

Editorial

...even in this place one can survive, and therefore one must want to survive, to tell the story, to bear witness; [...] We are slaves [...] condemned to certain death, but we still possess one power [...] the last – the power to refuse our consent.

Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz*.

As a blind mirror of the future, *Tiresias* presents itself through the question of consent, which is at the same time a question about us, graduate students, and therefore a question of our present. The question itself is meaningless unless we recognize its intrinsic paradox: in order to choose *consent* as the central theme of *Tiresias*' first issue, it was necessary to arrive at a consensus without calling into question the notion of *consent* itself. During the last year, the very same idea of *consent* became, perhaps without consciously noticing it, the central issue in the internal debate that preceded this publication. Issues of representation, community, plurality and participation were paramount in the process of reaching an agreement on the purpose, scope, content and design of *Tiresias*. Although we, as graduate students, are trapped inevitably within institutional hegemony, we are interested in exploring ways to escape it through artistic and intellectual creations that reflect our own consent.

Just what is it that we consent to? We consider it necessary to reflect on consent on three different levels. First, an examination of consent functions as a node of departure as well as a destination, a node through which every thought passes in order to re-appear as a new thing—a new way of passing through the same node. Likewise, the question of consent must reflect on and take a position *vis à vis* university discourse and society at large where this discourse reproduces its conditions of existence as well as expresses its limitations. As such, *Tiresias* is not

only the end-result of a particular process but it is in itself *the* process and therefore a beginning that will shape the publication in a way we cannot predict.

Second, we must negotiate our *consent* in order to construct a certain *consensus* about our intellectual practice, a practice that implies a struggle within and between us. This relation between *consent* and *consensus* has been with us through our initial collective experience, yet it may very well disappear. This opening may contribute to the creation of a political practice that irrupts the repetition of institutional hegemony even while the deployment of that political practice may prepare us for a new opening that could carry us beyond institutional alienation.

Finally, we had to limit discourse production (whether academic or creative) to particular topics within the Humanities (politics, culture and critical theory). Although we reached consensus that *Tiresias* would be an online publication, we will continue to challenge that consensus: Why the online format? Why peer-reviewed? Why conditioned on institutional support? What have we agreed to and to what extent do we all agree as the project takes flight? Our challenge is to re-craft continuously the question of consent while staving off its erosion at the hand of the academy. All the while, we recognize that the chosen format conceals the space where we are compelled to challenge our thinking, reading and writing.

These three dimensions of the question of consent pursue the development of a project *in, through, and for* a new collective space. Are we on the way to grasping *consent* or is "the question of consent" only a starting point? We are obliged to revisit these questions from one issue to the next: the universality of the struggle, the irruption of our political practice, the decisions we have made. Nonetheless, *Tiresias* is and will be among us.