic events such as the killing of 1968 been officially represented and imagined? The Plaza of the Three Cultures is a charged political space in the geographical and historical account of Mexico City. The ephemeral appropriation of space during the protests of October 2, 1968 in Tlatelolco created a heterotopia of democracy and fraternity highly contrasted by the events of violence and repression that succeeded it just a few hours after its initialization. Also, the ephemeral appropriations and negotiations of physical and social spaces of memorialization of the '68 traces have become in a sense heterotopic moments of promise (Stavrides 2007), and a breath of democratic and revolutionary hope (Lefebvre 2008[1974], 54). The official sites of memorialization erected in Tlatelolco can be traced back to initiatives made by citizens, intellectuals and academics to build physical symbolic spaces that help to not forget the event. Through this chapter I will be presenting how has the official memorialization of the 68 killing has been represented, negotiated and appropriated by the government and different groups in the social and physical spaces of Tlatelolco and beyond its porous fontiers.

The first official site was accomplished by a project made by the Comisión de la Verdad (Truth Commission) in 1993. Other attempts have been made to reclaim memory, specifically in 2007 by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM, National Autonomous University of Mexico) through its Centro Cultural Universitario Tlatelolco (CCUT, University Cultural Center of Tlatelolco ), inaugurated
the Memorial '68. Through these events and continued struggle to take to court the perpetrators of the killing, the state has yielded and has officially institutionalized the tragedy by creating a National Mourning Day in 2011. These memorialization strategies show that although space is in continuous change and must be analyzed always as a process; there is a need and desire to fix meaning to some of the spaces of Tlatelolco regarding this dreadful past. It also shows that space is a product of interrelation, a sphere of the possibility of the existence of multiplicity in the sense of contemporaneous plurality and a sphere where different trajectories can coexist in heterogeneity. It is always under construction it is never finished; never closed (Massey 2008[2005]). The ongoing construction of Tlatelolco through space and time show the complexity of its meanings and representations. But, at the same time, the materiality of these memorialization sites shows an attempt to fix meanings in space and create a true historical account giving a space for the ghosts of the past.

Throughout this chapter I will show the contestation of social groups, intellectuals, journalists and the University through its newly opened Cultural Center have done in order to incorporate what really happened in the official discourse and memorialization of the killing of October 2; as well as how the government has also co-opted this memory and represented it partially along the years.

**In Search of History and Contested Memory: The Official Placard in 1993**

The effort to make some sense of the tragic event and try to convict the guilty governmental officials has continued throughout time. The number of deaths has greatly fluctuated, while a sports writer from *The Guardian* reported 325, the local
news on the next day just reported from 20 to 30 deaths (Doyle 2006); officially 44 have been accepted but the unofficial number oscillates around 200 (Zolov 1999, 130). In 1993 the creation of an independent Comisión de la Verdad (The Truth Commission) was formed, but it did not last long primarily due to lack of resources (Aguayo 1998). Also in 1993 the "Committee 68" created a stone placard and placed it in the Plaza of the Three Cultures with private funding (Huffschmid 2008). The stone placard looks like a piece of wall covered with cantera stone. On the upper part, the years of 1968 - 1993 (year it was inaugurated) are depicted, and under them there is an image of 3 doves with the inscription of: Adelante (Go forward). Beneath that image, there is an inscription that reads: "A los compañeros caídos el 2 de octubre de 1968 en esta plaza" (For all the comrades that fell on October 2 in 1968 in this Plaza), then a list of 20 complete names of the people that have proof were killed in the Plaza. Next to each name there is a number referring to the age when they were murdered. Then on the bottom, after a poem excerpt from Rosario Castellanos, it reads: "...y muchos otros compañeros cuyos nombres y edades aún no conocemos" (...and to many other comrades which names and ages still we don’t know of). Figure 42 shows the Commemorative placard on the Plaza (Figure 42).

The governmental archives were disclosed until the late 1990's (Aguayo 1998; Gallo 2010, 63). In 1994, through the records obtained under the Freedom of Information Act and archival research (The National Security Archive) more investigations have been done to try to uncover the truth. There are also photographs and videos that show the atrocities but the crime continues unpunished. There are also documented stories that even the CIA was implicated
Figure 42. Commemorative Placard '68 inaugurated in 1993. (Photo by the author 2012.)
with the events occurred in October 2. Although the government and mass media tried to hide the killing in official history, many artists, writers and journalists continued investigating and writing about it. For example, Rosario Castellanos, a well known Mexican poet and author, wrote a poem and one of its excerpt was engraved in the commemorative plaque of 1993. The poem is shown on Figure 43 (Figure 43):

La plaza amaneció barrida; los periódicos dieron como noticia principal el estado del tiempo.
Y en la televisión, en la radio, en el cine no hubo ningún cambio de programa, ningún anuncio intercalado ni un minuto de silencio en el banquete.
(Pues prosiguió el banquete.)

The plaza woke up swept; the newspapers presented as principal headline the weather.
And on the television, on the radio, and on the cinema there was no change to the program no commercial or news headline in between programs, and not even a minute of silence during the feast (Because, the feast continued.)

Flowers can be found some days brought by people to honor the dead and sometimes some off the road tourists adventure within the housing complex to find the placard. In my experiences I have always found people sitting and talking about the event, for example Don Carlos and Roberto the musician. I have also encountered national and international tourists taking pictures of the placard while the neighbors play soccer on the plaza. If the tourists are lucky, they get to talk to
Figure 43. Poem on the bottom part of the Commemorative Placard '68. (Photo by the author 2012.)
someone related to the event sitting on the steps, or maybe listen to Don Carlos stories or listen and buy some of Roberto's music and memorabilia. For many years every October 2 people would congregate in the plaza and then protest towards the downtown Zocalo. Recently the protesters now start their manifestations from different parts of the city and end up in the Zocalo. The neighbors have also organized some years to pay tribute to the dead. Different social groups, many young people that were not even alive, have continuously appropriated the plaza to manifest and protest the unjust killing of students, professors and sympathizers on October 2 in the Plaza of the Three Cultures.

Reclaiming Memory

In 2007 a new page was written revolving the Tlatelolco killing of 1968. The Memorial '68, in Figure 44, was inaugurated inside a newly opened Cultural Center from the National University (CCUT, Centro Cultural Universitario Tlatelolco), in what used to be the Office of Foreign Affairs (SRE, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores) building, one of the emblematic structures of the urban mega building complex of Tlatelolco (Figure 44). "The objective of the Memorial del 68 is to make memory accessible to the new generations [...] Contrary to the commemorative placard, this institutionalized non-private initiative makes the UNAM (National Autonomous University of Mexico) assume its compromise with its own university's history" (Huffschmid 2008, 1). The memorial pretends to "name and visualize life" (Huffschmid 2008, 3). It is a "representation that is alive" (Arroyo 2008, 73, General Director of the CCUT).
Figure 44. Memorial ’68 entrance in the University Cultural Center in Tlatelolco. (Photo by the author 2012.)
This space is organized as a multimedia museum tour that guides the visitor through the 4 month of student protests in Mexico City comparing and contrasting it with other international student protests, shown in Figure 45, the revolutions and political changes around the world (fieldwork, Summer 2011) (Figure 45). Edited recorded testimonies, see Figure 46, from 57 individuals, multiple fragments of material from the cinema, radio, videos, photography, newspapers, magazines, and graphic designs related to the historical period composes the Memorial tour (Figure 46). International and national revolutionary images are depicted such as Che Guevara, Janis Joplin, Mao, María Sabina, Rosa Luxemburg and Carlos Monsivais is shown in Figure 47 (Figure 47). "A psychedelic installation stages the sixties in Mexico as a crossing and aesthetic global point: Vietnam, the barricades in Paris, the anti-colonial fights in Africa mix with Warhol, the Mexican hippies, the saying 'it is forbidden to forbid', and the soundtrack of 'Lucy in the Sky of Diamonds' (Huffschmid 2008, 6). Figure 48 shows this installation (Figure 48). It has no clear interpretations of what happened on October 2 or why, and it lacks any link to today's contemporary world.

Unfortunately the "memorial", that seems more so as an exhibition, does not engage in the debate of how many deaths and prisoners were taken by the state's organized secret police and military. "The principal aim of the Memorial '68 is to trace the student movement in Mexico from July to October 1968, and its relation to other student movements around the world; but it is not about the killing of Tlatelolco nor for its' victims itself" (interview with Cyntia Velazques, director of Educational Services in the CCUT, June 2011). The only strong evidence of the killing
Figure 45. Memorial exhibitions with other international student protests, revolutions and political changes around the world. (Photo by the author 2012.)

Figure 46. Testimonies from well-known Mexican academics, politicians and writers related to the ‘68 student movement. (Photo by the author 2012.)
Figure 47. International and national revolutionary images are depicted such as Che Guevara, Janis Joplin, Mao, María Sabina, Rosa Luxemburg and Carlos Monsivais. (Photo by the author 2012.)

Figure 48. Psychedelic instalation in the Memorial '68. (Photo by the author 2012.)
is a very long video with fragments of interviews, pictures, and video documentation showing how the military entered the plaza and started shooting followed by images of semi naked arrested young women and men and some dead bodies (including the famous picture of a young boy of about 12 years old). A compilation of these pictures is shown in Figure 49 (Figure 49). The pictures have been widely published on local and international newspapers as well as online archives and digital journals.

Since the video lasts so long (about 5 hours), hardly anybody stops to watch it all, so visitors will only appreciate some of its fragments while walking through the tour.

The video is shown in different televisions and sometimes shown next to other videos that complement the information given in the main video during the exposition. Figure 50 shows a photograph of this video where these 2 images are shown at the same time (Figure 50). The video contains "a multiplicity of narratives, edited fragments of talks with 57 characters, all of them activists or at least privileged testimonies. Today all of them are bureaucrats or academics, journalists or writers, with some relation to the public politics or political parties, some also are members of the Comité del 68" (Huffschmid 2008, 6).

6 It is interesting to note that not much has been written about the women's role in the 1968 student movement. Writers usually identify the leaders as men, privilege their narratives and memories, and associate reason and planning with their actions. Although some of the traces of feminism in Mexico started to sprout in the 1960's and more specifically during the student movement (with smoking and minifalda (shortskirt) being symbols of revolution); still today women's narratives are usually associated with the emotional and their practical service duties (making coffee) during the student movement. Anne Huffschmid (2008) mentions it in page 6, but for an outstanding account see Frazier and Cohen (2003) "Defining the Space of Mexico '68: Heroic Masculinity in the Prison and 'Women' in the Streets" Hispanic American Historical Review (83)4: 617 - 660.
Figure 49. Famous 1968 photographs shown in the video.

Figure 50. Video with testimonies and photographs in the Memorial ’68. (Photo by the author 2012.)
Institutionalization of Memory

"They [the CCUT's Memorial '68] never talk about the features of the real aggression, that of the genocide, the problem is not the quantity but the target. Therefore, here, it does not matter if they were hundreds or only thirty, but that of who was it aimed at, and that is what it gives it the character of genocide. Clearly, the significant characteristic of genocide is that the addressees were the students, that it was directly targeted to el pueblo (the popular people) and concretely to the popular organizations. Yes, because we were all members of popular organizations, it was an organized pueblo. There were railway worker organizations here and many syndicates. Many neighbors also supported the students [...] they were all sympathizers. This sympathy mobilized people even from outside Tlatelolco, even in a national level, because there were many delegations that came from distant different places to support the students."

- Roberto Tello (interview, July 2011).

"Poor Mexico, so far away from God and so close to the United States"
- Popular Mexican Saying

The fight of social organizations such as the Committee of 68 and other social groups and individuals that have been investigating what really happened on October 2 has been a long process. The memories and investigations have slowly being incorporated into the official discourse and official memorializations. "For many years, thirty, forty years we didn't know exactly what had happened. What they did to us. There was a movement, there was a massacre and there was a forty-year search for the truth. And after some years, well, the truth started to appear" (D. Huerta cited in Richman and Diaz-Cortes 2008, Huerta was a high school student in 1968, today he is a renown writer and poet in Mexico).

One of the most documented pieces of work is the outstanding book from Aguayo (1998). Since 1968 the numbers of deaths, disappearances and prisoners have widely changed, the number of deaths has varied from twenty, to two hundred,
and up to two thousand people (Doye cited in Richman and Diaz-Cortes 2008). "In addition to the dead and wounded, almost three thousand leaders and activists were rounded up and taken to a military camp for interrogation. They were expeditiously tried, and three hundred were imprisoned at Lecumberri prison, some remaining until mid-1971" (information from the National Archives cited in Frazier and Cohen 2003, 625).

What is today known as the Guerra Sucia (Dirty War) started after the 1968 massacre of students and lasted up until the '80s. It's principal aim was to eliminate any social movement of political and armed opposition against the Mexican state. Many academics compare this Dirty War with other military and political social repressions in Latin America, many of these orchestrated from and greatly influenced by the White House in the USA (Funari and Zarankin 2006; Mychalejko 2009; and many others).7 Some academics argue that the Dirty War ended in 2000 with the presidential election of Vicente Fox, ending the 70 years of government by the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI, Revolutionary Institutional Political Party). Some others argue that today there is a new kind of Dirty War emerging from the Drug War that started in December 11, 2006 when the President Felipe Calderon declared war against the drug cartels: "The difference is that 40 years ago the victims were those who opposed the political regime that saw them as enemies, but today the enemy is anybody [everybody everywhere]" (López Villanueva 2012). Today

---

7 For example, the US Army School of the Americas has been greatly criticized in and outside the USA for training Latin American armies and diffusing and perpetuating oppressive discourses and violent actions.
about 60 million have died as a result of the drug war (Camil 2011)\(^8\). In 2011 after a 2 year analysis of only 5 states out of 32 entities in Mexico, Human Rights Watch documented 170 cases of torture, 39 forced disappearances, and 24 extrajudicial executions committed by the police and military officers that lay in impunity, and which victims were not linked to any organized crime (Otero 2011)\(^9\).

Following the promises made in his presidential campaign, the President Vicente Fox opened long closed and hidden archives related to the Dirty War post 68 arena. He created the Fiscalía Especial para los Movimientos Sociales y Políticos del Pasado (FEMOSPP, Special Prosecutor Office for Social and Political Movements of the Past). Also, the first government that official paid homage to the dead of the 68 was the Partido Acción Nacional (PAN, National Action Party) through the President Vicente Fox on October 2 in 2000. In 2002, Fox released "millions of military, police and intelligence files [...] The reality of trying to obtain those files, however, and use them in an investigation is a tremendously difficult task. The collections include no index. The archivists rely on internal, unpublished rules -- that seem to change frequently and without warning -- to decide what to release and what to deny. The process can frustrate even the most persistent researcher to the point of defeat" (Doyle 2006).

In July 2002, the PRI's ex-President Luis Echeverría Álvarez responded to the accusations of "genocide, homicide, injuries, [and] forced disappearances"

\(^8\) Today (May 11, 2012 at 10am) MilenioTV just announced that the number of deaths related to the war today is of 51,082 people. Another well-known magazine accounts 60,420 deaths classified by the government as either: "executions", "confrontations" or "homicides-assaults" (Mendoza Hernandez Zeta 2011).

\(^9\) It is important to note that this war is not only being fought my Mexican military and "intelligence" offices; the USA has greatly "aid" and contributed principally through the Plan Merida (Merida Initiative) launched in 2007.
made by the ex-leaders of the student movement of 1968 in the FEMOSPP court (Aranda and Petrich 2002). Also, the well known Proceso Mexican Magazine together with the U.S. National Security Archive, founded in 1985, launched in March 2, 2003 a project "to publish and disseminate to a wide audience newly-declassified documents about the United States and Mexico" (National Security Archive 2006).

Through this fragmented puzzle journalists and academics have delved into the duty of investigation. The first semi-official list can be identified on the Commemorative Placard inaugurated in 1993 on the Plaza of the Three Cultures. In 2003 a list of names was published with the ages and professions of each dead, made available by one of the Intelligence Agencies of Mexican Government (El Universal 2003). In 2006, another list was published, it confirmed 44 men and women from the archives of the Dirty War, 34 victims have been identified by name and 10 more remain unknown (Doyel 2006; see the three list of names in the Appendix A-C of this thesis). Although most names overlap, the three lists do not include the same number and names of people.

In October 2006, the FEMOSPP again accused the ex-President Luis Echeverría Alvarez of Genocide (Mendez 2006) and on November of that same year, the court ordered a warrant to apprehend Echeverría. He was not sent to jail due to his age (86 year old) and delicate health issues (Mendez Ortiz 2006). He started serving his condemned in his home. In 2007, as exposed in the previous section, the Memorial '68 was inaugurated by the UNAM in the CCUT. Figure 51 shows the inauguration with some of the members of the Committee 68 and Elena Poniatovska giving a speech (Figure 51). In 2008 more information was diffused due to the 40
Figure 51. Memorial ’68 Inauguration, Poniatowska is reading a speech while the ex-members of the Committee 68 stand besides the podium. (Poniatowska 2007).
year anniversary (see for example Arvizu 2008). Incredibly, in 2009 the ex-president Luis Echeverría Álvarez was exonerated from all his charges related to the killing of Tlatelolco, academics and journalists condemn this act as a "confirmation that 40 years after, the same political system that permitted the killing of Tlatelolco is still current in Mexico [...] there was genocide, yes, but not charges or guilty people...

[The lawyer is] mocking the living, because he kills for another 40 years (or maybe forever) the possibility that by confronting the past, we can at last find a way to establish a democratic system" (Camil 2009a). It seems as if the saying of "October 2, We Will Not Forget" has changed into "October 2, We Will Not Forfeit but We Will Not Condemn" (Camil 2009b).

In 2011 the Senate approved a new law that dictates October 2 a National Anniversary of those who "fought for democracy" on the Plaza of the Three Cultures in Tlatelolco in 1968, commanding that the flag must remain half-mast during that day to show National Mourning. The Parliamentary groups stated that they "will remember the victims without entering into the phenomenon of historical culpabilities" (Garduño and Méndez 2011). This act is considered to be the first national official acknowledgment by the Mexican state condemning the killing of student in 1968 (CNN 2011). The law states, "this date should be solemnly institutionalized to serve as a `permanent reminder' of what should not occur in a democratic system" (CNN 2011).

Today, no matter how many official commemorations or acknowledgments the government does, the living ghosts are starting to die. The president at the time of the killing of ’68 Gustavo Díaz Ordaz died in 1979; also Luis de La Barreda -judged
but never in prison- (Méndez 2008) Fernando Gutiérrez Barrios, and Moya Palencia who also were accused for committing crimes against humanity during the Dirty War already died (Becerril 2012a). Recently the ex Director of the Office of Federal Security and who was under the commands of Gutiérrez Barrios, Miguel Nazar Haro also known as "El Tigre" (The Tiger) died in January 2012. Nazar Haro was accused of disappearing young men and of personally torturing students, social fighters, 

\textit{guerrilleros} and all those who opposed the regime in 1968 and during the years of the Dirty War (Becerril 2012b; Cruz Martínez 2012). Nazar Haro also served as an undercover for the American CIA (Periódico La Jornada 2012). Just as Echeverría, in February 2004 the FEMOSPP accused Nazar Haro and was condemned for torturing, murdering and violating human rights was also absolved (Periódico La Jornada 2012; Becerril 2012a)\textsuperscript{10}. "Mexican society, Pablo Gómez insisted [Senator from the \textit{Partido Revolucionario Democrático} (PRD, Revolutionary Democratic Party), has not forgotten about neither the 68 nor about the Dirty War and not even about other atrocities, because 'the recent events keeps us remembering them' [we must investigate each case] 'not because of vengeance. It has to do with a right of memory, a right to know the reality of our country'" (Gómez cited in Becerril 2012a, my italics). In Mexico it is not about remembering but about not forgetting. It is present in every news headline and in every political campaign, but absent in legal matters and just actions and talks.

\textsuperscript{10} Nazar Haro in an interview in his home arrest once recounted: "'One time, when I already was Director of the DFS (Office of Federal Security), I had a couple of drinks. It was late into the night and I was driving through the Avenue \textit{Insurgentes}. I was driving in the wrong sense, and I saw the night lamps and started to fire at them because they were orange, reddish (communists!)' he narrated his story while laughing" (Castillo García 2012).
Not only the perpetrators have died but also many of the victims of the families of the victims. I can briefly mention the mysterious death of who was one of the leaders of the student movement in 1968, Florencio López Osuna "El Flaco" (The Skinny) who on December 2001 was found dead just a couple of days after the publication of inedited photographs from 1968 (Castillo, Bolaños and Herrerax 2001). Another example is the recent death (May 3, 2012) of the well-known fighter and activist Eduardo Valle "El Búho" (The owl). Among other accomplishments, he is widely remembered for his touching speech during the Marcha del Silencio (March of Silence) in September 13 of 1968: "We are aware that the governmental power can destroy us using its tanks and its soldiers. They can massacre the students and the pueblo (the people), but never, they will never be able to make us bow, they will never convince us to live our life gagged and kneeling down..."11 ("El Búho" cited in El Universal 2012). El Búho was arrested on October 2, 1968, taken to the Campo Militar no. 1 and then to the Lecumberri prison. He was imprisoned until 1971 (Redacción 2012). Son of a professor (mom) and a trailer driver (dad), during his life he served different political office jobs, he co-founded the Partido Mexicano de los Trabajadores (Mexican Workers Political Parties), he was a congress man, a journalist, and he even passed some time in the USA as a political refugee.

---

11 Original excerpt in Spanish: "...Somo conscientes de que el poder gubernamental puede destruirnos usando sus tanques y sus soldados, pueden masacrar a los estudiantes y al pueblo, pero nunca, nunca podran doblegarnos, nunca podran convencernos de que vivir amordazados y de rodillas es el camino al nuestro pueblo..."
Fixed Memory

The long struggle by many social groups to recuperate the fragments from the past and condemn what has happened to demand justice has been a heavy loaded duty. The ghosts from the past continue to haunt the present history of not only of Tlatelolco but of the entire nation. No matter how hard other groups have tried to alleviate the demands, both the perpetrators as well as the victims continue to be in constant struggle to rewrite what has happened. The constant interpretations and symbolic accretion of the past and through the physical spaces of Tlatelolco is still today in constant battle. Space continues to be important in the process and the politics to remember and create the collective memory. The textures, processes, and meanings of the Plaza are constantly used by different actors to represent and form the meanings and histories of the place and its identity. It reifies some identities (like the duty of the University to appropriate Tlatelolco's spaces or the state to commemorate a National Mourning Day) while denying further investigations, courts, or other memorialization spaces for the victims of the dreadful killing in Tlatelolco or for the years of the Dirty War. The debate whether the Killing contributed or not to the growth of a "democratic" space, or if it is still just a mirror of today's injustices continues. These groups insist to nail down into a space (whether on a Placard, inside a Memorial, or on the national flag one day per year) memory and its consequences.

Through this type of historical analysis (biography of a site) the different political actors and struggles can be identified into the creation of memorialization meanings and spaces. The uses of the past historical accounts in today's present
society change depending on who is or not claiming memory. This interpretation, although it aids towards the reading of landscapes beyond appearances and understand its different political representations and power struggles falls short in explaining the daily life relationship of the people that live and use that space. It also lacks an understanding of how personal or individual memory is produced and represented and how is space and memory experimented in a daily base. It focuses on different official representations trying to show the "truth". This historical analysis informs who, how and by whom memory in social and physical spaces is represented, but how are those haunted spaces lively experimented by ghosts of the past? What do those ghosts want to communicate? How can they or we rest? Should they or we rest? How do we encounter or not and feed or not the ghosts of the present and of the past? What should we do with those who are still alive? What can we do or not with Don Carlos or Roberto the musician, or the Memorial or with the 51,082 bodies (and counting) left behind by today's war?

Today the simple walking through the spaces of Tlatelolco will bring up the ghosts of the '68; ephemeral graffiti on its halls and walls of military and '68 related images, together with taggings and chalk sayings on the floor of the Plaza of the Three Cultures reading: *Ni perdón. Ni Olvido* (Neither to Forget nor Forgive) next to a drawing of dead bodies makes the memory emerge, divagate and wonder off...
CHAPTER 4

Unofficial Memory

I remembered the BANOBRA S building as a ruin full of graffiti prints and broken glasses haunting the dramatic spaces of Tlatelolco with its somber pyramidal guise looking down. As I hopped off the Metrobus line on the stop of Manuel González, before entering Tlatelolco, I stood right in front of the eerie structure on the footbridge that crosses over the Avenue of Insurgentes taking some photographs for my thesis fieldwork. As I started walking from the first section towards the second and the third I continuously stopped to take more pictures, record random sounds or live ambulant musicians, and chat with several people around. I frequently sat down on the benches whenever there was an open space, bought different kinds of spicy peanuts or chips from the street vendors or in the tienditas (small shops) and drank a coke while listening to other peoples’ conversations. On the corridors, inside and on the entrance of each building, shop, or commercial space, small groups of women and men talked and gossiped about politics, stories, and other rumors, while other lonely people like me just stared and watched what was going around us.

Young boys and girls played soccer or basketball in the courts of the first section, people rushed in and out of the metro in the second section, and some wondering tourists glanced inside the archeological site or read the '68 placard on
the Plaza of the Three Cultures in the third section. In each newspaper kiosk, people gathered around buying the last minute news or their traditional newspaper or magazine. Men and women walked their dogs and gardeners swept and cleaned the greens spaces while couples cuddled in the benches and lawns scattered around all the sections of the Unidad (housing complex). Many different people walked through and used the corridors of Tlatelolco, street vendors had slowly appropriated many of the open spaces selling things like used clothes and shoes, food such as tamales and chips, and copies of music and dvds from the black market\textsuperscript{12}. Every now and then homeless individuals sat and roamed the spaces of Tlatelolco, I overheard and later someone told me that it was normal to see them; they resembled "dirty" ghostly like phantoms circulating around the complex without causing any trouble or raising any surprise.

As I started to move outside the orangey decaying mazelike corridors, entering the comidas corridas (economic kitchens) and other little beauty salons, papelerias (office stores) or food stands still inside the Unidad I continued to observe more places: a lack of lightning on almost all the corridors, old maps and announcements of buildings that were not even there anymore (such as the Banobras building or the Ministry of Cultural Affairs) were covered with other advertisements or graffiti tagging. Some of these graffiti taggings can be seen in Figure 52 where a past announcement containing a map of the complex and some information has been covered with graffiti and other announcements (Figure 52).

\textsuperscript{12} Something very common in all the popular streets and markets of Mexico.
Figure 52. Old maps in the housing complex. (Photo by the author 2011.)
Also past announcements, shown in Figure 53, of other buildings such as the SRE and the Banobras that are not there anymore have been painted and far from being removed (Figure 53). Some other places were full of garbage, tagging and graffiti reminding the '68 repression, and random waste such as a couch, a needle or even shoes on some hallways and parking lots - fragmented found objects. For example, Figure 54 has images of graffiti related to the 68 killing (Figure 54). Meanwhile people going to work or kids rushing to eat and getting their last minute materials or dropping out clothes or shoes to get fixed moved around the housing complex. Families circulated in and out of the hospital clinics while children played and passed their day inside and outside the schools and recreational spaces. As eternally staring the daily movement, enormous colorful murals, shown in Figure 55, depicted some of the walls of Tlatelolco (Figure 55). Some of these dynamic places, which around 5pm many where closing and cleaning up, were side by side to other gloomier abandoned haunted spaces, next to other corridors that took me to some out of sight areas where you could encounter other types of material historical artifacts breathing traces of the past.

By walking around and exploring the social and physical spaces of Tlatelolco I encountered different fragments that took me to trespass different spatio-temporal thresholds of the present and of the past that forced me into experiencing different kinds of heterotopias. I currently found myself trapped in between twilight zones. Walking through the urban porosities (Stavrides 2010) of Tlatelolco becomes a subjective exploration of the Unidad’s diversity and communality, and of its public and private spaces; "which shows the complexity of how one gets to know this city,
Figure 53. Old announcements of offices that are not even there anymore. (Photo by the author 2011.)
Figure 54. Graffiti related to the ’68 repression. (Photo by the author 2011.)
Figure 55. Murals in Tlatelolco. (Photo by the author 2011.)
its inhabitants, its buildings, and its everyday life" (Studio Beirut 2006). Certain unwritten "rules of navigation" arise influenced by every particular moments of time (Studio Beirut 2006).

On one of my urban explorations I met a food vendor that told me that if I wanted to know everything about Tlatelolco I should read the local newspaper titled Vivir en Tlatelolco (Living in Tlatelolco), this recommendation emerged several times with different people. Later, as I got to meet and know more neighbors, I was invited to attend a workshop of memory that was going on in the University Cultural Center of Tlatelolco (CCUT) organized by a couple of artists whom titled themselves Memoria Migrante (Migrant Memory). This local monthly publication and the workshop of memory influenced how I perceived and experience the different heterotopias of Tlatelolco: their individual and historical memory (Halbwachs 1997) and their personal and social recollection of memories (Till 2006), through their fragmented experiences and stories, influenced my individual (Halbwachs 1997) and personal (Till 2006) memory and my imaginary of the past and present of the Unidad.

As I read the official history of Tlatelolco and heard the unofficial stories and memories related to its spaces I started to be haunted in certain places as I trespassed Tlatelolco’s porous spatio-temporal heterotopias. Within these twilight zones of physical and invisible presences, I was not necessarily hunting for something specifically, but I started to search out why or from where these ghosts came from and slowly embodied their needs and desires.
These material haunted spaces became a terrain that retained other unofficial memories, unexplored *unmarked sites* (Tyner et. al 2012) and *accidental monuments* (Studio Beirut 2006) in the urban public and private spaces of Tlatelolco, hiding and showing traces of the past.

**Personal Individual Memory**

It is widely written and told that memory is found in specific sites and commemorative spaces, in the "*lieux de mémoire*" (Nora 1989, 1992), places of memory that tell you the historical account of what happened in that place (discussed in Chapter 3). But these other spaces that I encountered during some ephemeral visits to Tlatelolco were fragments of some other non-official memories that recounted other stories. While individual memory is related to emotions, impressions and affections linked to a singular experience; a historical memory is that of reconstruction of information given in the present social life and projected to that of the past (Halbwachs 1997). Individual memory has become a new object of research since any kind of memory, even a very personal one, has a relation with other notions of space, people, groups, places, dates, ideologies and the material and moral life of a society (Halbwachs 1994, 38). Till deepens on the idea of the individual memory as a personal memory, "described in terms of screens of images or fleeting sensations triggered unexpectedly by experience in the present or through dreams" (2006, 330). Personal memory is considered "less coherent in temporal structure and content than is social memory, which is structured by narrative (through myths, histories and stories)" (Till 2006, 330). All kinds of
memories can be studied like fragments: concrete, individual, historical, personal, and social memory because they create different representations and through them, and with other pieces of our imagination, we make up the meanings or non-meanings of our life.

The fragmented past and story telling concepts of Hannah Arendt can relate to those conceptions of history and narrative from Walter Bejanmin (Herzog 2000). They believed that the past is fragmented and that only through the fragmented writing in the form of stories can help in the representation of the ruins of today's present. Story telling according to them does not commemorate the dead, but only show their absence and invisibility (Herzog 2000, 1). The stories of Living in Tlatelolco and of the memory workshop are made up of fragmented memories of the past and are a threshold (a window) into the understanding and representations of today's present.

Till identifies two ways of looking upon memory, one that analyzes how individuals make meaning through remembering, and another one that argues that "the relationships between an event, its representation and participants' experience of it are far from straightforward" (Till 2006, 331). The scholars interested in this second way are concerned in the role dreams, fantasy, repression and unconscious processes that create knowledge about the past and the present, and identify the failure or gaps in how memory is transmitted and through what technologies, and how these work socially (Till 2006, 331). These are related to the psyche and become central to understand how memory is mediated and transmitted in both a personal and a social type of representation. So, by using fragments of the local monthly
publication Living in Tlatelolco and the stories of the workshop of memory from Migrant Memory I will expose different kinds of memories trying not only to make meaning of today's situations, but also to write about and show the different spatio-temporal heterotopias experienced today inhabited by ghosts, these present absent invisibilities.

**Vivir en Tlatelolco**

"Why did we come up with the idea? It has to do with several things. I started noticing that things here in the Unidad started to change they started to decay. I'm talking about things such as the green spaces for example and other situations. Tlatelolco only existed in the mass media whenever there was alarming news, whenever there was negative things going on, and us, the tlatelolcans did not have any means to communicate between us or to the outside [...] There was a lot of misinformation and confusion in Tlatelolco” (interview with Antonio Fonseca, director of Living in Tlatelolco, June 2011).

Countering the exalted linear narrative that thresholds and mass media has tried to impose to Tlatelolco and fighting against the silencing of other historical accounts of the urban complex, a counter project appeared in the public space of Tlatelolco. Since 2007, but with a non-official smaller version since 2004, a local publication emerged titled **Vivir en Tlatelolco** (Living in Tlatelolco), with a recently added subtitle of **Periodismo Comunitario** (Community Journalism). The monthly publication consists of 980 copies and comes out once a month. It is only distributed among the newspapers kiosks and some papelerias (office stores) inside the housing complex, and it has a cost of $3 pesos (less than a quarter). The newspaper or magazine describes itself as, this can be seen in Figure 56 (Figure 56):
Figure 56. Objectives of the publication *Vivir en Tlatelolco* (Living in Tlatelolco). (Photo by the author 2011.)
VIVIR EN TLANELOLCO busca contribuir al mejoramiento de la calidad de la vida de la zona, frenar su deterioro y promover una ciudadanía con pensamiento crítico, que ejerza plenamente sus derechos y obligaciones.

LIVING IN TLANELOLCO seeks to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life in the area, stop its deterioration and promote critical thinking citizenry, to fully exercise their rights and obligations.

Inspired on the ideas of the Brazilian Felipe Pena de Oliveira (1999) Vivir en Tlatelolco defines community journalism as a way to oppose journalism destined to mass media communication and a tool for social mobilization that serves the demands of the citizens. The anthropologist Migue Angel Márez Tapia who is part of the Committee of Collaborators of the publication states:

although community journalism centers its attention to a local space, the social mobilization variable uncovered by Pena de Olivera empowers and transcends print and digital community journalism, not only because it creates a bridge of dialogue about daily life and immediate necessities, but because it also makes communitarian collective action possible in other broader dimensions of society all the way up to a global scale. It mobilizes ideas and it shares ideas. Community journalism becomes a stage to fill the empty holes that mass media communication leave out, and it is a way to democratize information access. (Márez Tapia 2011).

The publication's first concern was the physical printed copy; a blog with an online copy and a Twitter account appearance is recent. It is sold inside the housing complex and one of their first objectives was to make it an open inclusive project, open for anyone who wanted to participate in it. To avoid writing and reading the publication only by themselves (by the committee) they added a space for people to publish letters or articles about almost any theme related to Tlatelolco. Most of the themes have been related to Tlatelolco's daily life, its history, myths, events, or about the life of specific people related to the housing complex such as politicians or activists. It is very common to find stories related to the '68 killing and the '85
earthquake. Some of these collaborations demanded a change in the housing complex, while others just narrated an event; for example, some of them have been about suicides in Tlatelolco, illegal dog fights, Mexico City’s urban history, urban renovations inside the complex, the presence of trash and noise, social events, or of economic situation of the housing inhabitants. Figure 57 shows some examples of the front pages of Living in Tlatelolco (Figure 57). "This part of community journalism has been very important. In this part we only publish letters sent to us by the neighbors, sometimes half of the magazine is only letter, sometimes is less than that, it varies a lot" (interview with A. Fonseca, one of the main directors of the publication, June 2011).

Some of the themes of the local publication I could identify are:

PhotoReports (where people send their own photographs denouncing irregularities or disruptions of public space); Origins, History, and Memories of Tlatelolco's past / Historical Events (these are more serious with some research articles romanticizing the past, almost all come with images that cannot be acquired easily and they can go as far as the Aztec époque and up to the Spanish colonial times); Community ideals and debates (referring to what should the population do or not); Environmental issues (many related to the daily hazards such as dog poo on the streets or trash separation in the form of recycling); Violence and Insecurity / Police Presence (dealing from new security cameras in the neighborhood, illegal dog fighting or police captures of bandits in the neighborhood); Building Infrastructure (urban renovation and other myths and legends such as stories that the government wants to displace people or demolish buildings); Gossiping, Neighbor letters and portraits
Figure 57. Some of the front pages of the publication *Vivir en Tlatelolco* (Living in Tlatelolco). (Photo by the author 2011.)
(to create that sense of community); Relationships with "the outside" (usually referring to the Cultural Center, urban projects such as the Metrobus, the government, or people that do not live in Tlatelolco); and other Spaces. Today the newspaper now also has a Blog and a Twitter, and other several Facebook pages have opened in the last few years all remembering and reconnecting idealized and romanticized the spaces of Tlatelolco.

The Committee of Collaborators also made a space at the back of the publication titled *Gente de la Unidad* (People from the Complex) and it contains picture portraits of 6 or 8 random people with their names and sometimes a sentence of whatever that person said or was doing in the moment of being photographed in the complex. See Figure 58 for 2 examples (Figure 58). This tactic, according to Antonio Fonseca the director of the publication, was an attempt to make people buy the publication because there was a published picture of someone they might know. Even though they say they do not print any anonymous articles or letters, they do have a section of anonymous gossip and rumors; maybe this is to make it more attractive or to make people send some information or investigate about those themes. Many of the articles also have to do with *grilla política*, which means disqualifications and idealization of different political parties. "What we are looking for is that a dialogue exists, what kind of a dialogue? One that it is not monolithic but plural, and that it has to do with the problems of this area. We have been polishing all these ideas throughout time, if you see the first numbers, there are some things that should not be there, that are outside of our editorial line."
Figure 58. *Gente de la Unidad* (People from the Complex) at the back of the publication *Vivir en Tlatelolco* (Living in Tlatelolco). (Photo by the author 2011.)
"What we do] is an exercise to practice democracy" (interview with A. Fonseca, June 2011).

Through the practice of the creation of the subtitle of "Community Journalism", the local monthly publication attempted to imagine a community maybe related to an utopist character, in many ways it resembles the discourse that the urban housing project of the early 1960's tried to produce. The discourse also focuses on the ideas of cohabitation and on the creation of an urban space based on the shared memories and histories through the fragments of pictures and stories that the neighbors produce:

The publication should be an instrument to mobilize its habitants, and consolidate itself as an information portal that takes place in the space we live in; it is a dialogue about the claims and demands in a place. Finally, it registers the memory of the habitants of the community, there where a shared history is expressed and that it has been constructed in its own interior. *Vivir en Tlatelolco* will be consolidating itself towards this direction, it is a collective work, a creation and recreation of all the *tlatelolcans*, a work that is part of a longer trajectory of a diverse ray of resistance, civic and communitarian publications of the past in our housing complex, a duty that we can all belong to (Márez Tapia 2011).

Some of the articles and reportages of *Vivir en Tlatelolco* are focused on individual experiences and can be analyzed as stories that have "not been explicitly experienced as collective experience [they are] a conscious evocation of the past, so it is as different from the process of involuntary memory as from that of voluntary memory, which presents an incomplete image of the past" (Herzog 2000, 16). The residential practice of participating, reading and being involved with the newspaper creates the imaginary social and physical borders of Tlatelolco, a heterotopia, and in many of its stories it convokes the absent presences of the past. This, together with the practice of the publication and auto-descriptive expressions such as "community
journalism" creates an imaginary community congregating as well as segregating the people in Tlatelolco and those not part of Tlatelolco. These borders are sometimes created through storytelling, they are also a fragmentation of what has happened or of what is happening in the public space of Tlatelolco. "The storyteller's attempt to seize time, referring to entire history perceived from its end [...] stories are the only way to represent the fragmentary nature of individual life, which fights and collapses between past and future, and later reappears crystallized" (Herzog 2000, 8-9).

The local publications *Vivir en Tlatelolco* is always open for locals to write their points of view in relations to the history, identity, daily life, and projects of Tlatelolco. There are articles most of the time romanticizing the past and express strong critical points of view to certain projects that produce change or that are considered as "exterior" such as the Cultural Center or the Metrobus new line bus. Through the use of history and immediate denunciation reports, the local publication *Vivir en Tlatelolco* has re-appropriated time and space and tries to create awareness of the public spaces and non-official and alternative hidden histories of Tlatelolco. These new cultural practices, are directly concerned with remembering the modern golden time of Tlatelolco and creating a more "civic" "community" life. The local publication, and those who call themselves *tlatelolcans* become cultural producers that have thrown themselves into reinventing (because not all are original habitants of Tlatelolco) / or rediscovering both their "origins", and their urban public spaces, trying to recreate the golden times and the original *tlatelolcans* through their memories, stories and myths related to the past. Through fragments of these stories ghosts are remembered and recreated.
Memoria Migrante

"I am not a melancholic, I am not motivated by a romantic vision of the past, I do not think that the past was better or worst, no no no... [...] I started to work with oral histories of people in the south, in Mexico City, and I started to recognize the maps' ghostly territory that I repeatedly encountered" (interview with Genaro, one of the organizers of Memoria Migrante, July 2011). Genaro affirms: "the act of going to the past from non-official sources is for me an ideological proposal in which I believe, support and practice that the human being vision is extremely important and it is a defense towards the contemporary totalitarian regimes" (interview, July 2011).

Motivated by his curiosity to work with memory, find common interests, identify biases and challenges, question believes, and find common cliché places in order to find where are we "wasting life" and where are we "contributing to life"; Genaro together with Melina created the project of Memoria Migrante (Migrant Memory).

Memoria Migrante is defined as "a project of oral history, art and ambulant cultural encounter; it constructs, articulates and moves itself throughout Latin America. It starts under the conviction that the construction of our individual and social identities is not possible without the exercise of memory. It opens a space to a utilizable past, constructed by and for the community in order to relate personal experience with a collective one" (Final Presentation M.M. and CCUT 2011). Genaro explains their name of Migrant Memory because memory migrates, it goes from one place to another place, "we recognize that we all come from a place and that we all are going to another place, and that we should if we want to, we have the right to,"
arrive and take a space [...] We share the idea that these spaces are not only for the citizens but they are of the citizens and they can be used not only by the inhabitants of the area but by inhabitants of all the city. Tlatelolco [in its pre-Hispanic times] was a place where people came from all over, it was a very important trade and cultural center, today this cultural center [the Univeristy Cultural Center (CCUT)] is attempting to strength this part in relationship with society, and that is what really interested us" (interview with Genaro, July 2011).

In this way, space is there for the use of all, for the city, for it to be re-appropriated through memory and by identifying the ghostly territories that map our existence. "We are not interested in working with the truth but the voices and presences of all the persons is necessary. You [Gabriela] have heard how every person in the workshop has its own experience, and we have heard many different versions of the same event; therefore, we are interested in the myths, in the legends, everything has a reason and we believe that all that should be part of the people and not of the official history". Memoria Migrante works with the daily life spaces, with the people that define themselves as tlatelolcan:

they identify 'the other' that who has 'recently' arrived [...] everybody has been greatly traversed and marked by the '68 and the earthquake [in '85]. You [Gabriela] saw it when we started talking about their 'origins' of how they had arrived. We are interested in knowing who they are but also who they wanted to be, and what is what they have attempted to do. We believe that the fights of the defeated are as important as the fight of the victorious. The phantom fights that have been lost but there is a continual attempt to recuperate, [a fight to have] the right to recuperate those spaces. When people talk about themselves they cannot avoid talking about those events (interview with Genaro, July 2011).

The workshop's main attempt was to create a material archive of memory through transcribed audios of interviews, sounds and thematic talks and images
from photographs, letters, IDs or whatever other artifact that could be related to a memory of Tlatelolco. The participants of the workshop were there because they answered to a public announcement from the Cultural Center (CCUT) to be part of the group free of charge and participate in the workshop titled was: Historias de la vida cotidiana: Memoria y Fotografía (Stories of daily life: Memory and Photography). Once inside the group everybody had to sign a letter giving copyright to all the material to the Cultural Center. It was organized along an audiovisual component, each member had to do several interviews and bring any kind of visuals that could be related to a memory of Tlatelolco. Many people interviewed their neighbors, or habitants that had been there from a long time ago and took old photographs that related to their private and public lives in Tlatelolco. Some of the photographs included their children playing in the public spaces of Tlatelolco, their fist steps in the halls of the housing complex, or other important events in their life. The pictures and other artifacts were scanned and given back to each donator. Figure 59 shows some examples of some of these photographs (Figure 59). The workshop was also organized through a series of thematic talks, which were all recorded. These talks were about: their origin in Tlatelolco, their experience in the '85 earthquake, the neighbor organization before and after the '85 earthquake, public spaces, games and free time in Tlatelolco. The themes were chosen as a group, but the artists slightly influenced the decision because they propose most of the themes.
At the end of the workshop they produced a pamphlet reproducing some of the recuperated pictures and excerpts of the interviews and recordings. The pamphlet had as an introductory note:

Thanks to the fact that we have a language and that our word recuperates a specific or proper culture that must not be lost, and that it permits us to integrally comprehend the world in which we live, during 3 months, the University Cultural Center Tlatelolco (CCUT) in coordination with Memoria Migrante (Migrant Memory), made the Taller Memoria y Fotografía: Historias de la vida Cotidiana en Tlatelolco (Memory and Photographic Workshop: Daily life stories in Tlatelolco), in which it was constructed, together with the neighbors, a space of reflection around memory and with the intention to affirm the Tlatelolcan character and identity (Final Presentation M.M. and CCUT 2011).
This workshop can be analyzed as an effort to recuperate non-official memories and create a network by identifying oneself with the inhabited space and sharing with their neighbors events and important and daily life stories, an attempt to create a awareness of a community is being forged. *Memoria Migrante* invitation to participate in an exercise of memory in which each member of the workshop has to literally and physically "move around the architecture of their homes and look inside their drawers or closets, inside the old shoe box where the old photographs of the past have been stored, comment it to her husband or ask their grandparents for information... it is a recuperation of their life, a recreation of life, a questioning, a reflection that is shared in a group" (interview with Genaro, July 2011). This working of memory and movement of memory is influenced by this group of artists Genaro and Melina who rather than treat their participants as spectators, they make them go out into the housing complex' public and private spaces and contemplate their spaces as an inhabited place and consider "how the unfolding and open-ended pathways of memory might offer possibilities of shared belongings" (Till 2012, 5). This pathway of belongings creates multiple pasts in which Genaro and Melina hope to construct possible futures.

**Unmarked Sites and Accidental Memorials**

As I read more and more things on the pages of *Vivir en Tlatelolco*, assisted the meetings of *Memoria Migrante* and talked with local people I started experiencing the spaces of Tlatelolco in a different way. I started to identify a series of unmark sites (Tyner et. al 2012) and accidental monuments (Studio Beirut 2006) containing
traces of the past. The unmark sites of past violence went from the displacement of more than one hundred families to create the housing complex, the army and secret police hunting down the students in 1968 beyond the plaza, and the enormous physical and social changes suffered after the '85 earthquake among others. On the other hand the accidental monuments started to become even more visible than just graffiti and tagging related to the '68, but to abandonment and disuse of important spaces of what once was the most modern housing complex in Mexico City. Some of these accidental monuments inclusively had a decaying mark of information hinting the observer of what once monumentally laid there.

Unmarked sites of memory laid everywhere. As I walked through the housing complex, I could imagine the Aztecs fighting for their land against the Spanish armada just as narrated in the pages of Vivir en Tlatelolco. The smell of dead bodies under the bridge that crosses from section 2 to section 3 from the '85 earthquake recounted by Anita during one of the thematic talks of Memoria Migrante penetrated the nostrils of my imagination. The sound of students jumping into the garbage dumpsters of the building trying to escape the army committing suicide from the stories heard in some of my talks inundated my ears. In my mind, the green spaces of Tlatelolco were full of people from the Unidad and from adjacent neighborhoods camping after the earthquake of '85 negated to go back inside because of fear or because their homes were destroyed.

The other fragmented spaces seemed haunted and had traces of other stories; forgotten memories left for days, years or decades under the moon, the shiny sun and rainy days. These slowly vanishing spaces where loosing their color
and their materials that had started to tear down and peal off. The skeletons of what used to be an enormous bakery, shown in Figure 60, laid covered with broken glass still hiding some of its original announcements and utensils, see Figure 61 and 62, such as a cahier and other materials inside (Figure 60, 61 and 62). An old dirty smelly cinema, shown on Figure 63, was rotting and barely stood up was the home of some guys that passed their day asking for money on the entrance of the metro (Figure 63). Figure 64 shows some abandoned parts of the old cinema (Figure 64). What in the past used to be commercial spaces were now being forgotten, Figure 65 pictures what has been left back locking up a ruined emptiness behind the bars (Figure 65). A wallpaper of posters, announcements and advertisements covered the walls in between these rotting spaces: offering services, searching for lost dogs, promoting music concerts, claiming social demands next to old political propaganda among other themes flooded the wall, many with orthographic errors. The graffiti and tagging condemning the '68 killing as well as the men that stood on the commemorative placard were already integrated within the familiarity of the neighbors. The un-useful maps and names of what used to be the emblematic buildings in Tlatelolco could still be spotted on the corridors of Tlatelolco, announcing and mapping what was not there anymore.

**Thresholds and Heterotopias**

Past and present share and intertwine the same walls, they create new mazes made of fragments of other stories. The fragmented individual, collective, historical and concrete memories of Tlatelolco can be seen as a process of decay and ruin where
Figure 60. Bakery skeleton. (Photo by the author 2011).

Figure 61. Original utensils and old cahier inside the abandoned bakery. (Photo by the author 2011).
Figure 62. Bakery olds materials seen through the broken glasses. (Photo by the author 2011).

Figure 63. Cinema skeleton. (Photo by the author 2011.)
Figure 64. Cinema old spaces. (Photo by the author 2011.)

Figure 65. Old commercial spaces. (Photo by the author 2011.)
"the old is made new in this fragmentary recovery of the past... a present past" (Herzog 2000, 7). Through the identification and encounters of fragments, I try to reconstruct the social and physical construction of Tlatelolco; trying to identify and analyze the competing representations of memory and the "other" unofficial or hidden histories and social relationships of Tlatelolco. By finding these local projects, fragmented stories and other narratives in Tlatelolco I began imagining the urban public space of Tlatelolco differently. The recognition of other projects, stories and history show the simultaneous coexistence of other stories, memories and histories imprinted and hiding in space.

*Vivir en Tlatelolco* and *Memoria Migrante* both privilege the local daily narratives of the people in the neighborhood and sometimes they are also romanticizing the historical past of Tlatelolco and continuing the idea of "us" vs. "them" the outside. Unconformity, injustices and traumas, however, never disappeared, and still up to this date there seems to be a necessity for discussion and understanding. This can be seen in the amount of articles and letters about that time in the publication and on the continuous recounting and returning to that past to try to understand or uncover it by the workshop. Both projects are in the search of what Benjamin calls "remembrance (*Eingedenken*)", "a voluntary focus on the traces of history [...] Remembrance does not transform the repressed into non-repressed, or 'commemorate' the repressed as the victorious part of history [...] Remembrance shows the repressed - the defeated and the dead - as absence in collective memory. It deciphers the traces of history as if they were symbols,
symptoms of the holes of history - holes of memory; it shows these holes as holes" (Herzog 2000, 16). These projects believe that by creating memory and a shared past they can contribute to the amelioration of the present; thus, stories are see as a tool of "illumination" of "dark times" creating a political condition, believing that stories can "save the world" creating a "political effect" (Herzog 2000, 17, referring to the ideas of Hannah Arendt on stories).

Walking through the corridors, roaming around abandon spaces, and exploring the urban spaces through the eyes of the newspaper and the workshop of memory made me aware of a series of heterotopias and haunted spaces that connected while disconnected through physical and historical thresholds in Tlatelolco's wounded space. The ghosts I encountered in these haunted spaces drew me into looking at a failed project of the modern urban housing complex, far from being the clean, organized, functional and utopist space Panni once dreamed of, the complex was a dynamic space hiding many of the most terrifying events of Mexico's modern history. These haunted spaces made me not only think of the past and present ghosts of Tlatelolco, ghosts that have not left our public collective imaginary, but on the daily dozens of deaths Mexico is today experiencing in this war against drug cartels. Are the neighbors and Mexican citizens becoming living dead trapped in a veil of familiarity or indifference? Or are people still fighting the same fights of yesterday? At the same time, the continuous identification of "the other" and the desire to produce community values is very present both in Living in Tlatelolco as well as in Migrant Memory, why is there a necessity or desire to underline and create this? Isn't that what many people are also fighting against from?
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

There is a single emotion floating here in the air, an emotion that heats all of our souls. It's the phantoms, comrades, the phantoms of the '68 generation; it's the phantoms that fought to open the doors to a combative and new Mexico. And here they are, today, with us.

- Paco Ignacio Taibo II, Mexican writer and novelist, in the Plaza of the Three Cultures during the meeting of Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador (left-wing presidential candidate) with thousands of university students in May 21, 2012.

Facing the pain that the nation is living, facing the daily laceration that is becoming day by day more profound, we do not know how many deaths we have, almost 60 thousand, 20 thousand disappearances, 150 thousand displaced, and deaths and decapitations every day. In front of the pain that it is the face of the nation, I would like us to stand up and to dedicate one minute of silence to our pain, to the pain of so many deaths and of so many families...

The nation is fractured, it is not polarized; and it is broken up into pieces in each of its fractures...

- Javier Sicilia, Mexican poet and creator of the Movement for Peace with Justice and Dignity, in the 1st Summit of Citizens for a Peaceful and Just Mexico where leaders from 300 social organizations met to work out several citizen proposals that were given to the four presidential candidates, in May 21, 2012.

Every day dozens of dead bodies inundate Mexican citizens' imaginations. In the public and social spaces of Mexico, people are dying. The fractured spaces of Mexico are wounded. People and communities try to keep up with the many deaths and injustices they have suffered and carried along generations. Just as the Plaza of the Three Cultures was once bloodstained, Mexico's public spaces are everyday also experiencing the same pain of deaths and disappearances. Everywhere, fragmented
stories slide through the fissures of our imagination. Stories that become bridges to connect to other stories of pain and thunder, other wounded spaces created through mental and material constructions. These thresholds and traumatic events perforate boundaries and transport us to different spaces. Porosity is created through discontinuities that permit us to move towards other spatio-temporal heterotopic spaces. Within these other spaces, these twilight zones produced through material and mental thresholds, there are trapped representations, ghosts that inhabit these spaces and become the presences of those who are absent.

These wounded spaces should be analyzed by describing "the complex interface between bodies, memory, social groups and the lived city, and affect" (Till 2012, 9). These fragmented social and physical spaces, these incomplete stories and landscapes, which some might define and categorize as "decadent spaces" or unworthy or unaccountable persons are pieces of heterotopias that can be identified by analyzing the thresholds of the past and of the present. The way the state and individuals recalls its past; how and why they do it; "how individuals relate to collectivities in constituting memory, history and identity; how time works individually and socially; and what role the psyche places in the process" (Till 2006, 331) is being today revisited to try to understand: the relationship between individual and social memory; the relationship between the past, the present and the future; and the creation of new forms and ways to heal those wounded spaces. Along this thesis I have tried to show these relationships through the analysis of the social and physical spaces of the housing complex of Tlatelolco and its official and unofficial memories.
Through this chapter I will try to discuss how the affective way of how we remembering or forget commonly creates an imaginary nostalgia for the past, as well as the way deaths are represented (either by naming or counting them) creates different sentiments towards how we might think or remember them. Then I propose that the fights are not only focused on a duty to remember but on a right to be remembered. These different processes of remembering and forgetting create thresholds that bring upon and connect with ghosts of the present and of the past. Through the ideas of nostalgia, counting and naming, a right to be remembered, and thresholds I try to show how all the fragments exposed throughout the past chapters connect in today's socio-political arena and how they are all part of the complex processes between bodies, memory, social groups, urban space and emotions and the creation of, and sometimes an attempt to heal, wounded spaces.

**Nostalgia**

The remembering and forgetting can be paired to life and death, as stated by Marc Augé, not only as "oblivion as a type of death, the life of memories" but also "death as another life, or death inseparable of life [...] these roles reign memory and oblivion: in one case death is in front of me and I must in the present remember that one day I will die, and on the other death is behind me, and I should live the present moment without forgetting the past that it inhabits" (Augé 1998, 10). In the second case "there is a hope, a memory, that gives a form to daily existence" (Auge 1998, 10). Augé investigates memory in the form of oblivion: we remember because we forget some things and we forget in order to live the present, through "the ways that
oblivion structures social life through the figures of return, suspense and starting over" (Augé explained by Till 2006, 332). Although Augé explores "African rites of possession, role reversals and initiations as social events that organize a passage from a before to an after" (Till 2006, 332); the continuously returning, re-living, embodying and going back to be in the "here" and "now" relates to how the different thresholds of Tlatelolco are remembered in the public and social spaces not only within the housing complex but beyond. It defines a process of remembrance through the traces and fragments of narrations and representations. Individual and social temporalities intersect and live in complex ways.

The personal and social stories related to Tlatelolco, even when fabricated, imagined or exaggerated can be seen, according to the ideas of Augé, produced by the act of memory and oblivion. It is interesting to note that the obsession with archives, commemorations, and the paranoia of following everything and recording all "presumes that the essence of memory rests in the act of recording and storage, rather than that of oblivion" (Stepnisky 2005). The memory traces an absence in the present, forever out of reach, that through individual and social process points out the absence and it takes form through different types of representations. The memories and stories are both at the same time individual and collective, they correlate each other through the "discordances of singular times and the expected concordance of their reconciliation in narratives with several voices" (Augé 1998, 23). In the first figure of oblivion, a type of possession exemplifies the act of return, "so the old habits and forms of life can be relived" (Stepinsky 2005). It is closely related to the feeling of nostalgia. Augé is determined to explain the "central
mechanisms of oblivion" which include the "nostalgia for a lost past, the ritual suspension of contact with past and future, and the pursuit of what he dubs "rebeginnings"" (Gardiner 2006, 2).

The nostalgia for a lost past is present in the stories related to Tlatelolco. Nostalgia is not "a pure sense of loss, nor is it the emotional self-indulgence of mere sentimentality" it also contains a "sense of belonging and familiarity, of identity and roots"; it is also a "sense of pleasure [...] the possibility of having an inherently contradictory experience" where one "can enjoy the present through the lens of the past as he (sic) simultaneously enjoys the past through the lens of the present" (Wilson 1997, 134-135). Through the fragments and stories encountered in the housing complex, in Vivir en Tlatelolco and in Memoria Migrante the narrations and places contained a nostalgia, an absence and lost relationships present in the social and physical spaces of the Unidad (housing complex). In many cases this nostalgia keeps being a lost past, to which it is continuously returned to, just to enjoy it, acknowledge its failures and then re-appropriate it in the present by remembering and sometimes by re-enacting it.

Counting and Naming

The threshold of the student movement created different heterotopias. The student movement shows a discontinuity of social order, an ephemeral appropriation of public space, and a re-identification with a national patrimony. "Ninety sixty-eight is the sudden rebeginning of an unorthodox public space, although only politically, and with the excessive cost of the killing of October 2" (Monsivais 2008). Many
academics, journalists and writers consider 1968 as a "turning point and a moral compromise because thanks to the kids of yesterday, today we are stronger, more resistant, and we took away some of its impunity to the power. We learned to denounce and resist. Agrarian and worker movements along the Mexican Republic recognize their debt to the 68" (Poniatowska 2012). But today the fight seems to continue; there are other injustices, other protests and other deaths.

October 2 was not the end of the struggle, those who stayed fought for the official recognition of the tragedy, for a just memory and for long years they combated not only to trial those responsible of the atrocity but also to give a dignified space in memory to those who where killed, disappeared and unjustly imprisoned. An important part of the fight still continues it has to do with the naming of the dead, to clean their death and dignify their identities. After the killing there has been many attempts to create a list of the dead, who where they? Poniatowska (1998[1971]) has been an important bastion through her recompilation of oral narratives and fragmented recollection of events that tried to reconstruct what really happened the night of October 2, and also many others have contributed to uncover the truth.

The humanization of the dead is not only a battle of the 1968 movement. Today, many individuals and social groups become the investigators and experts in Mexican "law" due to the inefficacies of the legal system in Mexico. Families and social groups investigate the killers or their loved ones and clear and dignify their
deaths by stating and showing how they were not related to any type of organized crime or drug cartel\textsuperscript{13}. Meanwhile, the government has:

systematically ignored national and international reports [...] that warn the systematic and generalized violation to human rights in the country with thousand of cases of extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, torture, and other human crimes [...] In 2011 more than 12 thousand people died - around 40 soldiers and 500 policemen-, and the majority of the cases are not investigated [...] According to the National Commission of Human Rights, today there are 8 thousand 898 cadavers in the morgues of the country that have not been identified, and there has been 5 thousand 397 people reported as missing since the start of the six year period [of the president Felipe Calderon] (Camacho Servín 2012).

International Amnesty reported that it has increasingly received notifications that the people that suffer such abuses have no relation to any organized crime or drug cartels, together with this, there are many Central America immigrants that have disappeared in Mexico, 9 journalists brutally murdered only during 2011 and many others threatened, and 20 human rights defenders have been also threatened and attacked (Camacho Servín 2012).

To combat the numbers, militant social groups have organized to investigate their individual deaths and take them to sometimes national and international courts. One social group that has focused to dignify their deaths and create awareness for a just and peaceful Mexico is the amazing effort Javier Sicilia has organized with the Caravan for Peace with Justice and Dignity that started about a year ago in 2011. In June 2011, Sicilia accomplished to meet with the president Calderon and some of the families of the victims of the drug war (Herrera Beltrán and Urrutia 2011). This group also recently accomplished a new \textit{Ley General de}

\textsuperscript{13} Some examples of how families become the investigators of crimes: Nepomuceno Moreno Núñez who was later murdered for finding out the killers of his son (Redacción Sin Embargo 2011), Javier Sicilia, Alejandro Martí, Isabel Miranda de Wallace and many more.
Víctimas (General Law of Victims) that, among other themes, grants the right to an integral damage compensation and legal, medical and economic assistance for those have been affected by military or police crimes or abuses. This law will also provide a national registry of victims and a permanent fund for an integral support and reparation and all this administration will be under the supervision of a National System of Victims in which social organizations of the civil society will be represented (Editorial 2012). The Caravan for Peace with Justice and Dignity is going to be traveling through the USA in August also to create awareness of a shared problem with the people of the USA (Huff Post 2012).

Another good example to humanize these tragedies and to create novel ways of talking and remembering the deaths have emerged such as the twitter account @TienenNombre (They have names) that has as a principal objective to name the victims of the violence in Mexico. They usually write the complete name, when and where they were found or murdered and who were they. It is an account from the group Contingente Mx which is a group that has as an objective to be a pacific manifestation for the human rights and organize and administer a series of actions and activities. Some of the twits from @TienenNombre are:

Esteban Francisco Casavo, 30 años, hondureño apuñalado en Medias Aguas #Veracruz mientras esperaba el ferrocarril.

Esteban Francisco Casavo, 30 years, Honduran stabbed in Medias Aguas #Veracruz while waiting for the train.

Teódulo Santos Girón, promotor de la recuperación de tierras en Ostula, Michoacán. Asesinado 16/05/12 bit.ly/JI92uy #LeyProteccion
Teódulo Santos Girón, promoter for the recuperation of fields in Ostula, Michoacán. Murdered 16/05/12 bit.ly/Jl92uy #ProtectionLaw

Donde esta Georgina, porque viva se la llevaron, viva la queremos #CarravanaForTheDignity #MarchaDignidad http://bit.ly/Jkr9VL via @JPNH01

Where is Georgina, because they took her alive, we want her back alive #CaravanaForTheDignity #DignityProtest http://bit.ly/Jkr9VL via JPNH01

(See more in the Appendix D)

The government (and many mass media) refers to the deaths generally as bajás colaterales (collateral damages) or that they were narcos (drug dealers) or belonged to the organized crime, and kind of justify their deaths by that. The problem talking about deaths as numbers and narcos is that there is a robbery and a un-legitimization of their identity. By calling them narcos, there is a de-state-tization of the person (See Melissa Wright’s work on justifying feminicides by calling them prostitutes or mujeres de la calle -public women-). This de-humanization of bodies and unjust killing and non-investigation of their cause of death (who and why they were murdered) is also a threshold in the sense of Agamben sites of exceptions, which refers to the idea that "the power to suspend the laws can belong only to the same power that produces them" and relates to the "unprecedented generalization of the paradigm of security as the normal technique of government" (Agamben 2005, 11-22). This de-legitimization of identity also occur during the 1968 student movement when the students were accused of being porros\(^\text{14}\), provocateurs, agitators or communists (not to mention the "threat" they were to the Olympic

---

\(^{14}\) A porro is a kind of irresponsible old-timer still in the university that likes to create chaos.
Games) and in post-68 through the non-investigation and illegal procedures during the Dirty War.

A Right To Be Remembered

"2 de Octubre, No se Olvida" (October 2, Will no be Forgotten) has been for more than forty years the claim passed from generation to generation related to the killing of 1968. More than a duty to remember there is a claim for it not to be forgotten. Those who still are involved in the memory of 1968 firmly state that the students and all those who were affiliated to them (syndicates, professors, and other sympathizers) opened a new space of protest against authoritarianism. Those who continued the fight, I would say that more than a right to remember fought for a right to BE remembered, to be named, and not to be a number or not even that. The state, by justifying death, denies the dead even to exist as a dead, or of being someone to be named or counted.

Suspense and Role Reversal through the Creation of Thresholds

"It is remarkable that the week that Fuentes dies and Poniatowska turns 80, there is a resurgence of young students fighting against injustices."
-Sergio Aguayo, academic and human right activist, in the 1st Summit of Citizens for a Peaceful and Just Mexico, in May 21, 2012.

Today, the defamation of social movements from the state authorities continues. During many years the '68 student movement was impinged with myths, legends and defamatory stories. For many years, the story that the students were armed tried to stay in the narrations recounting the official memory but the fight from social groups, specifically the Committee of 68 and the political race for power from
the ex president Vicente Fox\textsuperscript{15}, continuously fought for uncovering what really happened. Academics and writers see both the '68 movement as well as the uncovering of archives by Fox, an opening for new democratic venues in Mexico.

For more than 40 years the fight has continued, sometimes winning some battles while loosing sometimes others. Still today the phantoms of 1968 are still trapped in our imagination, they are summoned during some of the protests, they are present in the demands and claims in the public spaces and they are remembered beyond the night of October 2 in Tlatelolco. It is enough to look around and see the thresholds created today with the political election arena and the war against drug cartels in Mexico to see and feel their presence. These events are creating a series of heterotopias and ephemeral appropriations in space where differences meet and emerge not only as a threat but also maybe as a promise.

Today some students themselves and some media are calling the political powers (specifically today's ruling right wing political party the PAN and the old ruling party the PRI) the new representatives of authoritarianism behind a new type of Dirty War, and the young generation the new sixty-eighters protesters- which I do not know if I completely agree with calling the new generation a sixty-eighter one. In 2006 the governor at that time of the Estado de Mexico (Edomex, State of Mexico) Enrique Peña Nieto (today candidate for the presidency for the political party PRI) used police extreme brutality to combat "civil unrest" for people who defended their

\textsuperscript{15} Fox was the first president from the right wing political party the Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN, Political Party of National Action) after the political party PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional) had governed Mexico for more than 70 years without interruptions; one of his promises during his campaign was to uncover the secret archives of the Dirty War, after being elected he did uncover them. See Doyle 2006 among others.
fields against the imposition of building an airport in their land and their open support to the Zapatistas. Some of the police brutality is shown in Figure 66 (Figure 66). Also, since 2006 police and military abuses and murders from the president Felipe Calderon war against narcos has been national and internationally greatly criticized and contested by many groups. In Mexico there are many protests, occupations and different fights from many social groups. Some demands are heard or negotiated, many are ephemeral and sporadic, but there are still some that are repressed. Recently there has been two highly repressed student protests, and a sporadic new "medium-high class" student organization activity: the students from Ayotzinapa and Morelia, and the group #YoSoy132:

In December 2011 students from the Escuela Normal Rural de Ayotzinapa (Rural Normal School of Ayotzinapan) blocked the highway that goes from Chilpancigo to Acapulco in the state of Guerrero demanding an answer from the Guerrero state government to their demands. They wanted a raise of the $35 pesos (less than $3 dollars) that they daily received for their meals. The were also asking the authorities to fix the bathrooms, dormitories and school installations that have had no maintenance for the last eight years, and to increase the annual matriculation from 140 newcomer students up to 170. Lastly, they requested to have

16 Organizations in Ciudad Juarez fighting against feminicidios (Wright 2006), the Tribunal Permanente de los Pueblos de Mexico (Permanent Tribunal of the People of Mexico) (TTP Mexico), Salvemos Wirikuta (Lets Save Wirikuta) (2012), the Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas (SME, Syndicate of Mexican Electrics), the professors in Oaxaca, the Zapatistas, the Childcare House ABC parents, the Movimiento de los 400 Pueblos (Movement of the 400 Villages) of Veracruz...

17 The Asamblea Popular de los Pueblos de Oaxaca (APPO, the Popular Assembly of the Villages of Oaxaca) in 2006, Atenco, the parents of the ABC Childcare...
Figure 66. Repression in Atenco. (Miguel 2012.)
as a minimum passing average 7/10 and more scholarships for new students. After a couple of days of tense protest and having as a reference that that school is one of the oldest highly charged "revolutionary" schools in the country (the famous revolutionary Lucio Cabañas studied and taught there); police officers and an undercover police fired against the students protesters and killed 2 kids of 20 and 21 years old, severally wounded and disappeared students, and detained almost 50 others (Hernández Navarro 2012). Figure 67 shows one of the two bodies of the dead students lying on the road (Figure 67). Police excused themselves by saying the students were armed (which was not true) and that they put on fire a gas station (one worker in the gas station died trying to put out the fire).

In April 2012 students in Morelia, Michoacán were violently evacuated by 200 federal and state policemen from three student housings of the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo (UMSNH, Michoacan University from San Nicolas of Hidalgo). Students fought with sticks, stones and other objects; 7 students were beat, 194 detained and 15 policemen suffered burns, after a couple of days of negotiations the students were let free. Some of the pictures of that night were spread through internet, Figures 68 and 69 are some of these examples (Figure 68 and 69). This was the response from the authorities after several weeks of negotiations and a student revolt from the Coordinadora de Universitarios en Lucha (Fight University Coordination) that stole 12 official police cars and put several on fire, in demand of asking 30 buses and economic help to transport students to other municipalities to promote entrance to the university. (Martínez Elorriaga 2012).
Figure 67. Dead student from Ayotzinapa lying on the highway. (La Jornada 2012.)

Figure 68. Students in Morelia are evicted from their student housing. (Elorriaga 2012.)
Figure 69. Students are arrested after eviction. (Elorriaga 2012.)
In May 2012 students from the Universidad Iberoamericana (Iberoamerican University, one of the most expensive and famous private universities in Mexico, known for being for the elites (preppy) although there is a great variety of students from all over the country) received the PRI's presidential candidate Enrique Peña Nieto with claims and demands of principally the Atenco case (previously explained) (Elvira Vargas 2012). Calling him "corrupt" and "killer" students shouted to him "Fuera! La Ibero no te quiere! (Get out! The Ibero doesn't like you!)" (online videos and TV reportage news at night). The people in his campaign said that that was just a couple of people wanting to pass by as students, maybe porros, and very likely implanted by the left wing party. In response, 131 students made a video and diffused it on the online social networks showing their student IDs saying their ID number and complete name stating that they were neither porros nor that they belonged to any political party. After this many other students around other universities in Mexico City and other principal cities along Mexico showed their alliance and a Twitter group titled #YoSoy132 (#Iam132) started online and since then has been protesting (online and on the streets) not only against Enrique Peña Nieto but principally against the two most powerful TV networks TvAzteca and Televisa accusing them of having a favoritism towards the PRI candidate and portraying him almost as the virtual winner. The biggest march, shown in Figure 70, that emerged from this event was of 25 thousand people in Mexico City (Peñaloza 2012). Some of their posters stated: "We are not a telenovela, this is reality" (Figure 70).
Figure 70. Students adherents to the call of #YoSoy132 protest against the TV companies and the PRI candidate. (Hernández 2012.)
To this a series of comparisons have emerged to the 1968 student movement. For example, as I have tried to show in the previous chapters, the deaths and disappearances of the war against organized crime has been compared to that of the Dirty War post 1968 on the printed press and on images that are shared on Internet. Figure 71 shows one of the images comparing the two wars (Figure 71). Also, the repression suffered by the students in Ayotzinapan, and the images that show police abuse in Atenco and the treatment towards the students in Morelia has being also compared to that of the night October 2 in Tlatelolco. Figure 72 shows the comparisons of police brutality from 1968, 2006 and 2012 (Figure 72).

Peña Nieto’s answer in May 2012 in the Ibero towards the demands about the Atenco case was compared to that of Gustavo Díaz Ordaz statement referring to the 1968 student killing. The comparison was made in different ways and was portraid as a cartoon mixing both Gustavo Díaz Ordaz face, see Figure 73, mixed with Peña Nieto’s face on Figure 74 (Figure 73 and 74). The cartoon was made by a very well known cartoon artist Hernandez, Figure 75 is a reproduction of the image (Figure 75).

I want to add that the demands and level of organization that the student movement had in 1968 cannot be comparable to those that exist up to this today (although it seems it is exponentially growing). Up to this day, we still need to see how far is the #YoSoy132 organization will go, if it will or not become a movement, or if it is just a political tactic done to demerit the candidate Enrique Peña Nieto and an aim from the medium-high class students that reflects its "cosmopolitanism" and wish to connect with other international student/youth movements around the
Figure 71. War Against Drugs compared to the '68 Massacre. (With the PRI: 1968 Militarization in the Streets and the Killing of Innocents... With the PAN: 2010 Militarization in the streets and the killing of innocents.) (Facebook author's collection 2012.)

Figure 72. Comparison of the Repression in Tlatelolco, Atenco and Morelia. (83 years of Terror: Tlatelolco 1968 Atenco 2006 Morelia 2012). (Source: author’s collection 2012.)
Figure 73. Gustavo Díaz Ordaz was the president during the killing of 1968.

Figure 74. Enrique Peña Nieto was the governor during the Atenco repression in 2006.
Figure 75. Cartoon simulating Díaz Ordaz and Peña representing the PRI. (PRI - Vote President 2012). (Hernández 2012.)
world such as los indignados in Spain; Occupy Wall Street in New York; and to the Arab Spring\textsuperscript{18}. They are even calling themselves "The Mexican Spring" and in their protests and speeches they remember the ghosts of 1968: "We have the echoes of 68 burning in our hands, the thoughts of all those who gave their life for a better world, we have the social fights, the scars and the history, scaping from the books and vibrating in our skin" (Sandino Bucio student opening speech in the 1st General Assembly of the movement #YoSoy132 where more than 7 thousand students from around 35 schools and universities gather to organize thematic roundtables for defining #YoSoy132 cited in Montes 2012; Martínez and Granados 2012). Figure 76 shows students showing a placard saying "1968-2012: Students are back!" (Figure 76). Also, Figure 77 shows a placard saying: "This is our Mexican Spring #132" (Figure 77). Also, on online and printed media there are several articles comparing the #YoSoy132 to the '68 student protest and to the Arab Spring, some agree and few disagree\textsuperscript{19}. One of the 1968 student movement was to fight for the poor and unhoused by the state, today the #YoSoy132 seems to be a fight against the clock before election day (July 1st) stating they are only fighting for a democratization of media (without other clear propositions and not defining what democratization means). They state they are against Televisa and TvAzteca but at the same time they say they are not voting for Peña Nieto, their shouts and claims in their protests revolve against the PRI candidate and the two TV companies. Meanwhile there are

\textsuperscript{18} The Occupy WallStreet movement has already expressed its support and solidarity (Saldívar 2012).

\textsuperscript{19} Some examples are: Cacho (2012), Esteva (2012), one of the leaders of the '68 movement González de Alba (2012) Poniatowska (2012), Taibo II and more.
Figure 76. Students remembering the 1968 during the 1st General Assembly of #YoSoy132 in the UNAM in May 2012 (Guadarrama photo in Montes 2012.)

Figure 77. Students during the March #YoSoy132 calling themselves the Mexican Spring.
other TV channels they do not make any reference to, they are only focusing on "democratizing" TV -without defining what that is- and say that this will "democratize" mass media communication, although communication is not exclusive a TV affair).

The memories and events of the past are continuously revisited, remembered and forgotten. Sometimes the look at the past is through nostalgia while other times the past is used to justify present actions. The right to remember as well as the right to be remembered (how and through what means) is a process in constant construction. Social groups emerge in the public spaces of Mexico to express their demands and repression is still today a normal response by the authorities. Meanwhile, social groups continue to emerge, reclaiming and re-appropriating a past. It seems there is a formula of protest that still today is difficult to outline and clearly see its accomplishments and results.
CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

The analysis of the housing complex of Tlatelolco is an opportunity to delve into a series of thresholds of the past and the present that create spatio-temporal heterotopias where ghosts might inhabit. The utopist project of the architect Panni and the state government to construct an urban place that would "fix" the social problems through the construction of new physical spaces and create wonderful new environments failed. The wounds created by thresholds and heterotopias in Tlatelolco sometimes go beyond the physical and social spaces of Tlatelolco. Tlatelolco represents important turning points and discontinuities in Mexico as a city and as a state. The series of thresholds occurred in Tlatelolco reifies the idea that there is no perfect unfinished plan, that urban space is a process and that places are relational and are experienced, represented and remembered in different ways by various people, in different times and spaces. Tlatelolco's contradictory and wounded spaces help us comprehend the complex quest of understanding today's contemporary physical and social spaces in Tlatelolco and beyond its porous boundaries.

The politico-socio-economic situation Mexico is going through might be better understood through the analysis of individual and collective memories and experiences of the social and physical spaces of Tlatelolco. The continuous presence
of the heterotopias created in the threshold of the 1968 student movement show a lack of explanation or understanding, an appropriation of social and physical space, a justification of being there and belonging, and a forced references from different social groups today within and beyond Tlatelolco. October 2 is being today relived in each moment where there is repression, injustices, deaths and disappearances. October 2 cannot be forgotten because it is still lived today, its heterotopic spaces are revived in each protest and manifestation. And even further, Tlatelolco continuously emerges in each debate, in cartoons, in video documentaries, movies, essays, opinion articles and in my daily life.

There are different groups of people in and connected to the urban public space of Tlatelolco. This thesis focused on the analysis of Tlateloloco material and discursive public spaces. I showed how the official discourses of the government; the institutional practices of a cultural center; a local monthly publication; a workshop of memory; and the personal motivation and interest of people in Tlatelolco represent Tlateloloco's different spatialities and temporalities, and how they create and transmit memory. And although I acknowledge that stories are always fabrications, even sometimes products of the imagination, I explore how these different representations and personal social stories show contradictions and tensions of the past and the future, that disrupt the linear narrative of history and progress and try to identify how people might feel haunted by the presence or absence of diverse narratives. These moments or images may also be linked to traumatic events of
society and how and why we come to terms or not, must be analyzed. Individual, collective, historical or any other memory raise different and difficult questions including who is the agent that has the right to the memory and the right to be remembered and named. The use of these stories must be analyzed to let us free from the past in a wounded city with rotten decadent failure of modernity in Mexico as a nation and as a city. It might be a dangerous arena because by our witnessing of absences and presences we might become both perpetrator and victims. No memory exists outside the realm of representation. Memory is always mediated. The politics of memory is historical, it defies individuals, and we embody and represent the spaces and memories of the city.

Through this thesis I propose a study of urban space of wounded cities through memory and imagination of how the thresholds of the cities are represented and remembered and what type of heterotopias they produce. The use of space and history to [re]create society's "truths" and imaginaries can be identified within the urban process. Fragmented truths create a historical account within space creating different identities. Captured around a dense historical background, Tlatelolco has been in the imaginations of Mexicans for a variety of reasons. I intended that by the analysis of the different representations of Tlatelolco we can engage in a conversation of the "multiple pasts and possible futures" (Till 2012, 5) in the creation of just cities.
Tlatelolco

I have tried to describe the multiple agencies that comprise this overall, yet, fragmented project out of which being from Tlatelolco or wanting to be from Tlatelolco is being forged. After describing some other ways in which tlatelolcans or people participating in some projects are consuming Tlatelolco’s images, history and identities, I try to show how Tlatelolco’s "unity" prior to abandonment, lack of care and fall into disuse is related to the ongoing social and physical construction of space by the neighbors, the changes in the neighborhood and the projects and practices of all. I have tried to show the importance to see the wounds of urban space that can be traced through its fragments and memories represented through stories and other material constructed physical spaces in the city in order to identify thresholds that will take us to experience different heterotopias.

In order to engage in the different spaces and identities of Tlatelolco we must identify the production of space of Tlatelolco and the different ways it has been appropriated and negotiated through memories and imagination. We can engage through going towards the otherness, by trespassing the porous spaces that transport us to other spaces and time and that can create heterotopias of hope, care, and affect. Through urban explorations we can make ourselves vulnerable and place us in odd situations where there is no controlled space or a secure area can be a way to engage with different spaces, to try to situate ourselves where the otherness emerges. This way the experiences will not be prefabricated, not a
consumer experience, it is a creative one in which we can experience the different spaces of Tlatelolco and of Mexico. Once outside the spaces that we know, within different heterotopias, we might be able to appropriate and negotiate them through memories and imagination.

1968

The fight for an official memorialization of 1968 has been complex and not always just, fair and completed. The ongoing process shows the complexity of its meanings and representations. At the same time the people and places that assist the others to remember or not forget and the importance of creating sites for people to remember an official public memory is an important political tool. Also, there seems to be an attempt to fix meanings in space and create a true historical account and by trying to totalize space, whatever is left out is an invitation for those ghosts of the past. "Ghosts haunt the regulated city and the impossible dream of totalisation" (Edensor 2005, 835). Yet, many contemporary social groups, people that were not even alive at that time, continue to use and appropriate the fight of the '68 student movement. Today, the '68 movement is unimaginably being appropriated and uniting different groups in incredible ways, and unfortunately repression, disappearances and deaths are still present. The fights around these repressions, forced disappearances and unjust deaths are today not a fight to be remembered
but a daily struggle of alive people claiming for a stop to violence and create spaces for dignity, justice and peace.

The characteristic images of photographs and videos that continue to be diffused through the internet and which some of them are present in the '68 Memorial's Cultural Center, continue to haunt and hunt our imaginations and influence how we remember and relate to the '68 movement: a women running grabbing two girls one in each hand hiding behind a car; a 12 year kid dead full of blood; young people standing against the wall semi-naked; men (undercover police) with a white gloves to differ themselves from the students; light flares running down the skies of the Plaza of Three Cultures; soldiers running along the plaza and lying on the floor pointing up with their guns; students knocking on the door of the church in the plaza to hide and be protected, the church's closed doors; pieces of paper and shoes on the floor of dead plaza; military tanks patrolling; and the silence and the emptiness; the impugn guilty and the countless and nameless dead... Figure 78 captures the silences and the absences of Tlatelolco's killing, the image shows the plaza one day after the Killing of October 2 (Figure 78).

These ghosts continue to be summon, they still want to communicate or maybe not, maybe people want them to communicate, to know exactly what happened, or to communicate us that there is still hope, that "we go hand by hand" (Taibo II during the AMLO meeting May 2012). I wonder, did they open new spaces for democracy? Do they rest if we name them in every protest? Do we feed them by
giving them answers to their protest? Do we not feed them if we are looking for
something else than what they fought for? We encounter them every time we start
fighting for what they fought, for what their fight started. Is it an inconclusive fight
that social groups still fight? Should we do 51,082 memorials for the dead of the
drug war?

Vivir en Tlatelolco and Memoria Migrante

Daily people relate, live and use the spaces of Tlatelolco. Their individual and social
memories relate in different and complex ways and influence how they experience
the space. Through the local project of the local monthly publication of Vivir en
Figure 78. The emptiness... and presences of those absent in the Plaza of the Three Cultures of Tlatelolco. This photo is after October 2, 1968. (La Ciudad de México en el Tiempo 2011.)
Tlatelolco (Living in Tlatelolco) and Memoria Migrante (Migrant Memory), I have showed how non-official individual memory shape social and collective memory and how through their memories and imagination appropriate the past and present thresholds of Tlatelolco and sometimes create different heterotopias.

Maurice Halbwachs attributed memories to a collective memory, in which social groups (family, religion and class) permits the creation of an individual memory (Halbwachs 1994[1925]). There are no two different types of memories, but a social articulation of events that depending on one's distance or adherence to a group is only a situated position within a current collective thought. At the same time, there can also be different collective memories because there is a diversity of social groups. Although memory can be seen as a personal possession, memory involves "the other", because "the experience of others is a given as primal as the experience of the self" (Ricoeur cited in Lavenne et. al 2005, 9n). Memory exists in the public sphere because it is a testimony presented and received by someone. Joël Candau, contrary to Halbwachs, affirms that collective memory emerges from the interaction of individual memories, leading to a partial homogenization of the past; collective memory becomes a regulative structure of individual memories (Candau cited in Lavenne et. al 2004, 3). This mutual influence of individual and collective memories constructs a historical memory. While individual memory is related to emotions, impressions and affections linked to a singular experience; a historical memory is the reconstruction of information given in the present social life and
projected to that of the past (Halbwachs 1997). The memories of others help also towards the reconstruction of our autobiographical memories, and the perpetuation of memories is a reconstruction of fragmented individual memories.

Individual memories can be seen as fragments of a collective memory. This emphasizes the importance of social frameworks of memory and their influence on the persons’ remembrances. But in daily life the different types of collective memories are not available to all members of society, because there is often a creation of only one true representation of the past. This constrains members of society to have an equal access to the different representations of the past; therefore, the importance to talk and question the public official memory of society is significant, as well as the projects that call upon memory and make use of it in different ways is a novelty. We must wait and see what is the impact of participating in these kinds of activities (i.e. community journalism and archives of "dynamic" memory) and if or if not different objectives are accomplished such as the one Vivir en Tlatelolco wants to accomplish of creating a responsible and critic citizenry that exercises its responsibilities and obligations. Or if Migrant Memory has given the tools to create an aware group that has appropriated its past and recovered their lost fights in order to be able to acknowledge that their shared past can be the fuel for a shared future; and a motivation to retry and accomplish their lost dreams and hopes as a society.
Conclusion

Individual memories, such as those of Don Carlos and Roberto, the official and unofficial memories, and my experience in those spaces are tied to the collective and the social memory of Tlatelolco. I tried to approach space through fragmented landscapes, stories and histories where imagination and memory help into the reconstruction of space, acknowledging how history (time) influences space processes. This understanding of space opens up a new question of how do individuals appropriate, negotiate and reconstruct space and become agents and of how the processes are represented in people's everyday life. I also try to understand Tlatelolco through what is known as urban explorations that can be an alternative to explore and live the world and understand our surroundings. I believe there is still a need to create a heterotopias (a space) of heal, care and affect. An understanding of stories, traumatic events and the creation of new spaces from different perspectives must be place within space; because the creation of political subjects always involves spatial transformations (Wright 2009).

The analysis of memory and imagination through fragments, thresholds and heterotopias is an important tool to analyze contemporary wounded urban space. Memory is embodied within the real and symbolic city. Through the physical and mental fragments in the form of memories and spaces in Tlatelolco, the ghosts are forgotten, remembered, used and recreated. Thresholds are not necessarily 'bad', 'good', or 'wrong' and 'right' because they precisely show the processes of the urban
space. This dialogue of memories and shared memories influence also what we remember and recreate. Living in Tlatelolco and Migrant Memory create and summoned ghosts and remember, and according to them non-official memories serve to create awareness.

The neighbors and the Mexican citizens are becoming living dead trapped in not a veil of indifference but in a net of corruption, legal inefficacies, injustices, and impunity. The fights continue in many different levels and from many different social groups calling for justice of the past and the present. We are becoming all the "others", we are all experiencing different stories that relate to a social history and the experiences of all and memories of all are needed in order to create not a homogenous reality, this is not a homogenous fight, but a homogenous space of peace, justice and dignity. It seems a homogenous fight, but at the same time there are so many other struggles, so how can they all unite? Is that the answer?

A further analysis of this investigation would be more interested on how will the war on drugs be remembered and if there is a possibility or not to create spaces that will heal the wounds. Also a study focusing on what is needed in order to reconstruct or not the public urban social and physical spaces of Mexico and how heal, care and justice be represented and obtained would be of great interest. Also a view of those who support the war or even fight it, the military and policemen, would be incredibly interesting to see how the social processes occur. I think that the police as well as the military are also victims of the war on drugs. Also there is a
danger of being so aware, can we or are we accustoming to live among ghosts and haunted spaces? Who and how do we care for those who die? How can we communicate and make the government sensible towards the social demands? I would like to finish with a poem from Bertolt Brecht that Nepomuceno (see foot note no. 13) reproduced and gave out a copy to everyone during his participation in the Caravan for Peace, Justice and Dignity created by Javier Sicilia\textsuperscript{20}. This is the poem given out by Nepomuceno during the Caravan in 2011:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Primero se llevaron a los judíos, pero como yo no era judío, no me importo
Después se llevaron a los comunistas,
pero como yo no era comunista, tampoco me importo.}
\textit{Luego se llevaron a los obreros,
pero como yo no era obrero, tampoco me importo.
Más tarde, se llevaron a los intelectuales,
pero como yo no era intelectual tampoco me importo.}
\textit{Después siguieron con los curas, pero como yo no era cura, tampoco me importo.
Ahora vivenen por mi, pero ya es demasiado tarde.}
\end{quote}

First they took the Jews, but since I was not a Jew, I did not care.
After that they took the communists,
but since I was not a communist, I also did not care.
Then, they took the laborers,
but since I was not a laborer, I also did not care.
Later, they took the intellectuals,
but since I was not an intellectual, I also did not care.
After that they continued with the priests,
but since I was not a priest, I also did not care.
Now, they are coming for me, but now it is too late.

\textsuperscript{20} There are different versions of the poem.
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Appendix

A. List of Names from 1993 (Commemorative Placard 1993)

1. Cuitlahuac Gallegos Bañuelos - 19 years old
2. Ana María Maximiliana Mendoza - 19 years old
3. Gilberto Reynoso Ortiz - 21 years old
4. Antonio Solorzano Gaona - 47 years old
5. Agustina Matus De Campos - 60 years old
6. Cecilio León Torres - 27 years old
7. Ana María Teuscher Kruger - 19 years old
8. Jorge Ramírez Gómez - 59 years old
9. Carlos Beltrán Maciel - 27 years old
10. Miguel Baranda Salas - 18 years old
11. Juan Rojas Luna - (?)
12. Leonardo Perez Gonzalez - 29 years old
13. José Ignacio Caballero González - 36 years old
14. Luis Gómez Ortega - 20 years old
15. Jaime Pintado Gil - 18 years old
16. Guillermo Rivera Torres - 15 years old
17. Reynaldo Monzalvo Soto - 68 years old
18. Cornelio Benigno Caballero Garduño - 15 years old
19. Fernando Hernández Chentre - 20 years old
20. Rosalinda Martín Villanueva - (?)
B. List of Names from 2003 of the dead during the student movement since July 26 until October 2 of 1968 (El Universal 2003):

1. VICENTE REYMEL BETANZOS. Student of the Superior School of Economy; died in an accident of the bus no. 5 of the National Polytechnic Institute, August 23.

2. ROMÁN NÁJERA VALVERDE. Laborer; shot wounded in the protest against the National Flag in the Zócalo (main plaza of Mexico City), later died in the hospital Rubén Leñero because of the wound on September 3.

3. ENRIQUE GONZÁLEZ RAMIREZ. Died in the hospital Rubén Leñero on September 11.

4. JULIO ALDANA. Grenadier wounded by the lieutenant Caballería Féliz Benjamin Uriza, in Tlatelolco, died in the Red Cross on September 21.

5. MIGUEL LLAMAS GONZÁLEZ. Grenadier shot by the lieutenant Caballería Féliz Benjamin Uriza, in Tlatelolco, died in the Red Cross on September 23.

6. ÁNGEL VALDEZ VELASCO. Found dead in one of the rooms of the Superior School of Medicine.

7. ÁNGEL SANTIAGO LUNA. Student of the vocacional (a type of high school) "Wilfrido Massieu" from the National Polytechnic Institute.

8. LUIS LORENZO RÍOS OJEDA. Student from the ESCA in the IPN, died on September 23 after confronting the grenadiers that day.

9. LORENZO HERNÁNDEZ REZÉNDIZ. Student from "Antena College" died on September 24.

10. ANTONIO PEÑA MAYA. Sold birds, died in some fights in Iztapalapa, DF.

11. VÍCTOR MANUEL HERNÁNDEZ LINARES. Student in ESCA, found dead on September 26 in the Superior School of Medicine.

12. ELISEO HERRERA MENDOZA. Student of the night Secondary School died in Poza Rica, Ver on September 29.

13. JOSEFATH FIGUEROA VARGAS. 28 years old, professor of elementary from the SEP, died on September 30.

14. ÁNGEL SANTIAGO LUNA. Student of the Vocacional Wilfrido M. His corpse was identified on September 28.
15. PETRA MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA. Domestic worker in the building "February 5" in Tlatelolco.

16. BERTHA CORONA TAFOYA, died on October 4 at 22:30 in the Red Cross hospital.

17. GLORIA VALENCIA LARA DE GONZÁLEZ. Vendor.

18. ROSA MA. MAXIMIANA MENDOZA ROBLES. Student from the Escuela del Valle de Mexico (School of the Valley of Mexico).

19. RAMON HORTA RUIZ. Varnisher.

20. CARLOS ANTONIO BELTRÁN BELTRÁN, Student of Quimical Engineer, originary from Sinaloa.

21. OCTAVIO RODRÍGUEZ CID. Died on October 2 in the Plaza of the Three Cultures in Tlatelolco.

22. PEDRO GUSTAVO LÓPEZ. Soldier of the Primera de Infantería (First Infantery), from the Battalion 24.

23. JAIME ARMANDO REYES HARO. Student of third year of high school in the vocational 7.

24. CARLOS CRISTÓBAL FORTANEL HERNÁNDEZ. Student of second year in the Tecnological 5 in the housing complex of Tlatelolco.

25. CONSTANTINO CORRALES ROJAS. Sergeant of the National Military and died on October 3 in the hospital Rubén Leñero.

*26. FERNANDO HERNÁNDEZ CHANTRE. Student of the high school 3.

*27. ANA MARÍA REGINA TEUSHER KRUGER. Student of Medicine in the UNAM.

*28. MIGUEL BARANDA SALAS. Student of the vocational 7.

*29. LEONARDO PÉREZ GONZÁLEZ. Professor of middle school.

*30. GILBERTO REYNOSO ORTIZ. Student of Chemistry in the IPN.

*31. CUITLAHUAC GALLEGOS BAÑUELOS. Studied the first year of Law in UNAM.

*32. JOSÉ IGNACIO CABALLERO GONZÁLEZ. Worker.

*33. JORGE RAMÍREZ GÓMEZ.
*34. ROSALINO MARÍN VALLANUEVA. Studied the first year of middle school in the school 100.

*35. LUIS GÓMEZ ORTEGA. Radio technician.

*36. CARLOS BELTRÁN MACIEL. Chemical Industrial Engineer in the UNAM.

*37. CORNELIO BENIGNO CABALLERO GARDUÑO. Student in the high school 9.

*38. CECILIO DE LEÓN TORRES.

*39. JAIME PINTADO GIL. Student of the Franco-Spanish School, found in the Guanajuato building of Tlatelolco.

*40. ANTONIO SOLORZANO GAONA. Bank employee.

*41. AGUSTINA MATUS DE CAMPOS. Housekeeper.

Those with a star are in the placard of 1993. There are three people that are on the placard but are not in any of the official lists up to 2003.
C. List of Names from 2006 (Doyle 2006):

1. Miguel Baranda Salas
2. Carlos Beltrán Maciel
3. Cornelio Benigno Caballero Garduño
4. José Ignacio Caballero González
5. Bertha Corona Tafoya
6. Constantino Corrales Rojas
7. Alejandro Felipe Carbajal Galán
8. Carlos Cristóbal Fortanel Hernández
9. Cuitlahuac Gallegos Bañuelos
10. Luis Gómez Ortega
11. Fernando Hernández Chantre
12. Ramón Horta Ruiz
13. Cecilio de León Torres
14. Manuel Telésforo López Carballo
15. [Pedro] Gustavo López Hernández
16. Rosalino Marín Villanueva
17. Petra Martínez García
18. Agustina Matus de Campos
19. [Ana] Rosa María Maximiana Mendoza Robles
20. Reynaldo Monzalvo Soto
21. Manuel Nájera Oviedo
22. Leonardo Pérez González
23. Melitón Pérez Vitel
24. Jaime Pintado Medina o Gil
25. Pablo Pinzón Martínez
26. Jorge Ramírez Gómez
27. Guillermo Rivera Torres
28. Octavio Rodríguez Cid
29. Armando Reyes Haro
30. Gilberto Reynoso Ortiz
31. Juan Rojas Luna
32. Antonio Solórzano Gaona
33. Ana María Regina Teuscher Kruger
34. Gloria Valencia Lara de González

…and ten more unidentified persons.
D. *No Son Cifras, Tienen Nombre* (They are not numbers, They have names)

**Examples:**

*Hallan cuerpo de reportero secuestrado en México bbc.in/M2EJ0C << Marco Antonio Ávila García I #Sonora @Tienennombre*

*Faustino Hernández Méndez, 38 años. Asesinado a tiros en su domicilio. Puerto Vallarta, Jalisco 17/05/12 #nosoncifras #tienennombre*

*De los 18 hombres ejecutados en #Chapala @Tienennombre José Miguel Rubio Sánchez, 31 años, albañil de oficio, vivía Jocotepec, iba a trabajar!*

*Diego Francisco Rodríguez Lira. Policía Federal. Asesinado a tiros junto con un joven. Acapulco, Gro. 13/05/12 #NoSonCifras #Tienennombre*

*Alan Aldair San Martín Villa, 22 años. Asesinado a tiros junto con un policía federal. Acapulco, Gro. 13/05/12 #NoSonCifras #Tienennombre*


*Por Itzel Méndez de 17 años y María Citlali de 16 años Asesinadas en #Chiapas #niunamas http://lockerz.com/s/209004464 @Juansabinesg*

*Vidal carrillo molina 9/mayo/2009 desaparecido y caso sin resolver @Tienennombre*

*Ayer secuestraron al periodista Marco Antonio Avila García en Sonora, hoy aparece su cuerpo en Guaymas. #LosQueremosVivos #tienennombre*

*Donde esta Georgina, porque viva se la llevaron, viva la queremos #CaravanaxlaDignidad #MarchaDignidad http://bit.ly/Jkr9VL via @JPNH01*

*Luis Manuel Lara Quintero, 25 años. Abogado. Asesinado a tiros afuera de su casa. Monterrey. N.L. 27/04/12 #NoSonCifras #Tienennombre*

**Translated:**

*They find the body of kidnapped journalist in Mexico bbc.in/M2EJ0C << Marco Antonio Ávila García I #Sonora @TheyHaveNames*

*Faustino Hernández Méndez, 38 years. Shot killed in his house. Puerto Vallarta, Jalisco 17/05/12 #TheyAreNotNumbers #TheyHaveName*
From the 18 executed men in #Chapala @TheyHaveName José Miguel Rubio Sánchez, 31 years old, construction worker, liked in Jocotepec, we was in his way to work!

Diego Francisco Rodríguez Lira. Federal Police. Shot killed next to a young men. Acapulco, Gro. 13/05/12 #TheyAreNotNumbers #TheyHaveName

Alan Aldair San Martín Villa, 22 years old. Shot killed next to a federal police. Acapulco, Gro. 13/05/12 #TheyAreNotNumbers #TheyHaveName

Marco Antonio Carmona Luvio, 24 años. Kidnapped and found dismembered in the interior of a taxicab in the highway Acapulco-Zihuatanejo.

For Itzel Méndez of 17 years old and María Citlali of 16 years old. Murdered in #Chiapas #NotAnymore http://lockerz.com/s/209004464 @Juansabinesg

Vidal carrillo molina 9/may/2009 dissappeared and unsolved case @TheyHaveName

They kidnapped the journalist Marco Antonio Avila García yesterday in Sonora, it is found dead today in Guaymas. #WeWantThemAlive #TheyHaveName

Luis Manuel Lara Quintero, 25 years old. Lawyer. Shot killed outside his home. Monterrey. N.L. 27/04/12 #TheyAreNotNumbers # TheyHaveName