

Photographic Representation: Negotiating Sites of Memory in Eduardo Rovner's *¿Una foto...?*

Michelle L. Warren

...una foto es algo que queda para toda la vida (88)
Alicia, *¿Una foto...?*

What is a photograph? In this discussion of Eduardo Rovner's 1977 short play *¿Una foto...?*, I look at the photograph that the characters attempt to orchestrate during the play and at the role that the photograph plays as a false "site of memory," or *lieux de mémoire*, to use Pierre Nora's terminology. I also discuss how the play itself has been used as a post-dictatorship archival piece to remember and document the atrocities from the years of the *Proceso* in Argentina, creating a sort of documentary *mise-en-abîme*, preserving and memorializing the extent to which those in charge were willing to go in order to create a semblance of national peace and harmony.¹

¿Una foto...? comes from the very early stages of Rovner's prolific career, but has remained among his most frequently staged works.² In 2014-15, it was performed under the direction of Gaby Fiorito at the Teatro del Bordo in San Telmo as part of a trilogy of Rovner plays, including *Viejas ilusiones* (2006) and *Concierto de aniversario* (1982). Says Emiliano Basile of this twenty-first century production: "La puesta a cargo de Gaby Fiorito expone la crueldad de las relaciones humanas en todas sus dimensiones: partiendo de la ternura en el primer caso, de la comedia en el segundo, y del arte en el tercero. La violencia contenida en los vínculos ya viene desarrollada en el satírico humor del autor argentino." The three plays, presented under the umbrella title *3x Rovner: fotografías de un concierto de ilusiones*, were well received and represented only a small number of the many Rovner plays on stage at the time both in Argentina and abroad. Aside from several staged productions in Buenos Aires, in 2014 alone Rovner had works performed in

Spain, Germany, France, Florida, Texas, and even Slovenia, where *Volvió una noche* celebrated its sixth year of continual production. That same play is expected to remain in production in Prague through 2018, thereby completing a fifteen-year run.³ Rovner's peculiar ability to create darkly comedic plays with absurdist tendencies and without specific contextual references makes his work accessible and relevant in diverse sociopolitical situations. In the case of *¿Una foto...?*, the lack of specific reference allows the play to function in a number of different contexts, but in its original 1977 production, during the early part of the Argentinian military dictatorship, this same ambiguity helped the play to pass undetected as subversive in the eyes of the censors, who did not spot the political allegory of the parents beating their baby into an apparent smile in order to document domestic peace and harmony.

The military dictatorship in Argentina, explained by the United States Institute for Peace, followed the March 1976 military coup. During the dictatorship,

...a series of military juntas exercised power in Argentina, while an opposing leftist guerrilla movement grew. A seven-year armed struggle between the military dictatorship and opposition "subversives" resulted in the systematic yet secret, disappearance, torture, and death of thousands of individuals suspected by the government of supporting the left-wing agenda." (www.usip.org)

The Comisión Nacional sobre la Desaparición de Personas, which convened in the years following the military dictatorship, attempted to trace and document the fate of that regime's victims through interviews, research, and rigorous investigation.

Understanding the truth about the past is an integral part of moving forward with the healing process and is also considered a basic human right to those who have been victims of wrong-doing. Marianne Hirsch, in her 2008 article on postmemory, supports the need to know the atrocities of the past:

The growth of the memory culture may, indeed, be a symptom of a need for inclusion in a collective membrane forged by a shared inheritance of multiple traumatic histories and the individual and social responsibility we feel toward a persistent and traumatic past—what the French have referred to as "le devoir de mémoire." (111)

Memory of what one has not experienced, but of what came before one's time, is nonetheless crucial to an understanding of self. The U.N. proposes in its 2005 Updated Set of Principles for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights that citizens have "the inalienable right to know the truth about past

events concerning the perpetration of heinous crimes and about the circumstances and reasons that led, through massive or systematic violations, to the perpetration of those crimes” (United Nations). Accordingly, the victims and family members of the Argentinian *Proceso* from 1976-83 have a right to know what happened both to themselves and to their loved ones during the torture-ridden military rule.

The U.N. document also states the duty to preserve memory:

A people’s knowledge of the history of its oppression is part of its heritage and, as such, must be ensured by appropriate measures in fulfilment of the State’s duty to preserve archives and other evidence concerning violations of human rights and humanitarian law and to facilitate knowledge of those violations. Such measures shall be aimed at preserving the collective memory from extinction and, in particular, at guarding against the development of revisionist and negationist arguments.

Memory of historical events and atrocities can be preserved in numerous ways. Hirsch reminds us of the need to memorialize, as mentioned above. Around the world one can witness war memorials, both on the site of tragedies and battles as well as near the homes of the victims affected. In Argentina, the exESMA comes to mind—a former Naval Academy and renowned torture site of the *Proceso* now repurposed as a performance and educative site.⁴

Art, songs, films, stories, and plays can also serve as memorial pieces that demonstrate solidarity with the victims and their loss and simultaneously continue to educate and create awareness of past ills for people who otherwise would not know of such events. In the case of the *Proceso*, many internationally known cultural “products” come to mind, such as Luis Puenzo’s 1983 film, *La historia oficial*, which presents an upper-middle class school teacher who slowly becomes aware of the torture, abuse, and murder that went on during the Dirty War as she also discovers that her adopted daughter was born to and stolen from one of the victims. Another well-known example of post-*Proceso* art that purports to help victims heal is Eduardo Pavlovsky’s much-disputed *Voces/Paso de dos* (1990), a play in which a victim confronts her torturer and refuses to recognize him by naming him, but is then raped and killed by him.⁵ The play enjoyed wild success in its season, and was deemed redemptive and healing by many Argentinian spectators, despite vociferous opposition from some, who felt it glorified the torturers and perpetuated violence, particularly against the female body.⁶

Unlike the aforementioned items, Rovner's *¿Una foto...?* was written and staged *during* (technically, toward the start of) the *Proceso*.⁷ Its darkly absurd depiction of parents willing to go to any means to create a picture of their baby looking happy underpinned the real-life terror imposed by government officials who would stop at nothing to create a surface image of peace and happiness. Its later inclusion in post-dictatorship Santillana text books brings a sort of *mise-en-abîme* to the play as an archival, memorial piece. Included in an anthology used to teach and remember this historical moment, the play itself features a photograph that is purportedly being staged to remember a superficially tranquil domestic environment.

A mere year and a half after Argentinian newspapers published photographs of Isabelita Perón being swept out of the Casa Rosada by the military, there was another photograph: Rovner's play *¿Una foto...?* appeared on stage in Buenos Aires for the first time. A deceptively simple little piece, it features young parents Alicia and Luis as they attempt to capture their baby making the perfect expression. The baby, who spends the entirety of the play unseen by the audience in a baby carriage, starts out content. Luis, seated near the baby, rocks the carriage back and forth while the "Spring" movement of Vivaldi's "Four Seasons" plays in the background. When Alicia calls from off stage to ask how the baby is doing and hears he is happy, she insists that they take advantage of the moment and get a good picture. Luis initially protests, claiming they should not disturb him. Alicia scoffs at her husband (in what effectively provides a foreshadowing of the horrors to come), asking what harm could possibly come from taking a simple photo?: "Dale, no le va a pasar nada porque le saquemos una foto... andá a buscar la máquina" (83). As Alicia fusses over him, Luis interjects and asks her to leave the baby as he is, because a "natural" look works better for photographs:

LUIS: Así está bien... que esté natural... lo más importante es el gesto...

ALICIA: Sí, que sea como... como de improvisado, ¿no?

[...]

LUIS: Eso... (*arreglando el bebé*) Las fotos en pose no me gustan. Es como si no tuviesen vida. (84)

This dialogue proves to be ironic as the parents labor to compose the perfect photo. As they fumble with the camera and argue about the best way to proceed, the tension mounts between them and eventually the baby starts to fuss. Alicia and Luis go to ridiculous lengths to get the right angle and expression. Luis climbs up on a chair and points the camera down toward the baby, while

Alicia dances around, shaking a rattle, making funny faces, and eventually jockeying back and forth between Vivaldi and Tchaikovsky on the stereo to try to make the baby happy again. When the baby finally smiles, they quickly snap what they think will be the perfect picture—only to discover the camera is out of film. They reload the camera and *almost* get to the perfect moment, but then disagree on what *type* of smile the baby should make. After all, states Alicia, “. . .una foto es algo que queda para toda la vida” (88). Finally, the two agree that what they really want is just the *appearance* of a smile, regardless of the reality behind it, and settle on a *mueca*, a grimace, as a happy medium. Here, the action takes on a sinister tone. Luis remains poised above the baby, ever aiming his camera, while Alicia, with his encouragement, slowly begins poking, twisting, and prodding at the baby, forcing his face into a new expression. The two notice the baby’s face turning color, yet he still does not grimace. In the end, Luis takes matters into his own hands, kicking the baby carriage and the baby alike into the air, then regarding what lies on the ground before him:

LUIS: (*con odio*) ¡Vamos a ver ahora si se ríe o no!

Luis se pone a una cierta distancia del cochecito, toma la carrera y le pega una patada de costado, volcándolo. Se produce un apagón e inmediatamente se prende un foco sobre las caras de Luis y Alicia juntas, mirando hacia el piso.

ALICIA ¡Qué sonrisa hermosa!... como queríamos los dos... (91)

The play closes with Luis clicking the camera, the flash blinding the audience—the baby, one would deduce, thrown to the floor and wearing what appears to the parents as the perfect grimace.

As in many of his pieces, Rovner employs touches of the absurd and dark humor to underline the lengths that people are willing to go to achieve their goals. As Osvaldo Pellettieri points out:

La pieza no descarta en su recepción los contenidos políticos, sociales e ideológicos inmediatos, y si bien pueden adjudicársele pluralidad de sentidos, al ponerla en contacto con el contexto de producción y con textos posteriores como *Concierto de aniversario*, aparece claramente su tesis realista: para el totalitario no importa cómo se consiguen los fines. (28)

Rovner himself explains that the military/parents metaphor went unchecked in 1977 by the censors, who were, in Rovner’s own words, “unos estúpidos” incapable of perceiving the clever familial/political allegory.⁸ The family in this play resembles the one depicted in Rovner’s *Concierto de aniversario*,

which, as Priscilla Meléndez points out, displays a similar abyss between the characters' words and actions (21). She notes that in *¿Una foto...?* Rovner presents the family "...como una de carácter distorsionado, grotesco, poco familiar, pues se vincula con lo destructivo y violento" (12). The father in *Concierto* justifies his abusive behavior by claiming that is for the collective good—the sacrifice of the individual in order to “save” the collective group (14). Though we hear no reference to a grand collective in *¿Una foto...?*, we do witness a frantic attempt to document peace and harmony, whatever the cost, as in *Concierto*. In some ways, the vacuum of any contextual information or back story to the characters provides a certain universality to the play. This is something that has, perhaps, made Rovner's work accessible to an audience that extends well beyond the Argentinian borders. For our purposes, however, the context in which the play was first written and staged is fundamental.

Today we are bombarded by an amount of information that cultural critic Jean Beaudrillard would have found obscene. We snap pictures of everything from today's breakfast to last week's manicure and just as rapidly slap the images up on social media for our most intimate hundreds of friends and family to view, carefully weeding out anything that would suggest less than a perfect life.⁹ Hirsch, in her 2008 study of family photography, explains how deceiving photographs can be:

Because the photograph gives the illusion of being a simple transcription of the real, a trace touched directly by the event it records, it has the effect of naturalizing cultural practices and of disguising their stereotyped and coded characteristics. As photography immobilizes the flow of family life into a series of snapshots, it perpetuates familial myths while seeming merely to record actual moments in family history. At the end of the twentieth century, the family photograph, widely available as a medium of familial self-presentation in many cultures and subcultures, can reduce the strains of family life by sustaining an imaginary cohesion, even as it exacerbates them by creating images that real families cannot uphold. (7)

The onslaught of images we experience in daily life is astounding, especially compared to the pre-digital days of 1976 Argentina. Though more ubiquitous than analogue photography, today's digital pictures still show only a carefully crafted (or filtered) version of a person's life. When pictures were taken with a camera and film, they seemed more permanent; as Alicia points out, a picture lasts one's entire life. This made it even more important for the characters at hand to create what appeared to be the “perfect” memory.

In her book *The Archive and the Repertoire*, Diana Taylor examines the archival attributes of photographs in Argentina for both the military and those hunting down lost family members. The military further disappeared its victims by destroying photographic evidence, while the Madres de la Plaza de Mayo publicly paraded photos of their loved ones to prove that they *did* once exist. She explains the use of photo IDs as proof:

The photographs used by the Abuelas and Madres and later (in a rather different way) by H.I.J.O.S. present a kind of proof, evidence of the existence of the people in them. They played a particularly vital archival and performative role at the beginning of the movement, in the absence of other social and legal structures that could redress the crimes against humanity committed by the Armed Forces. (176)

Taylor goes on to explain that “[b]oth the Madres and the military enact—in their own ways—the faith in photography as one particular type of evidence” (177). While her examples of photos-as-evidence operate on an ontological level (proving the *desaparecidos* had in fact existed) and the photograph taken in *¿Una foto...?* would theoretically be more phenomenological in proof (purporting that the characters enjoyed a happy family life), both examples eventually fulfill similar documentary purposes.

International audiences became more familiar with the use of photography as documentation in Argentina through Luis Puenzo’s aforementioned film, *La historia oficial*. Winner of the 1986 Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film, it shows the *abuelas* searching for their lost grandchildren marching with enlarged photographs of their missing children and grandchildren, just as the real-life *abuelas* have done. One of the *abuelas* in the film, Sara, actually uses old photographs to recount the story of her missing daughter and grandchild. Sara confronts Alicia with the possibility of the protagonist’s adopted daughter being Sara’s missing granddaughter, believed to be born in captivity. The dog-eared pictures that Sara carries with her and that she shares with Alicia serve as the cornerstone of her missing daughter’s (and hence, grandchild’s) history/story. The resemblance between Sara’s daughter and Alicia’s adopted child proves uncanny—and the childhood love story Sara recalls through her pictures increases the personal and very poignant loss that Sara’s family suffered upon the disappearance of her daughter. In the case of *La historia oficial*, then, a photograph also serves as archival proof of (lost) life.

The parents in *¿Una foto...?* work throughout the play to find the perfect pose for a picture of their baby. Roland Barthes, in *The Responsibility of*

Forms, talks about the importance of the way things are posed, or as he calls it, the “pose of objects” when reading a photograph (11). In Rovner’s play, the “posed object” is actually the baby, never seen by the spectators except through the insinuation of the parents who struggle to get it just right and to create the perfect image. Barthes explains that “...objects constitute excellent elements of signification: on the one hand, they are discontinuous and complete in themselves, which is, for a sign, a physical quality; and, on the other hand, they refer to clear, known signifieds; hence they are the elements of a true lexicon, stable to the point where we can readily constitute them into a syntax” (11). Luis and Alicia agree to pose their “object” (baby) in order to communicate a clear signified, to use Barthes’ term, of domestic tranquility and happiness. The photograph that they extract by pinching, twisting, and kicking their baby into the air is one that, upon viewing, becomes an object itself, endowed with a “structural autonomy” (Barthes 4).

A photograph, then, has gained unquestionable currency in its ability to prove something, particularly in this case, in the context of the Argentine *Proceso*. It can serve as a cultural artifact, archival “proof” from the past, and can also be read as a “site of memory.” Margaret Ferguson identified “Negotiating Sites of Memory” as the Presidential Theme for the 2015 Meetings of the Modern Languages Association. In doing so, she referenced Pierre Nora’s *lieux de mémoire* and his theory (sometimes contested and negotiated) regarding archive-based sites of memory. As Ferguson shares in her Fall 2014 letter to the MLA, sites of memory “...occur in many media, genres, and material forms; their scales vary, as do the kinds of emotion they memorialize and engender and the negotiations for which they call.” Nora, who originally coined the term, tells us that “*lieux de mémoire* originate with the sense that there is no spontaneous memory, that we must deliberately create archives, [...] we buttress our identities upon such bastions, but if what they defended were not threatened, there would be no need to build them” (12).

Why do Luis and Alicia go to extreme means to achieve the perfect photograph of their baby? They must construct and defend the appearance of a perfect family, whatever means that requires. Nora states that “modern memory is, above all, archival. It relies entirely on the materiality of the trace, the immediacy of the recording, the visibility of the image” (13). By creating a visual image of their “happy” baby, Luis and Alicia create a *lieu de mémoire*—albeit a false representation—that can later serve as archival proof that they did indeed have a happy family (despite what goes on behind closed doors).¹⁰ In the allegorical reading of the play, Rovner provides

the darkly absurd act of torturing the innocent baby into a grimace/smile as a mirror image of the military (parents) coercing its citizens (baby) into a complicit “smile”—forcing them at all costs to submit to that particular image of well-being. Even the very title of the play undermines the veracity and archival accuracy of the photograph that Alicia and Luis (attempt to) take. Surrounded by question marks and ending with an ellipsis, it poses the question “a photograph?” Is this play about a photograph? Or, what *is* a photograph and what purpose does it serve? Or, did the parents ever successfully take a photograph? After all, the audience is blinded in the end of the play by the flash. No one ever sees the supposed document, archive, *lieu de mémoire* that the parents fought so hard to secure. The title, with its question marks and ellipsis, suggests some wiggle room for spectators to interpret the intrinsic value—or even existence—of the/a photo.

In studying the play, one can see this particular photograph as a falsified archive, a *lieu de mémoire* that serves as (false) evidence of peace and tranquility in the family/nation. Stepping outside of the fictional theatrical world, however, and flashing forward some thirty years after the original staging of *¿Una foto...?*, one can also view the entire play itself as a site of memory, as it became an institutionalized tool used to teach about the *Proceso*.

Years after the Dirty War, when schools began openly discussing with students some of the atrocities that took place during the *Proceso*, Rovner’s *¿Una foto...?* was anthologized in the Santillana text books and thus became required reading for Argentinian youth.¹¹ Its inclusion was intended to help young generations understand the oppressive measures that the military government exercised in order to maintain stability. As a result, *¿Una foto...?* has enjoyed widespread readership and eventually became the most frequently performed work by Rovner, owing also perhaps to its staging simplicity (two actors, a camera, a chair, a camera, and a baby buggy). Remembering the dedication written below the title of the play, “a quienes se resistieron a sonreír,” one can infer that the play pays tribute to those who refused to “smile,” or to agree to false illusions of peace and tranquility amid atrocities. As a site of memory from the *Proceso* years, the play can also serve as a reminder to (current) audiences: Those who refuse to smile can be understood as those who remember—and those who are remembered. In fact, Rovner points out an important error committed in most of the post-Santillana staged versions: Many directors ignore the textual placement of the flash—it is supposed to *encandilar*, or blind, the audience members, pushing them into the role of the tortured baby, who was forced to suffer punishment for not “agreeing” to

smile.¹² The breaking of that fourth wall, the flashing the camera in the face of those watching, is a clear invocation to the audience to never forget. This invocation seals the play's 21st-century position as a performance memorial, an archive, and a *lieu de mémoire*, as the play, much like the photo within it, now becomes a documentary tool to help victims and their families mourn and remember, and also an educational piece for those too young to have lived the *Proceso*.

Interestingly enough, when the play is over, we, as audience members and as readers, are left with a couple final mysteries. First, despite the title of the play, which implies that there *is* a photograph, there still is none as the curtain falls on the couple smiling down at their baby. What does this absence mean? Does the fact that Luis and Alicia are left at the end of a play without an actual photograph in hand allude allegorically to the military not actually achieving a peaceful society despite its torture and murder of supposed subversive citizens?

The second mystery that remains unanswered at the end of the play is this: Why a baby? Obviously, a baby works well as the victim of the parents' manipulation of a grimace/smile. Were the child old enough to express himself verbally, he probably would have protested the treatment from his parents. If he were mobile enough to remove himself from the kicks and pinches, he would have fled from the parents, or at least attempted to free himself. Also quite obvious is that a baby solicits the highest amount of pity; the least able to fend for himself, he depends wholly on the adults around him for his well-being and even his survival. While all of this is true regarding the choice of a baby as the "victim" of abuse in *¿Una foto...?*, what does it say of the parents/military, baby/citizens allegory? Could it suggest that the audience, and by extension the Argentine citizens, were subjected to the *Proceso Militar* with the wide-eyed innocence and vulnerability of a baby? Ariel Strichartz, in her study of Rovner's *Carne* (1985), points to the issue of complicity present in all four of Rovner's *juguete teatrales negros*. She states by the fourth *juguete* (*Carne*), the spectators, upon witnessing the allegorical victim's willingness to sacrifice herself, must "...question their own complicity with the country's demise at the hands of the dictatorship" (46). A baby as victim is harder to view as having fault in his own torture. However, the photo that Luis takes at the end *does* position the spectators in the subject role of the photographed, blinded by the flash. Also, the play's dedication "to those who refused to smile" implies that some were willing to "smile for the camera," or to allow themselves to become victims.

As the play lives on, it continues to serve as a *lieu de mémoire*, memorializing a time in history that today's Argentine youth did not experience themselves. ¿*Una foto...*?, while missing an actual photograph, shows that a simple photograph, as well as the act of taking it, can challenge what we superficially “read” in that photograph. Hirsch recalls the power of a photograph:

Reading snapshots and photo albums, art photographs and gallery installations, verbal descriptions of actual and of invented photographic images in the same terms and with equal attention is in itself a postmodern critical gesture. The textual analysis of family pictures, in particular, can illustrate the aspects of postmodernity I find most troubling and most exciting: the incorporation of the aesthetic in the practice of everyday life; the plural, decentered, and transactional or relational dimensions of subjectivity. The need to demonstrate, again and again, the cultural and constructed character of what appears transparent and natural; and, most important, the rigorous critique of power and domination that recognizes its own complicity in the very structures it critiques. (*Family Frames* 14)

A photograph, as discussed earlier, can serve as proof of something from the past. When “read” according to its context, it can also reveal and suggest hierarchies of power—as witnesses to the process that ensues in ¿*Una foto...*? In order to achieve that photograph of supposed domestic tranquility, we see the coercion and abuse that the parents use to “facilitate” it, representing the abuse and torture that the *Proceso* military government carried out against its “subversive” citizens to create a superficial image of tranquility. The play, as an archival piece and a document, helps to fulfill the rights of more recent generations to know and understand the atrocities of the past, while both the photo and the play serve as instrumental *lieux de mémoires* that prevent people from ever forgetting that past.

University of Nebraska at Kearney

Notes

¹ *Ollantay*, in its 10th anniversary issue, features Rovner and his work and includes studies by Jacqueline Bixler, George Woodyard, and Osvaldo Pellettieri. It also contains an interview with Rovner by Pedro R. Monge Rafuls, as well as a published version of Rovner's play *Almas gemelas*.

² This play, along with *Concierto de aniversario* (Teatro Abierto 1983), *La vieja, la joven y el harapiento* (1984), and *Carne* (1985), make up Rovner's four *juguets teatrales negros*.

³ This, according to a Facebook Messenger personal message from Eduardo Rovner, dated April 25, 2015: “Te cuento cómo va el ‘dramatur’ por Europa: En Praga *Volvió una noche* seguirá, por lo menos, hasta fines del 18, así que serán más de 15 años en cartel! Y tienen en proyecto *Cuarteto* y algunas lecturas dramatizadas de mis obras ya traducidas (cerca de 10) en la Facultad de Teatro, mientras el Instituto de Teatro tiene la intención de publicar un libro con las obras traducidas. [...] En Bratislava, capital de Eslovaquia (donde estoy ahora) ‘Volvió una noche’ cumplió 6 años y están en proyecto de montaje la última obra que trabajamos: ‘La musa y el poeta’, en el Teatro Nacional de Eslovaquia (un sueño), y ‘Almas gemelas’. [...] El lunes me voy a Múnich, donde se presentarán mis obras en general y proyectan estrenar, en la segunda mitad del año, ‘Compañía’ o ‘Almas gemelas’, ‘Cuarteto’ y ‘Noche de ronda’. Se confirmará cuales durante mi estadía. Y ayer me pidieron, de ahí mismo, ‘Te voy a matar, mamá’. La otra semana le toca a Francia, donde estrenarán ‘Concierto de aniversario’, daré un par de charlas y tendré reuniones con un grupo de traductores interesados en mis obras. Una semana después a Madrid, donde tendré algunas reuniones por proyectos posibles”.

⁴ For more information on ex ESMA, see <http://www.espaciomemoria.ar/>

⁵ This recalls the activity organized by the 1983-84 Truth Commission, which reported on some 9,000 victims’ experiences—thought to be exceedingly short of the more likely number of 30,000, most of whom refused to come forth for fear of retaliation by their torturers.

⁶ For further discussion of the debate over the staging of *Voces/Paso de dos* by Eduardo Pavlovsky, see Feitlowitz (1991) or Taylor (1997).

⁷ For a discussion of theatre in Argentina during the *Proceso*, see Jean Graham-Jones.

⁸ Rovner pointed out in a phone interview from March 14, 2014 that the censors were much wiser when *Concierto* came out several years later and did understand that the cruel characters were intended to represent the military government.

⁹ See Jean Baudrillard for discussion of the excess of information in postmodern times.

¹⁰ I have used the singular *lieu* when referring to just one item, in this case, the play.

¹¹ This information is taken from a Facebook Messenger personal message from Rovner dated 10-10-2014: (excerpt) “La edición en el manual de Santillana fue para los alumnos del último año de las escuelas primarias. Creo recordar que fue alrededor del año 2000 (No encuentro el libro)”.

¹² Per telephone conversation from March 2014 with Rovner.

Works Cited

- 3X Rovner: Fotografías de un concierto de ilusiones. Web.
- Barthes, Roland. *The Responsibility of Forms: Critical Essays on Music, Art, and Representation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1985. Print.
- Basile, Emiliano. “Reseña: ‘3X Rovner: Fotografías de un concierto de ilusiones’ de Gaby Fiorito.” *El aura cultural* (2013): 1 Aug 2013. Web. 13 July 2015.
- Baudrillard, Jean. “The Ecstasy of Communication.” *Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. London: Pluto Press, 1987. 126-34. Print.
- Bixler, Jacqueline. “Metaphor and History in the Theater of Rovner.” *Ollantay Theater Magazine* 10.20 (2002): 6-14. Print.
- Feitlowitz, Marguerite. “A Dance of Death: Eduardo Pavlovsky’s *Paso de dos*.” *TDR* 35.2 (1991): 60-73. Print.
- Ferguson, Margaret. *MLA Newsletter* 46.3 (2014): 2-3. Print.

- Hirsch, Marianne. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative and Postmemory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997. Print.
- _____. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today* 29.1 (Spring 2008): 103-28. Print.
- La historia oficial*. Dir. Luis Puenzo. Historias Cinematográficas Cinemania, 1985. Film.
- Meléndez, Priscilla. "Disonancias musicales: violencia y performance en *Cuarteto* de Eduardo Rovner." *Latin American Theatre Review* 44.1 (2010): 9-28. Print.
- Monge Rafuls, Pedro R. "Entrevista: Rovner en concierto." *Ollantay Theater Magazine* 10.20 (2002): 113-22. Print.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-24. Print.
- Pavlovsky, Eduardo. *Voces*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Búsqueda, 1989. Print.
- Pellettieri, Osvaldo. "Estudio preliminar." *Teatro de Eduardo Rovner*. Buenos Aires: Corregidor, 1989. 9-44. Print.
- _____. "El teatro de Eduardo Rovner: Un mundo sentimental y satírico." *Ollantay Theater Magazine* 10.20 (2002): 97-111. Print.
- Rovner, Eduardo. *Teatro*. Buenos Aires: Corregidor, 1989. Print.
- Strichartz, Ariel. "Consuming Argentina in the Name of Love: Cannibalism and Holy Communion in *Carne* by Eduardo Rovner." *Latin American Theatre Review* 42.1 (2008): 33-48. Print.
- Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire*. Durham, SC and London: Duke UP, 2003. Print.
- _____. *Disappearing Acts: Spectacles of Gender and Nationalism in Argentina's "Dirty War"*. Durham, SC and London: Duke UP, 1997. Print.
- "Truth Commission: Argentina." United States Institute of Peace. 16 Dec 1983. Web. 22 July 2015.
- "United Nations, Econ. & Soc. Council, Comm'n on Human Rights, Updated Set of Principles for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights through Action to Combat Impunity, U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/2005/102/Add.1" University of Minnesota Human Rights Library. 8 Feb 2005. Web. 22 July 2015.
- Woodyard, George. "Rovner's Theater: Questions of Values with Humor." *Ollantay Theater Magazine* 10.20 (2002): 15-22. Print.