Specters and Spectacles of Disappearance: The Figure of the Doll in Argentina’s Memoryscapes

In 1959 six family members of Argentina’s most celebrated writer of comics, Héctor G. Oesterheld, pose for a photograph in a garden (figure 1). The four young sisters – from left to right, Elsa, Marina, Diana, and Beatriz – sit in a row in front of their smiling parents; Elsa and Diana are holding dolls. In fact, the sisters look like dolls themselves, a parallel suggested by the way their mother, Elsa Sánchez, holds her youngest daughter, Marina, which also mirrors the way Elsa and Diana cradle their dolls. On the face of it, this is a conventional family snapshot. And yet, just over a decade later the four Oesterheld sisters would join the left-wing guerrilla organisation Montoneros, only to be disappeared and murdered by the military dictatorship that terrorised Argentina between 1976 and 1983. [[1]](#footnote-1) Oesterheld himself also joined the Montoneros and was disappeared in 1977, leaving Elsa Sánchez as the only surviving member of the family.

This photograph is a good example of the various memory roles that family pictures of disappeared militants have played over the past decades in Argentina. Firstly, they have served as objects of transmission, treasures to be handed down from generation to generation, which, by triggering family narratives, guarantee the continuity of a genealogy interrupted by the abductions. Secondly, they are material and visual proof of the existence of five people the terrorist state subsequently refused to acknowledge, documentary evidence and an aid not only to family memory but also to the collective memory of the traumatic past. Finally, this picture of happiness, play and togetherness is also a counter-image that refutes the discourses and images published by the press, which, in cahoots with the military regime, contributed to the pernicious discourse that *guerrilleros* demonstrated a lack of care and love towards their children.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Knowing now what subsequently happened to the Oesterheld sisters, the presence of dolls in this photograph is unsettling. Dolls are objects of play and comforting companions for the girls, but in this image they metaphorically prefigure the understudied ways that dolls would subsequently be used to represent the bodies absented by the dictatorship. As US poet Susan Stewart has said, dolls are a ‘kind of “dead among us,”’ caught somewhere between our world and the realm of the deceased .[[3]](#footnote-3) Due to their anthropomorphic shape and their ‘strangely moving stillness,’[[4]](#footnote-4) she says, dolls trigger all sorts of associations with those who have left us. Thus this photograph –and photography is itself a cultural form that encapsulates the presence of absence –raises the disturbing question: who are the ‘dead among us’ in this picture: the dolls or the girls?

In this article I focus on the visual presence of dolls in photographs, paintings and performances, where they are used to represent disappearance as a result of their associations with issues of duplication, the undead and the uncanny. When using the term ‘doll’ in this chapter I refer to all kinds of small models of human figures, from miniatures, mannequins, and automata, to handmade dolls, industrialised dolls and collector’s dolls. I will look at both their *spectral* quality and at their role in performances and plays that were considered by some to be controversial *spectacularizations* of terror. I approach the figure of the disappeared in particular as one that has shaken up the ways in which post-Cold War visual culture has pictured the atrocities of the second half of the twentieth century. Disappearance has produced a crisis in the visual representation of suffering and massacres, since representing absence with an image might, on the face of it, seem to be a contradiction in terms. Questions of visibility and invisibility are at the core of the debates addressed here, including to what extent dolls allow us *to see* absence, and what uses of toys our eyes can tolerate when dealing with traumatic memories and which ones make us, on the contrary, ‘look away.’ I analyse not only images of dolls (that is, two-dimensional representations), but also what it means to be a spectator of highly visual plays and performances that re-materialise the disappeared, an experience ever more chilling giving this figure’s lack of corporality.

Dolls, and children’s play more generally, have started to attract the scrutiny of scholars interested in their relationship to genocide and wars. For both children and adults, dolls can serve as powerful triggers of memory and nostalgia or as collectable ‘documents’ of the past. The link to memory is exaggerated by the manner in which dolls are also uncanny and ghostly, historically used in funerary ceremonies and voodoo practices, and serving as silent witnesses of traumatic childhoods. While there is a growing body of scholarship on the uses and meanings of dolls and play in other contexts, notably in Nazi Germany,[[5]](#footnote-5) the relationship between dolls and disappearance in Latin America has been largely overlooked.[[6]](#footnote-6) Scholars interested in post-dictatorship culture in Argentina have instead focused on other forms of visual memory, namely on the black-and-white photographs of the victims exhibited in marches and commemorations since 1977, and the silhouettes of the 1983 event called the *siluetazo*, both of which have come to be the dominant ways of representing disappearance. While the photographs highlight the previous lives of the victims (the images prove that they existed), silhouettes draw attention to the absence left behind.[[7]](#footnote-7) Nevertheless, the three figures and visual forms of memory making – photographs, silhouettes *and* dolls – are part of an aesthetic of the *Doppelgänger* concerned with similar issues of replication and phantasmagoria. In Argentina, as in other authoritarian regimes in the region, dolls have indeed come to occupy a prominent place in the works of filmmakers, comic writers, playwrights, photographers, and artists, all of whom explore the visual potential of the doll in the evocation of disappearance. In particular, they have been used to address three specific crimes perpetuated by the military during this period: uncertain death, the ‘appropriation’ of children, and sexual violence against female *guerrilleras*.

The presence of dolls in the Oesterheld family photograph eerily anticipates debates over whether it is appropriate to use objects of childhood play to express the traumatic past. In many post-dictatorship cultural artifacts that I explore in this article– especially in those that evoke disappeared girls – dolls are used to tackle issues of terror, childhood and gender.[[8]](#footnote-8) Unlike other, more studied, images that represent disappearance (such as the ID photographs of the victims and silhouettes), these works introduce important discussions about the subversive uses of playthings in the visual memory of collective trauma. Postmemory or post-dictatorship artists in particular have used toys and playful aesthetics to address the atrocities of the past and their childhood years under the dictatorship in irreverent and unconventional ways.[[9]](#footnote-9) It is unsurprising, therefore, that some of the works I examine here have been met with controversy. Furthermore, as they have been related to what some scholars have called ‘dark play,’ artworks that playfully transform problematic, taboo and forbidden themes (such as death, sexual violence or disappearance) in politically incorrect images or narratives, they have also been said to flirt with a pleasurable aesthetisation of pain, and to create a ‘show’ out of suffering.[[10]](#footnote-10)

 I thus explore the tensions that underpin the decision to ‘play’ with the Argentine traumatic past and to ‘toy’ with history. I ask what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ visual representation of the disappeared and whether there are things that it is better not to play with. It is my contention that play and playthings in these works are not disrespectful to the victims of the Argentine traumatic past but, on the contrary, offer a (mediated) form of accessing the past and of remembering painful events that are difficult to show or see and which are often regarded as (practically and ethically) unrepresentable.

**Disappearance and the Dictatorship’s Regimes of (In)visibility**

The 1976-1983 dictatorship installed an unprecedented type of violence in Argentina, known as State terror, that included the violations of all manners of civil and human rights. During this period, Argentine civil society simultaneously turned a blind eye to systematic repression, terror and censorship, which resulted in the disappearance of approximately 30,000 people, many of them children. The actions of the dictatorship were in part made possible because as part of the regime’s terror it also introduced a ‘regime of visibility/invisibility’ around crimes, directing the gaze of citizens towards certain staged public acts of violence and forcing many to look away whenever they saw an abduction taking place, or people ‘vanishing’ from their workplaces. Diana Taylor calls this phenomenon the ‘percepticide’ of the regime: ‘In order to qualify as “good” Argentinieans,’ she writes, ‘people were forced to focus on the given-to-be-seen and ignore the atrocities given-to-be-invisible, taking place around them. Signs indicated what the population was to see and not to see.’[[11]](#footnote-11) And she continues, ‘percepticide blinds, maims, kills through the senses.’ (124) Rather than hiding all its crimes, the dictatorship carefully staged what Taylor calls ‘spectacles of violence’ around the urban spaces, ones that were sufficiently disturbing to terrorise the population but not strident enough to disturb everyday activities.

 In the same vein, political scientist Pilar Calveiro argued that the dictatorship used the logic of the ‘half secret’, that which is half known and half revealed or visible, to exercise terror. Power, she writes, reveals itself in both what it exhibits (the legitimate exercise of violence, parades, legal prisons) and what it hides (the illicit control of its citizens, political assassinations, tortures).[[12]](#footnote-12) But in authoritarian regimes, the hidden is not completely secret, since ‘[e]s preciso mostrar una fracción de lo que permanence oculto para diseminar el terror, cuyo efecto inmediato es el silencio y la inmovilidad’ (it is necessary to show a fraction of what occurs to disseminate terror, the immediate effect being silence and immobility). (Calveiro, 44) Concentration camps were normally located in buildings belonging to the military or the police. Although they were clandestine the military did not make much effort to hide what was happening there. Neighbors could see strange movements inside or hear the screams of prisoners being tortured. Unlike the remote locations of Nazi concentration camps, in Argentina they were located right in the middle of the city. Thus, if such camps existed, it was because there was a society that *chose* not to see them, ‘una sociedad desaparecida’ (a disappeared society)(Calveiro, 147).[[13]](#footnote-13)

 As part of their ‘regime of invisibility’ some scholars have argued that, except for a handful of photographs taken inside the former Escuela de Mecánica de la Armada (ESMA), the most emblematic concentration camp in Argentina, or a similar group of pictures taken by the police in Córdoba, the dictatorship succeeded in leaving no image of their crimes. Victoria Langland has written, for example, that ‘no hay fotos de los vuelos de la muerte. No hay fotos del acto de tortura’ (there are no photographs of the death flights, there are no photographs of the act of torturing).[[14]](#footnote-14) However, as Ana Longoni and Luis Ignacio García pointed out, perhaps we are confronting a more complex problem in the relationship between the visible/invisible tension and disappearance. For these scholars it is not so much that there are no images of horror in Argentina but that the ones that we have (the photographs rescued by prisoner Víctor Basterra from the Escuela de Mecánica de la Armada, for example) are invisible, in the sense that they are impossible to look at: ‘en las memorias sobre la dictadura argentina no faltan imagines sino ojos que las vean, que les den un marco de inteligibilidad y las inscriban en el debate público’ (in the memories of the dictatorship there is no lack of images but instead lack of eyes that look at them, that give them a framework of intelligibility and that inscribe them in the public debate) (28). While the images referred to by Longoni and García are documentary photographs and are of subjects visibly deteriorated by torture, the ones I analyse here are both artistic and, at times, also playful. Both corpuses, however, have at least one thing in common: they are counter-images acting against the ‘percepticide’ of the regime, and bringing to light what was supposed to stay out of sight.

 Commenting on the culture and politics of the visual during and after the dictatorship, Andreas Huyssen has said that perhaps more important than possessing images of terror is to create them: ‘imágenes posteriores que utilicen todos los soportes, los géneros y las técnicas disponibles para combater la evasion y el olvido.’ (Images after the events that use all the mediums, all the genres and all the available techniques to combat evasion and forgetting).[[15]](#footnote-15) This article draws on that aspect of the visual culture of the post-dictatorship period and analyses cultural artefacts that turn to the image of the doll as a means to discuss issues of visibility/invisibility, perception, spectrality, spectatorship and play during and after the military regime.

**The Figure of the Doll and the** ***Doppelgänger***

Disappearance interrogates and challenges the productiveness of post-dictatorship visual culture because it demands the exploration of an impossible question: what does it mean to visualise absence and a frozen death? The eerie look of dolls effectively evokes the suspended death of the victims of the dictatorship. Their artificial illusionism and the icy expressions found on their faces remind us that in spite of their anthropological appearances they are not really human but *humanoid* bodies, imitations of the human form. In his famous 1914 essay on the wax dolls of Lotte Pritzel, Rainer Maria Rilke writes in this respect that, strictly speaking, dolls refuse anthropomorphization because they are incapable of reciprocation, cruelly showing us a ‘stony denial of our love.’[[16]](#footnote-16) In *The Dehumanization of Art*, Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset also mentions the ambiguous and uncanny condition of wax dolls, who ‘defeat any attempt at adopting a clear and consistent attitude toward them. Treat them as living beings, and they will sniggeringly reveal their waxen secret. Take them for dolls and they seem to breathe in irritated protest. They will not be reduced to mere objects. Looking at them we suddenly feel a misgiving: should it not be they who are looking at us? Till in the end we are sick and tired of those hired corpses.’[[17]](#footnote-17) It is this provocative ambiguity of dolls, ‘those hired corpses,’ both present and absent at the same time, which makes them a particularly suitable metaphor for Argentina’s unburied bodies.

 In a study on the artistic representation of massacres and genocides, José Emilio Burucúa and Nicolás Kwiatkowsi argue that, confronted with the challenge of understanding and representing the uncertainty of suspended death, art found a new formula centered on images of duplication, replicas, silhouettes, ghosts, masks and shadows, all figures that fall under the umbrella of the German term *Doppelgänger* (the double or lookalike), coined by eighteenth-century writer, Jean-Paul Richter.[[18]](#footnote-18) Richter’s fictions are indeed inhabited by doubles, shadows and identical people, masks, twins, wax effigies, mirrors, spirits and silhouettes. The concept of the *Doppelgänger* combines the phantasmagoric, the surprising and the mortuary, serving to question naturalised ideas of identity and subjectivity.Together with silhouettes and masks, dolls representing or evoking the disappeared in artworks and commemorations not only embody the *Doppelgänger* and its aesthetics of duplication and the uncanny, but they also emphasise issues of gender violence and crimes against children as well as adding an element of play to the memory strategies of both dictatorship and post-dictatorship culture.

One example of such use is the 1992 performance *El hombre de arena*, a loose adaptation of E.T.A. Hoffmann’s *The Sandman* (1816) by the Argentine theatre company El Periférico de Objetos, which has often been read as a metaphor for the missing bodies of the dictatorship (figure 2).[[19]](#footnote-19) In their plays, El Periférico de Objetos draw on the ambiguous and uncanny nature of dolls and marionettes. Established in 1989, the company set out to offer an alternative language in the tradition of marionette theatre by creating a closer connection between puppeteers and puppets. The idea was that both subjects and objects express themselves and interact on stage, provoking confusion in the audience about who controls whom. In this way, El Periférico de Objetos distanced itself from more traditional puppet shows that hide the puppeteers behind the puppets in order to create the illusion that they are alive.

 For this version of Hoffmann’s story, El Periférico de Objetos was particularly inspired by Freud’s definition of the *unheimlich* (1919), which drew on an analysis of Hoffmann’s tale about an automaton called Olympia and the myth of a sandman who tears out children’s eyes. Freud argues that, in this story, the doll is both a familiar and terrifying object, the *unheimlich* or *unhomely* referring to what is supposed to be hidden but which, instead, has been brought to light, like a ghost, a spirit, or an apparition.[[20]](#footnote-20)

 The *Doppelgänger* is the prototype of the ‘unheimlich.’ ‘The *Doppelgänger*,’ Burucúa and Kwiatkowski argue, ‘is not a mere ghost but it persists in the place of the subjectivity that represents so it becomes difficult to distinguish between the existing thing and its double’(196). In his famous work on the double, cited by Freud, Otto Frank defines this figure as a supplement of the ‘I’ that does not complete the subject, but rather manifests what the subject lacks. The ominous nature of the double derives precisely from the frightening absence of a complete image of the self and from its representation/apparition as a shadow.

 All these characteristics of the *Doppelgänger* are present in El Periférico de Objetos’ take on *The Sandman*. There is no dialogue in the play. The puppeteers manipulate the marionettes – an old man, a blond girl, a disabled man, and a baby, most of them broken, some with a hole in their heads, others without eyes –which are dressed in black as if they were in mourning. The mourning women bury and unbury dolls compulsively and ceremonially in a cube of sand, ‘sacando a la luz aquello que debería permanecer oculto’ (bringing to light what should have stayed in the shadows).’[[21]](#footnote-21) The dolls keep coming back from death to die again, only to be resuscitated later in an endless infernal cycle. There is also a model of an autistic boy (the only example of a male doll in the works I look at here) who keeps moving his head back and forth, repeating this movement as obsessively as the toys are buried and unburied. The play is accompanied by unnerving music that reinforces the effect of horror in the audience.

 What makes this play so disturbing for the spectator is the use of a particular type of doll, namely automata and marionettes, their mobile condition making them more independent and ‘human-like’ than regular dolls. The marionettes in this play were made with antique and collectors’ dolls, which helped them to look more like miniature replicas or models for adults than children’s toys. Philippe Ariès reminds us that if, by 1600, the universe of toys and dolls was monopolised by children (they were an infantile specialty), this was not always the case. In ancient times dolls also had a religious significance as objects of household or funerary cults, relics from pilgrimages, and miniature replicas placed in tombs. Children, says Ariès, had then to share dolls ‘at least with the dead.’[[22]](#footnote-22) In the Middle Ages, the ambiguity of dolls and replicas continued and both magicians and witches used them, for example, as a dangerous instrument in voodoo practices.

 In *El hombre de arena*,the use of antique dolls, the performance of funerary rites, and the references to the world of the dead suggest that these models have a similar function to that in ancient times. Like the dolls that acted as mediums to connect with the dead, in this play there is also a dialogue between our world and the spirits that cannot rest in peace. The puppets/the dead do not talk but they do whisper to their puppeteers. In turn, these do not merely move the dolls, but interact with them, receive their orders, tell them what to do, and share their secrets. The borders between the inanimate objects and the humans become even blurrier, to the degree that the effect on spectators is one of complete commotion. At one point, it is as if the dolls and the actors have become one, the hands of one of the widows acting as the hands of a blond miniature girl.

 Thus, in *El hombre de arena* dolls and marionettes point to the *unheimlich* condition of disappearance, to what is supposed to be unrepresentable, untreatable and sacred. ‘Un actor no puede representar la muerte como el objeto’ (An actor cannot represent death as well as objects do), says group member and current director of the Argentine National Cervantes Theatre, Alejandro Tantanian, ‘Nosotros intentamos utilizar los objetos en aquellas circumnstancias en las que el teatro de actores no funcionaría con la misma fuerza’ (we tried to use objects in those circumstances in which theatre with actors would not function with the same impact).[[23]](#footnote-23) Strictly speaking, in this play dolls do not represent so much the dead as the *undead*. Although the links between dolls and disappearance in the play was, according to the members of El Periférico de Objetos, unintentional, the reading that the public made of the play was univocal: in *El hombre de arena* the disappeared of the dictatorship ‘volvían para contar sus historias’ (returned to tell their stories).[[24]](#footnote-24)

**Girlhoods, Disappearance and Toys of Loneliness**

Most of the dolls and marionettes used in *El hombre de arena* were not manufactured for the purposes of play, but rather as collector’s items. They also ‘performed’ in a play that was addressed mainly to an adult audience, understood by this audience as a reminder of both disappeared children *and* adults. By contrast, in the artworks I examine now, dolls are not only designed to be children’s toys, but are also used to depict or evoke the ‘missing’ children of the Argentine dictatorship, and more specifically disappeared girls.

 According to play theorist Brian Sutton-Smith, toys that have the most humanoid characteristics, such as soft toys and dolls, are the best substitute friends, what he calls ‘the toys of loneliness.’[[25]](#footnote-25) Diana Dowek’s painting *La muñeca* [The Doll](1977), Alicia Carletti’s painting *Regalo* [Gift/Present] (1978), and Helen Zout’s photographic exhibition *Muñecos y Memoria* [Dolls and Memory](2007), all include dolls or images of dolls to refer to or to evoke, more or less directly, sometimes even unintentionally, the disappearance of children, and specifically girls, during the dictatorship. In these works, the dolls have been left alone and cannot fulfill their destiny of comforting their owners. The presence of female dolls in these images points thus to the impact of State terror on the fragile universe of dictatorial girlhoods. In all these cases the dolls acquire an ominous air and point, with their presence, to the most perverse of the military’s crimes.

 *La muñeca* (figure 3) is part of the so-called ‘barbed wire series’ or *Paisajes cotidianos* [Daily Landscapes] that Dowek started in 1976, the year of the coup. Dowek presented the collection in the Arte Múltiple gallery in Buenos Aires a year later, in 1977. The common element of all the paintings in the series is the presence of barbed wire covering different surfaces and objects. Sometimes, as in ‘Campo alambrado’ [Fenced Field], the barbed wire appears slightly broken, suggesting a possible escape from the general atmosphere of oppression insinuated by these images.[[26]](#footnote-26) The breach in the barbed wire in these paintings also symbolises a scar that has not yet healed, a trope suggested by the title of another of Dowek’s series, ‘Las heridas del proceso’ [The Wounds of the Process], which was made in 1985.

 As art historian Ana Longoni explains in her analysis of Dowek’s painting, barbed wire was an emblematic symbol in nineteenth-century Argentina. On the one hand, this material invokes debates concerning the fencing off of the national territory, exemplified by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento’s cry ‘¡Cerquen, no sean bárbaros!’ (Fence, don’t be barbarians!);[[27]](#footnote-27) on the other, it points to the use of barbed wire to enclose cattle on the pampas. However, this was to change in the wake of debates about the savage side of capitalism and progress, and the concentration camps of the Second World War. In short, rather than connoting expanding civilization, barbed wire came to symbolise oppression and barbarism.[[28]](#footnote-28)

 In *La muñeca*, a doll is depicted sitting on a sofa that takes up the entire painting. Expressionless and dressed from top to toe, the doll is surrounded by wire netting, the pattern mirroring that of the sofa’s upholstery. As critics like Longoni have argued, the oppositions in the work are evident: the dark furniture contrasts with the bright doll, the doll’s clothing and the wire netting; the doll is swamped by the huge sofa; the piece of furniture is an open space, whereas the doll is an ‘enclosed’ object. These and other comparisons introduce an element of mystery in the sense that specificity is avoided: sofas are not manufactured and upholstered for dolls; dolls are not meant to sit on sofas.[[29]](#footnote-29) Ultimately, the doll is a make-believe person, a disturbing figure that evokes both the vital nature of humans and the inanimate condition of toys. In the upper extremity of another painting that Dowek made the same year as *La muñeca*, entitled *Paisajes cotidianos*, there is a fragment of the same or similar sofa (though now a dark red color). The remaining two-thirds of the painting are covered by a lighter red floor. Someone is sitting in the middle of the sofa, but we only see her legs covered with barbed wire. The size and form of her shoes and the dress that she wears suggests that it is a girl, although the gender of the person is not entirely clear. Read alongside *La muñeca* (reproduced side by side in the 2013 book of Dowek’s complete works), this painting reinforces the comparison between the trapped doll, animalised prisoners and the disappeared girls of the dictatorship.

 *La muñeca* points, thus, to the violent irruption of the dictatorship in childhood/girlhood, but does not show it. What we do not see (the doll’s owner, the process of someone placing the doll on the sofa, of them tying it up) is, in this image, equally if not more important as what is visible. The absent maker of the scene, the absent body of the young victim that has been replaced by a doll playing his or her role in the painting makes visible what is not there: both the perpetrators and the disappeared.

 In Alicia Carletti’s *Regalo* [Gift/Present] (1977), the abduction of a doll also echoes Argentina’s youngest disappeared, even if it is not clear whether that was the explicit intention of the artist (figure 4). But instead of barbed wire, the painter used a large plastic bag to imprison the doll. In previous paintings Carletti had already imprisoned other objects to express the feeling of oppression that prevailed during the 1970s. In *Ciudad de pesadumbre* [City of Sorrow] (1975), for example, she depicted surreal yellowish towers or castles covered with rope, confined in similar fashion to the objects in Dowek’s wire fence series. If there is a feature that defines the shared aesthetics in the works of both artists it is ambiguity: they both paint scenarios that highlight the ominous atmosphere of familiar and domestic spaces and objects.[[30]](#footnote-30)

 Carletti’s girls seem to have escaped the children’s books where they live to enter a completely different reality, rather like Alice in Wonderland. Her girls are in fact creole versions of both Lewis Carroll’s literary Alice and John Tenniel’s 1860 drawings and prints of this popular character. Carletti painted a series called *En el jardín de Alicia* (In Alice’s Garden), a wordplay that alludes both to her own name and the name of her childhood hero. Her images are related to Lewis Carroll in many ways, ‘por el absurdo juego de lo irreal y lo real, lo que no se ve, pero se presiente, y las misteriosas apariencias latentes’(to his absurd world made with the real and the surreal, with what we can and cannot see but we perceive, and with mysterious and latent appearances).[[31]](#footnote-31)

 Carletti’s fascination with Carroll’s Alice is worth mentioning here because, since 1976, this classic children’s book has often been read in Argentina as an allegory of the dictatorship, from Charly García’s famous song ‘Alicia en el país’ [Alice in the Country] to Laura Alcoba’s 2008 novel *La casa de los conejos* [The Rabbits’ House], a semi-autobiographical account of her childhood living underground. *Alice in Wonderland* is indeed a suitable allegory for the dictatorship for several reasons, in particular the cruelty of the Queen of Hearts, who wants to chop off the heads of everyone who opposes her, and the lack of justice in a world in which values and principles are upside down.[[32]](#footnote-32)

 While not all of Carletti’s girls, nor her references to Alice, are ominous or evocative of the horror of the dictatorship, *Regalo* is particularly disturbing, not least because it was painted in 1977, just a year after the coup, and because of its subject matter. In this picture, a young girl dressed in a red skirt and jumper looks defiantly at the spectator, holding a huge plastic bag in which she carries a human-size doll (or is it another girl?), clad in a blue dress and black shoes. The doll also ‘looks’ at the spectator with a deep, disquieting gaze. They are both in what appears to be a threatening forest, surrounded by gigantic brown leaves. What makes this image unsettling is its opacity. Is this apparently innocent and inoffensive girl kidnapping the doll? Is she rescuing her? Where is she taking her? Who is this gift for and where does it come from? Are these just two friends playing a (macabre) game? The uncertainty is exacerbated by the sense that we have caught them by surprise, as if they were hiding some terrible and shameful secret.

 The *unheimlich* becomes literal in this canvas. It is not only the familiar in the sense of the ‘known’ that has become frightening, but also the domestic places meant to protect families. There is nowhere to hide in these scenarios, no untouchable spaces. Neither the inside nor the outside preserve these girls from the threats that haunt them, perhaps because these threats not only come from the foreign and the unidentified but also lie in accustomed objects of comfort, like dolls. That is also why, as critics have pointed out, in many of Carletti’s paintings children’s toys are discarded and abandoned, dead, forgotten and incapable of play.[[33]](#footnote-33)

 Twenty years after Dowek’s and Carletti’s paintings were made, the photographer Helen Zout turned to the figure of the doll in her exhibition *Muñecos y Memoria* (Fundación Clara Anahí, La Plata, 12 August 2007), this time to evoke the case of a specific *disappeared* baby girl (figure 5) called Clara Anahí Mariani Teruggi. In her work Zout honored not only the memory of the child, but also the struggle of her grandmother, María Isabel ‘Chicha’ Chorobik de Mariani, who at the time of writing, is still looking for her granddaughter, only three months old when she was disappeared on 24 November 1976.

 Clara Anahí was hiding with her mother and other Montonero militants in La Plata when the military found their safe house and attacked those inside. Though witnesses confirmed that Clara Anahí survived the attack there are still no traces of her whereabouts. Before this tragic episode, Clara Anahí’s parents had placed a doll with long legs in her cot. After her granddaughter’s disappearance, ‘Chicha’ Mariani decided to start buying dolls to give to her granddaughter when they meet again. She collected dolls from the places around the world to which she travelled in search of information and help, campaigning in her own right and on behalf of those other grandmothers also looking for their grandchildren. In time, people found out about her endeavor, sending dolls for her collection. She now has more than two hundred items, including harlequins, baby dolls, mice, Topo Gigios, Marilú dolls, and dolls with folkloric costumes made in Spain, Mexico, Brazil, Switserland, and Bolivia. ‘Chicha’ Mariani was Helen Zout’s first art teacher. Zout, now an internationally-recognized photographer and fervent defender of human rights, wanted to do something with those dolls that never quite fulfilled their conventional function as a child’s source of comfort. Together with Mariani’s dolls, Zout also took pictures of the toys that Clara Anahí’s parents gave to each other as expressions of their love when they were young.

 Mariani’s dolls point to her struggle to recover her granddaughter in a tender and playful way, somehow counteracting the suffering and pain caused by Clara Anahí’s absence. In 2008, while working at the Senate of the Province of Buenos Aires, Zout asked for permission to photocopy the dolls. The black-and-white photocopies made on ordinary paper comprise a delicate piece of artwork and symbolise both the fragility of Mariani’s waiting period and her own physical weakness, not least because, at the time of writing, she is over ninety years old. The grey colour of the images and the blurred nature of the dolls reproduced cannot help but trigger associations with the phantasmagoric presence of the disappeared. ‘Es,’ Zout explains, ‘Como si se pasara de la esencia irrealizada del muñeco que es la felicidad, la alegría, el color a la realidad dramática del secuestro de una bebe que fue arrancada de su madre.’ (It is as if the unfulfilled essence of the dolls that is delivering happiness, joy and color to children have been transformed here into images more suited to the dramatic reality of the kidnapping of a baby who has been violently taken from the arms of her mother).[[34]](#footnote-34)

 In sum, the dolls addressed here invoke the girls who once nursed them or were meant to be their owners, and more generally, evoke childhood and disappearance during the 1970s in Argentina. Neither of these works has been met, as far as I am aware, with controversy, perhaps because of their ambiguous nature, and the delicate and even poetic ways in which they implicitly and subtly represent the victims. Conversely, in the performance that I address in the following section there is nothing subtle in the way that Argentina’s prodigal rock-singer Charly García used dolls to evoke disappearance. Indeed, he pushed the limits of the ways in which art has playfully depicted the disappeared by *toying* not only with dolls but also with the so-called ‘death flights’. If the mere fictionalisation of this crime in films or novels is often met with suspicion, the fact that Charly García proposed to represent it with dolls and objects of play adds another layer of controversy to these evocations.

**Distasteful Memories, Intolerable images**

Debates about the representable/unrepresentable dichotomy have been historically associated with the sense of sight, to what can and cannot be seen/shown with images.[[35]](#footnote-35) According to this view, it is practically impossible to represent some things –including absence – through images. And yet, as we have shown here – particularly with the aesthetics of the *Doppelgänger* – artists have constantly insisted on finding images to represent that which defies our senses. A second problem, however, arises in terms of to the representable/unrepresentable debate. Even accepting that we can create images to depict events that defy conventional forms of representations, there is the issue of whether it would be ethically wrong to represent some things with images. Jacques Rancière reflects on this problem and what he terms ‘the intolerable image,’ that is, images that ‘make us unable to view without experiencing pain or indignation’: ‘is it aceptable to make such images and exhibit them to others?,’ (83) he asks.

 As well as being an issue involving the sense of sight, the unrepresentable/representable debate is thus associated with the sense of (good and bad) taste. From this point of view the ‘unrepresentable’ is something that we cannot physically, bodily, tolerate. Considering the ‘unrepresentable’ via the affective responses that certain cultural memories of the post-dictatorship era in Argentina have had in the past helps us understand why some uses of dolls to represent the disappeared were met with controversy whereas the ones analysed in the previous sections were not. The work that I will address in this section – what I call the ‘falling dolls affair’ – provoked certain bodily reactions in their readers/public – disgust, revulsion, disdain, aversion – all associated with the senses of both sight and taste.[[36]](#footnote-36) Unlike the works previously studied here, the ‘falling dolls affair’ can be thus defined as a ‘distasteful memory’ of the disappeared. Regardless of the good intentions of García, some people simply ‘did not have stomach’ for it.

 In 1999, in the framework of a concert at the festival Buenos Aires Vivo III, Charly García suggested that rag dolls representing the disappeared be thrown from a helicopter during one of his shows, simulating the ‘death flights.’ This was the dictatorship’s modus operandi, in which doped victims were thrown from planes into the River Plate so that their corpses would disappear in that vast watery cemetery. García’s idea was inspired by the visual effect of Francis Ford Coppola’s *Apocalypse Now* (1979) and the plan was to have an orchestra playing in a ship moored in Puerto Madero, as well as helicopters flying over the crowds.

 Only a few years earlier, in 1995, former military Captain Adolfo Scilingo had offered chilling details of the military’s perverse and widespread disposal of its victims’ bodies in an extended interview with journalist Horacio Verbitsky, later published in the book *El vuelo* [The Flight] (1995). When García proposed incorporating the practice into his concert, Argentines were still trying to come to terms with Scilingo’s revelation. It is thus not surprising that García’s idea generated controversy, sparking interventions from other musicians, filmmakers, politicians, the President of Madres de Plaza de Mayo, Hebe de Bonafini, and Estela de Carlotto, the president of Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo.

 The late Mercedes Sosa, an iconic folklore singer in Argentina, and mother figure for García, advised him against the performance: ‘Carlitos ponéte las pilas y sacá eso’ (Carlitos, get your act together and take that bit out).[[37]](#footnote-37) Sosa delivered this admonition in a televised interview screened by Channel Azul on 18 February 1999, looking straight at the camera as if she were telling off a naughty son caught doing something untoward. Bonafini was less condescending and accused García of using the memory of the disappeared to make a show at the expense of the victims: ‘vos no podes montar vuelos de la muerte ni en broma’ (You cannot perform the death flights, not even as a joke), she said. Carlotto was also worried about the impact that the performance would have on the children of the disappeared. Paradoxically, however, Raquel Robles, daughter of disappeared parents and one of the most visible faces of the organisation HIJOS, was not offended in the slightest by the idea. She even defended García, arguing that ‘la sociedad argentina necesita de cosas contundentes para ver lo que pasó’ (Argentine society needs shocking things to see what happened here).[[38]](#footnote-38) Robles was angrier about the fact that the show was being paid for by the Radicals, the party that, after winning the democratic elections in 1983 that marked the end of the dictatorship, had gone on to introduce controversial amnesty laws.

 García’s idea divided opinions and highlighted some of the challenges artists would have to face in the years to come when they wanted to ‘play’ with Argentina’s traumatic past. While writers and artists like Robles argued that censuring artistic creativity was no different from the censorship exercised by the military, others, like Darío Lopérfido, who was then Minister of Culture, claimed that remembering/representing the disappeared in a way that offended the Madres de Plaza de Mayo was simply wrong.[[39]](#footnote-39) Even García seemed to agree with Lopérfido and those who criticised him: in the end he decided not to go ahead, stating that he did not want to upset the Madres.

 More recently, other works that ‘toy’ with history have provoked similar responses in the audience, including Albertina Carri’s use of Playmobil figures to recreate the abduction of her parents in her ground-breaking film *Los rubios* [The Blonds] (2003).[[40]](#footnote-40) Moreover, the 2007-2008 comic *El Síndrome Guastavino*, by Carlos Trillo and Lucas Varela, a story centered on an obsessive relationship between the son of a perpetrator and a doll, provoked such an uncomfortable feeling in some readers that even Juan Sasturain, a leading expert in Argentine comics, confessed that he found the story ‘unbearable.’[[41]](#footnote-41) .

I would argue, however, that unlike the ‘falling doll affair’, both this comic and Carri’s film are not merely shocking but open up new and revelatory paths of enquiry in post-dictatorship Argentina. *Los rubios* has sparked productive debates on the role of forgetting and fiction in the vicarious memories of children of disappeared parents, while *El síndrome Guastavino* is one of the few texts in which the figure of the doll is used to refer explicitly to the sexual violations suffered by female *guerrilleras* during the military regime, an aspect of the period that remains underexplored. The issue is thus not so much whether the artists studied here use dolls to provocatively represent the disappeared, but whether there is something that they are telling us with their narratives and images that was not previously part of the discussions about both history and the history of the representations of the disappeared.

**Serious Play or the Trivialization of the Past**

In most of the cases studied here play and playthings are not used to scandalise or simply to provoke spectators; rather they are deployed in the sense suggested by Giorgio Agamben in his popular essay on play and profanation: that is, to irreverently appropriate the past, and more specifically what belongs to the spheres of the sacred, without completely abolishing its enigmatic aura.[[42]](#footnote-42) The use of dolls in these works opposes thus both the monumentalization of memory and the claims that there are certain events or phenomena that are practically and morally unrepresentable.

 One key aspect of these works is that through their spectral nature the image of the doll grasps the queer and anachronistic polytemporality of disappearance, a crime committed in the past but which is still *happening* today (someone is, not was, disappeared), disrupting our experience of a linear chronology of time. Moreover, these images and practices also visualise and *bear witness* to events that aimed to leave no visible trace and no witness to prove that the crimes had taken place. These cultural memories are what Griselda Pollock has called the ‘after-images’ of trauma. Substituting an absent referent, they point to the void left by disappearance by offering an ‘encounter with its traces.’[[43]](#footnote-43) Dolls do not replace a traumatic event such as disappearance, but evoke the effects of that event in the present via its partial and imperfect substitution. In other words, dolls occupy the physical space left by the victims and somehow provide them with the corporality that they lack. At the same time, however, dolls do not supplant the victims’ absent bodies but rather become their doubles, shadows and silhouettes. The inanimate replicas studied here, some handmade or animated by puppeteers, others photographed, drawn or painted, allude less to life and death than to the ‘alive dead’ that live among us, those ethereal figures that have haunted us for so many years – and perhaps always will – with their frozen, ominous eyes.
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