Carnero es consciente, pues, de la imposibilidad de llegar a unas conclusiones cerradas sobre una obra que es cíclica, eterno retorno nietzscheano, proceso y río en movimiento perpetuo. Desde el principio, el punto de partida del autor ha sido la humildad, sin que ello le impida, con paso firme, trazar un discurso de lo literal y de lo propio que tiene a la vez el sentido del re-pliegue, de lo que se retira como una ola en la playa, de lo que discurre sobre un discurso cuyo borde no es determinable según una línea simple e indivisible, según un trazo lineal e indecomponible. La pincelada de Carnero ha sido capaz de trazar un trazo sobre una multiplicidad de trazos, sobre una estructura plegada y re-plegada cuya escritura remite a la escritura, a los libros que hay en los márgenes y entre las líneas.
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It goes without saying that History —in capitals— has always been an important topic to deal with. Such writers as Joyce (concerned with the myth of Ulysses) or Eliot (when he quotes Virgil and Dante) refer to it in order to give their works an intellectual touch, in order to look for a splendidous past that could offer a universally valid system of values. They desperately try to avoid fragmentation and to achieve continuity. Moreover, this splendidous way of approaching History allows the artist to show off his range of knowledge and the aura of art: as Foucault would say, our subjective conscience and our sense of continuity are intimately connected with such concepts as the unity of the work, the idea of creation, etc. On the contrary, Marcus offers the «other,» the secret, history —not in capitals— of the twentieth century. He argues that it is impossible to understand it as a unique and continuous development and is convinced that culture must get involved in that loss of unity. Today this demistification has deconstructed the possibility of developing an endless economic progress, which was the aim of bourgeois democracy. Instead of interpreting history as a positive and onwards development, Marcus takes the Sex Pistols, the Situationists, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, the Dadaists, Michael Jackson or Michel Mourre as his starting points and offers a much more open and confusing history against sense and the logocentric and metaphysical representation of history. Thus, the music composed by the Sex Pistols, Cage or LaMonte Young is not a new aesthetics but a new ethics against any preconceived conventions. For example, the Sex Pistols argued that the state, work, the family, sex, and even their public, are not natural events but ideological constructs. They claimed they had the right not to work and, therefore, to ignore all bourgeois values: perseverance, ambition, honesty. Their most famous slogan was «NO FUTURE,» and in this sense Marcus comments on the similarities and differences between the 60s and the 70s: adventure vs. survival. During the 70s people regarded pleasure and humanism as rights; during Reaganism and Thatcherism, Marcus argues, those rights turn out to be
privileges. As Debord says in the first issue of the *Internationale situationnisten*, victory will be achieved by those who are able to create order without loving it. Thus, Marcus writes what Philip Sollers would call «a monumental history,» i.e. a history understood as a differenciated and contradictory series, a history which is neither monistic nor historicist: it is an Althusserian criticism against Hegel's conception of History and against his idea of expressive whole. Marcus shows that there is not one History, a true official History, but interrelated histories whose aim is rather use than order experience. As Eco argues, each story tells stories which have already been told. Marcus' history is not made up by facts but by representations; it is the (hi)story of Debord's «society of spectacle,» «that artificial void that we inhabit.» Following Nietzsche, Marcus wants to destroy epigonism, the excessive historical conscience and collective memory, which, in fact, no longer exists, argues Edward Said: tradition walks before us (Heidegger).

*Lipstick Traces* is about artists and movements that, following a Romantic impulse, did not have nor wanted institutional power but did not offer either a way of filling that void. However, they left an important trace, since they created an art which mirrored their society —eclectic, chaotic— and offered that which official History wanted to exclude: the possibility of its own denial. Marcus notices that in contemporary society everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation and that reality rises up within spectacle, our only reality. The true, says Debord, is a moment of the false. The final aim is the sign within a society which, according to Feuerbach, prefers the sign to the thing signified, the copy to the original, fancy to reality, the appearance to the essence. Illusion only is sacred, truth profane, and, with Nietzsche, art turns out to be what helps us not to die for truth.
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José María Navarro, autor de uno de los artículos que configuran esta obra, sentencia al comienzo de su colaboración: «La escasez de repertorio lexicográfico de nuestras variantes, registros y sociolectos parece justificarse por la extensión y diversidad de nuestro sistema. Si añadimos a esto que, sobre todo en el sector de los sociolectos marginales y juveniles, la pervivencia de los términos está amenazada continuamente por diferentes factores, y su vigencia, en algunos casos, es efímera, nos será fácil comprender la falta de estudios, parciales al menos, realizados con rigor científico.» Si junto a dichos obstáculos, inherentes a la naturaleza misma del objeto de estudio, consideramos que esta publicación fue concebida a raíz de la preparación de un ciclo de conferencias celebrado en Alicante en 1985 —Año Internacional de la Juventud—, fecha relativamente lejana teniendo en cuenta la vertiginosa velocidad con que evoluciona este tipo de lenguaje, comprenderemos el valor científico de una obra que se nos antoja única en su género.