ABSTRACT: America is a blurry concept that is difficult to define. This difficulty arises because America is not a unit, but corresponds to a multiplicity of imaginaries. The question that guides this article is how the multiplicity of imaginaries arises. This examination through historical tracking from emblematic texts points out the problematic about reality that those imaginaries produce. On the one hand, it can be claimed its fictive nature and the absence of an epistemological fundament that establishes this imaginary as necessary. On the other hand, these imaginaries produce "real" consequences in societies and in subjects. Thus, the text aims to make a reconstruction of some existing imaginaries in the Americas and from them to address the problem of the fiction-reality relationship.
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RESUMO A América é um conceito embaçado que é difícil de definir. Esta dificuldade surge porque ela não é uma unidade, mas corresponde a uma multiplicidade de imaginários. A questão que guia este artigo é saber a razão do surgimento dessa multiplicidade imaginária. Neste exame, através do rastreamento histórico de textos emblemáticos, a questão surge da realidade de tais imaginários. Se, por um lado, se pode afirmar sua natureza fictícia e, portanto, a ausência de um fundamento que estabeleça esse imaginário como necessário, por outro, esses imaginários produzem consequências “reais” nas sociedades e nos sujeitos. Assim, o texto pretende reconstruir alguns imaginários existentes nas Américas e, a partir deles, abordar o problema da relação ficção-realidade.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Américas-Imaginários-Ficção-Realidade

RESUMEN: América es un concepto borroso que es difícil definir. Esta dificultad surge porque América no es una unidad, sino que corresponde a una multiplicidad de imaginarios. La pregunta que guía este artículo es porque surge esa multiplicidad imaginarios. En este examén a través de un rastreo histórico a partir de textos emblemáticos surge la cuestión a partir de la realidad de dichos imaginarios. Si bien por un lado se puede afirmar su carácter
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fictivo y por lo tanto la ausencia de un fundamento que establezca ese imaginario como necesario, por el otro lado estos imaginarios producen consecuencias “reales” en las sociedades y en los sujetos. Así, el texto pretende hacer una reconstrucción de algunos imaginarios existentes en las Américas y a partir de ellos abordar el problema sobre la relación ficción-realidad.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Américas-Imaginarios-Ficción-Realidad

Introduction

The Americas is a space of multiplicities. This multiplicity has as origin a specific violent encounter between two systems of ideas. Moreover, it is the encounter of two visions of America. In other words, the origin of this multiplicity is the collision of two imaginaries. This concept coined by the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan in 1936 refers to the set of values and the image that a subject makes of itself (2013). This idea can also be extended to the idea of a group about other groups. In this regard, the use of this concept in this article is wider than the conceptualization done by Lacan (for a further discussion see the chapter “Foundational Narratives in the Americas” in this volume).

It is impossible to cover the multiplicity of imaginaries that emerge in the Americas. Consequently, the article focuses on the imaginaries which crushed with the so-called “discovering of America”. Afterwards, the multiplicity of imaginaries that emerged in the Americas due to the processes of independence is described. Finally, the text will argue about the fictionality of those imaginaries and the paradox of production of reality through fiction.

America as being

The Americas have been a difficult concept to define. The definitions seem to be inadequate to cover the multiplicity of social, political, economic, cultural and natural phenomena which occur in this space called America. The use of the term is already problematic, since this is a definition imposed by the colonizers over the original inhabitants of those spaces (for a wider discussion see “invention of the Americas” in this volume). The indigenous groups possessed other conceptualizations about their relationship with this environment. Those indigenous imaginaries implied different conceptualizations and believes than the ones brought by the colonizers. The contradiction between those imaginaries caused an epistemic problem which has been present in the Americas since this encounter.

Indigenous imaginaries differed from those by Spaniards and Portuguese, since the relationship with the environment was different. Although it is impossible to summarize the indigenous imaginaries in only one common imaginary, the relation of those tribes with nature seems to be a common feature of their imaginaries. This relationship also implied a different relationship with themselves, and it constructed a different society. They did not see nature as an element to be developed. Nature for the indigenous societies was a complete being which developed itself (TORRES, 2010). Nature as being cannot be appropriated. Thus, property did not exist in the indigenous society. Since it did not exist a concept of property, the indigenous groups had a different conception of labor.
The indigenous imaginary entailed a society based upon the respect to nature. Consequently, labor was mainly addressed to protect this being (Ibid.), and work was not essentially considered for production. In this regard, indigenous labor focused on providing an equilibrium between production and sustainability. This goal could only be reached by exploiting the soils as much as the minimum necessary for the whole society. The idea of producing for retaining did not belong to the social imaginary of the indigenous groups. The concept of property is not possible without saving. If the produced goods are consumed in short time, the property of this good is not important. The disappearance of the property occurs so fast, that the concept of property refers more to whom consumes the good than the possibility to maintain the good. This absence of individual accumulation derives from this imaginary of America as a being.

This conceptualization of no-accumulation also rests on denying the possibility of domination over time. As America was a superior being, it is impossible to dominate its behavior. Thus, the human beings cannot transform the processes of nature. It was impossible to transform the future, since the path was imposed by nature. Time is the difference between past, present and future. Those stages are distinguished by the occurrence of events. It means, the occurrence of an event, present, entails the transition from the ending of a former event, the past, and the expectation of the new one, the future. If it is impossible for the human beings to dominate the occurrence of events, time cannot be ruled by them. On the contrary, the human beings depend on this flow of occurrences designated by nature. The conclusion from this principle is the fatalism.

The indigenous people were intrinsically related during colonial times with fatalism (ORIZ BES, 2015). This feature of their social imaginary was strongly criticized by the invaders, since it implied the impossibility for the indigenous groups to develop themselves. Fatalism is defined as the acceptance of the unavoidable event which occurs in spite of the efforts that human beings can carry out in order to stop it. The indigenous groups, as mentioned before, imagined America as a being. It implies that they could not dominate it. Consequently, this being developed itself, and the human beings had no interference with this development. Since it was impossible to modify this development, human beings must adjust to it instead of attempting a transformation of this being. Fatalism was the conclusion derived from the imaginary of what the Americas were for them. This imaginary crashed completely with the one of the invaders which rested on the production and accumulation. Thus, the encounter with the Europeans was more than the loss of their lands. It was the abandonment of their whole imaginary which was the support for their entire epistemology and social relations.

America as savage new world

The world from the European perspective before 1492 ended at the fortunate islands (MARTÍNEZ HERNÁNDEZ, 2011). This name was given by Plato to some imagined islands that were located beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and they were the place where the virtuous could rest in perfect peace. The so-called discovering of the Canary Islands in 1312 implied an expansion of the European boundaries, and the confirmation of Plato´s assumption about an idyllic island beyond the known-world. The Europeans had finally discovered the end of the world. The war against the Ottoman Empire (DE BUNES IBARRA, 1994) forced the main powers of Europe to find out a new route to travel to the east. The expansion of the Portuguese followed by the Spaniards to the Atlantic shaped the idea of a new route to access the east. This
expansion to the Atlantic concluded with the encounter with an unknown territory for the Europeans, namely, the Americas. It was not an encounter from the point of view of the Europeans, but the discovery of a new world.

A new world emerged, and it implied a self-affirmation for the imaginary of the Europeans. The medieval imagining of the world exploded into pieces. The epistemological framework of the middle-ages was false. The earth was not plane. The world did not finish on the Canary Islands. The theological distribution of ethnic groups derived from the bible was incomplete. Noah had three sons and their descendants inhabited the known-world. The oldest son Japheth was the father of the ethnic groups in Europe (CASTRO-GÓMEZ, 2018). The middle son Shem was the ancestor of the near east and Asia excluding Russia. The youngest son Ham was the progenitor of African and Arab groups. This theological thesis sustained the division among ethnic groups and the imaginary of the Europeans of superiority during the middle age. This theory felt apart with the so-called discovering of America. The indigenous groups did not belong to this imaginary.

The old imaginary was not abandoned, but it was modified. Since this imaginary was false, the destruction or modification was necessary. A destruction of the imaginary was impossible, because it sustained the social, economic and political relationships in the medieval society. Thus, a modification of the whole framework was carried out. It entailed the introduction of the already existed territories in the old imaginary. The map of Juan de la Cosa² (1500) is a remarkable example of this introduction. This was the first map drawn since the arrival of Christopher Columbus in America. It showed the introduction of the “new” territories. The colonized islands in the Caribbean are painted in the same color as the already-known territories of Africa, Asia and Europe. On the contrary, the continental territory is a vast mass without a name and in green. In this regarding, America is not a new world, since it was a new territory, but it was a savage continent. A new or old world was not designated by the geological age of the territory. They were designated according to the connection with the epistemological framework of the Europeans. It means, the connection of those territories and their inhabitants with the European imaginary of the world.

The concept of new was related to the unknown knowledge for the Europeans. This old-new relationship, however, was not a neutral one, the colonizers presented the new world as former phases of the human process of development. Thus, the new world was actually a new-old world. It was the promise of a new wonderful world, but it should be developed. The mission of the colonizers was to provide the “truth” and civilization to the fantastic “savage” world. Christopher Columbus, Cabeza de Vaca and Americo Vespucci provided the first descriptions of indigenous groups in Europe. They described indigenous as monsters (CAMPUZANO, 2014). Those descriptions were still influenced by the medieval idea of the world’s ending on the Canary Islands. America was for them new territories, but they belonged to the old imaginary which claimed that the end of the world were full of monsters as the scholasticism taught for centuries. On the contrary, the first paintings of indigenous people remember the idea of what is a human by the antique Greeks (Ibid.). Those paintings represented the indigenous groups as noble human beings who were living in the European past. They represented the Roman-Greek world in the present. Thus, the indigenous people were noble savages. They were savages not because they were violent. They were savages, since they lived in the past. Moreover, they lived without time. Hence, Europeans imposed themselves the mission of
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² The map can be accessed in http://www.mesenburg.de/Seiten/Porolane/Weltkarten/Juan-de-la-Cosa/Juan-de-la-Cosa_Karte.htm.
introducing the past in this new world in order to develop it in some aspects. With this role of entrepreneurs, the colonizers sustained part of their imaginary, and they constructed the otherness from this device called Europe.

The emergence of the Americas

The two imaginaries mentioned before were presented as a unit. Notwithstanding, those imaginaries were different within the two continents. Both Europe and America were not transparent units. The societies and their imaginaries differed from each other. America and Europe can be presented as a whole, since the imaginaries between the societies that inhabited Europe and those that inhabited America were so different, that the similarities within the societies which inhabited the same continent created the idea of transparency and unity. Those differences only emerged after the processes of independence.

America as a concept was an exterior definition (See “The invention of America in this volume”). The indigenous groups never defined this being in relationship to other entities. This being that the Europeans called America was a totality. It was defined by itself. America was the concept to define the “new” otherness of the European imaginary. Although there were differences from colony to colony and from colonizer to colonizer, America remained as both the new space for the Europeans and the invaded land for the indigenous groups. The idea of America as space of multiple imaginaries only emerged with the processes of independence.

The colonial structures were the main reason for this difference. The pro-independence campaigners used the existing colonial structures in order to achieve their goals. As many authors claim (CASTRO-GÓMEZ (2018), ESCAMILLA (1996), LINDLEY (1977)), it is due to the motivation of maintaining the power over other castes. It, however, overlooks the feeling of belonging created by those structures. Different cultures emerged from those structures. The environment and the culture of indigenous groups and slaves also developed specific modes of social, economic, and political relationships. It is a multiplicity of imaginaries. This text cannot cover the whole multiplicity of imaginaries which emerge in the Americas. Moreover, those imaginaries changed during history. Thus, this article only describes the most relevant in the discussion about the Americas in a specific time period.

a) America: the land of future

America was the denomination for Latin-America during colonial times. The process of independence in The United States influenced deeply the French revolution. It implied that the most often use of America was addressed to the United States. This change of geographical orientation did not only transform the exterior idea of America, but it entailed a transformation in the self-consciousness of the United States. Since their independence, the United States claimed themselves as the Americans. On the one hand, it transformed its relationship with Europe. On the other hand, it created a tense relationship with the other emerged Americas.

The United States accepted the European imaginary of otherness. They claimed the difference from those living in Europe and their institutions. This otherness, however, was not dependent on Europe. The new American imaginary was the opposition of the European one. This opposition was coined in terms of time. During and after the independence in the United States, many authors (CRÊVECOEUR (1962), EMERSON (2005)) described the independent country as a new country. It was a new country, because the old European traditions were
abandoned in order to impose a new imaginary where “all men are born free and equal” (COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1788). In this regard, the Americans accepted the European imaginary in order to conceptualize it as the past which must be overcome. A new stage of the world started after the emergence of this new country. America was the future. The United States was not, however, a finished entity after the independence. It had a manifest destiny as the priest John Winthrop (1630) claimed. The expansion to the west, for instance, rested on this manifest destiny. America was neither the past nor the present, but the future. This new imaginary developed a new epistemological system, namely, pragmatism.

The construction of certain imaginaries, as mentioned before, implies the development of certain epistemological systems. The European imaginary of themselves was intrinsically related to the past. The social structures and the domination over the indigenous groups rested on the idea of the past. The validity of a claim was based upon the tradition and its validity in the past. The United States considered itself as the nation of the future. Its imaginary was not embedded to the past, but the future was the new epistemological tool to find out the validity of a statement. Pragmatism was the new epistemological system which derived from the new imaginary of America as a nation of future.

The US-philosopher James Bissett Pratt summarized in a formidable way the main theses of pragmatism. In his book “What is pragmatism?” (1909), the philosopher described the new form to do philosophy in America during the 19th century. The difference between the old forms of doing philosophy in Europe and in the United States is according to Pratt the use of consequence as system of validation. He writes “the "consequences" which, according to pragmatism, alone give meaning are "consequences” in our future practical experience.” (PRATT, 1909, p. 28). The whole system of pragmatism rested on this principle. The future was the key for the new philosophy. The separation from the old European philosophy connected to the past and historicism was one of the main transformations derived from this imaginary of America as nation of future. It was impossible for the United States to construct an identity from the past. Although indigenous groups inhabited the territories before, their imaginary did not belong to the large white population who carried out the process of independence. The black imaginaries could not be part of the new imaginary, since slavery sustained the economy of many states. The white settler needed an imaginary which could sustain their social, economic and political relationships. In absence of the past, the new imaginary was constructed towards the future. Pragmatism was the philosophical expression of that. The expansion to the west was the geographical expansion of this imaginary.

The United States were not a complete nation after the independence according to this imaginary. The manifest destiny also implied the completeness of the geographical nation. Consequently, an expansion in order to colonize the west territories started at the beginning of the 19th century. This expansion ended in February 14, 1912 when Arizona was admitted to the Union. This expansion also ended with the imaginary of the United States as the land of the future. The new imaginary of the Unites States at the beginning of 20th century was America as a global and imperial power which can be summarized in the Roosevelt’s politics of Big Stick. America is not more the promise of a powerful land, but the United States were already an imperial power. This change forced a shift in the imaginary from the nation of the future to the power of the now. It also implied the abandonment of the epistemological framework derived from the imaginary of America as a nation of the future. Pragmatism was abandoned in the 20th century. The future was not the tool of validation anymore.

b) America as Nuestra
The processes of independence, as mentioned before, implied the emergence of a multiplicity of imaginaries. It was the origin of the Americas in plural. This plurality emerged due to the former colonial structures, but it was also the product of the foreign policies of the new countries. The projects of the independence campaigners were different and contradictory. On the one hand, the United States developed an imaginary of America as the future. This imaginary, however, only included some north territories of the continent, and they proclaimed themselves as protectors of the whole continent with the Monroe doctrine (1823). On the other hand, Simon Bolivar and other independence campaigners sought the constitution of a large nation composed by the former Spaniards colonies. The role of the protector declared by the United States was seen for them as the declaration of interference in the Latin-American countries (BOLIVAR, 1829). Thus, the Liberator excluded from America the territories of the north. He wrote in his famous “Letter to Jamaica”:

> Since it [the New World] has a common origin, language, costumes and religion, it should have a unique government which confederated the different emerging states, but it is not possible due to different climate, diverse situations, opposite interests and different attitudes divide the America. (BOLIVAR, 1915, p. 317).

With the common language, Bolivar does not only exclude from America the north territories, but he also excludes those new countries that do not speak Spanish. Countries as Brazil, Haiti and other islands in the Caribbean are not included in the imaginary of America by Simon Bolivar. The belonging to the former colonizer is the cornerstone of this new imaginary. The new America could not constitute its imaginary by itself as Europe or the United States, but it is the otherness of Europe. The invasion and the resistance against the European injustice were the main features of the imaginary of America in the Spanish-speaking countries after the independence. Those imaginaries of America as Future and America of Resistance struggled promptly in order to impose themselves as the hegemonic one. The steady and rapid process of industrialization of the United States created a technological advantage over the other American countries. This advantage also allowed an imperial race by the United States which concluded with the neo-colonization of some former Spanish colonies such as Cuba or Puerto Rico in the Cuban-Spanish-North American war (GÓMEZ NUÑEZ, 1901). This imperial attitude deepened the feeling of resistance in Latin-America.

Latin-America as imaginary emerged as opposition to North-America. On the one hand, the external reference by academicians from Europe imposed this name of Latin-America to the former colonies of France, Portugal and Spain. This reference legitimized the pretension of the United States to be proclaimed as America. On the other hand, this legitimization of the United States as America by the western European powers created a strong feeling of solidarity among the countries of the other America. This new America conceived itself as the resistance against the global colonial and imperial powers. Resting on the Liberators as Simon Bolivar or San Martín, a new imaginary of America, which opposed to the North-American imaginary of future and expansion, emerged. *Nuestra America* as imaginary created the idea of a natural unity.

The Cuban thinker José Martí coined the term *Nuestra America* in 1891 to conceptualize this America which is the opposition to that America as future from the north. Martín developed in his article entitled “*Nuestra America*” the vision of a natural America. His idea was based on the natural man. Martí ontologized the inhabitants of Latin-America to create this imaginary of unity. *Nuestra America* is the place where the natural men inhabit and develop themselves. This
natural man is the result of the hybridization between the indigenous groups, Afro-descendants and peasants. In other words, the natural man is the mestizo one which has a particular reason. The particular social, environmental and economic configurations of this America developed a specific reason which should be followed by the governors in order to solve the local problems (MARTÍ, 2002, p. 20). This mestizo reason opposes to the European and US-American reason which are based on the book. The natural man conceptualizes not from the book, but it produces knowledge from its relationship with the American nature. Thus, Martí is a precedent for the actual imaginary of Latin-America created by Post and De-colonial Studies. Latin-America is for Martí an ontological space which has a specific reason for a particular subject who inhabits this space.

This imaginary of unity continues to be claimed by academicians and politicians. The de-colonial theory developed by the Argentinian thinker Walter Mignolo rests on the principle of a Latin-American reason. Mignolo (1995) claims that knowledge and reason are intrinsically connected to the environment and the social structures, and there is an impossibility of making understand this knowledge for the subject outside the region. This impossibility forces to admit that there is a multiplicity of reasons. The subject can only understand its own system of knowledge. This approach rests on the Martí´s principle of a natural man. This imaginary also includes political agendas. The socialism of the 21th century sought to develop the unity of Latin-America. The Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez, for instance, used the profit coming from the oil industry in order to establish a Latin-American cooperation which was the first step towards a deeper integration among the Latin-American and Caribbean countries. Notwithstanding, the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela contradicts this idea of natural integration in Latin-America. The national borders and the politics of migration for Venezuelans became thicker and many countries of the region are asking Venezuelans for visas in order to stay in those countries (EFE, 2018). In opposition to Nuestra America by Martí, the national imaginaries in Latin-America became stronger, and it implies a new conceptualization about the vision of Latin-America. This phenomenon also highlights that the imaginary of Latin-America as unity and place of resistance does not always imply a unity of those countries located in the region. Furthermore, both Bolivar and Martí did not mention what it is the role of the countries that were former colonies of England, France, Netherlands and Portugal and are located in this Latin-America.

c) America as divided by Tordesillas: between the origin illness and the civilization

The visions of America are deeply influenced by the former colonial powers. Hispano-America3, as mentioned before, had the same myopia as the United States with the construction of the America´s imaginary. The mentions of Brazil in this unity of America were almost nonexistent. In this context, Brazil seemed to be excluded from what is America, though they are the third largest country in the Americas. This exclusion is the result of a treaty between the two former colonizers, the Spanish and Portuguese crowns, in 1494. The treaty of Tordesillas, a city in Spain where the treaty was signed, creating the delimitation between the zones of Spanish and Portuguese control. Portugal did not have any intentions of colonizing the land. They only needed Brazil as port in order to reach their main objective, namely, Africa (quote). It implied that Brazil was mostly underpopulated, and the cities were constructed in an unorganized system in comparison with the colonies of Spain. After the independence, Brazilian Leaders wanted to transform the empire into a republic. According to the Brazilian
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3 Former spanisch colonies.
sociologist Antônio Cândido (2000), Brazil had a greater interest in the Hispanic America than the interest of Hispanic America in Brazil. The Brazilian imaginary after the colonization is constructed on the comparison between the colonizers. The sociologist Gilberto Freyre, for instance, in his classical book about Brazil “Casa-Grande & Senzala” (1957) describes the colonization of Brazil in comparison with the Spanish colonization of America. Thus, the Americaness in the Brazilian imaginary emerged in a specific context of colonization, but not about a similar natural features as Martí claimed. In other words, the unity emerged from the former colonization.

America in the Brazilian context is the place of injustice created by the colonizers. Manuel Bomfim (2008) claims that the Latin-American countries are already condemned due to the colonization. There is an original illness in the new Latin-American republics produced by the colonization. Moreover, Bomfim sustains that these vicious structure of exploitation could not be overcome. Thus, the original union of the Latin-American countries is this illness. The modernist movement in Brazil in 1920 followed this path. The cannibal manifest by Oswald de Andrade (1928) affirmed that Brazil is always incomplete. The Brazilians, according to Andrade, have to devour other cultures in order to obtain an idea of them. This emptiness produced by the colonization is the main feature of Brazil, but also for America. This idea of connection due to the colonization did not exclude any part of America. In opposition to the idea of Nuestra America, the Brazilian imaginary of America also included the United States. This inclusion is also the result of the disappointment of the Hispanic-American’s vision. At the beginning the 20th century, Hispanic-America was seen from the point of view of politicians and academicians as a violent and anarchical region (BETHELL, 2011). Afterwards, Brazil conceives itself and the United States as the defenders of America against the European imperialism. Brazil and the United States are the only two countries of the region with the resources, extension and political stability to civilize the rest of America according to this vision (Ibid.). Thus, Hispanic-America is an unstable region guided by the violence which must be civilized by the two largest and powerful countries, namely, Brazil and the United States. Thus, America from the Brazilian perspective is a whole which emerged against the European imperialism. Brazil and the United States are the civilizers of the region in order to establish wealthier and more pacific countries.

d) The Caribbean as archipelago: the fragmentation of the Americas

The imaginaries of America attempted to develop a totality. The Americas as a whole or as two great regions are visions of unities. Those imaginaries are the result of continental experiences of the region. They, however, lack of consistency, when they are used in the Caribbean. This region is always of transit and discontinuity. Consequently, a stable America is for many inhabitants of the islands inconceivable. The Caribbean thinker Édouard Glissant is conscious of this phenomenon. He highlights that a new thought is necessary to understand the Caribbean. This new thought is derived from a new imaginary of the Americas as fragmentation. Glissant (1998) considers the existence of totality-world. It is the whole world. This totality-world, however, only emerged from the experience of the difference. Thus, the idea the whole is only mediated by singularities. The Caribbean is a totality experienced through each island. There is no experience of the whole Caribbean, but a specific experience of an island. Those island had different colonial and national processes that it is impossible to define the Caribbean according to one single feature. They do not define them by the unity, but the difference within them.
The difference as fragmentation is the process of a whole America. Glissant claims Caribbean and the world as totalities. In this regard, America is a totality, but it is the set of differences which inhabit the region. America is a place full of social, environmental and political pluralities which cannot be defined by one single feature. America is the sum of differences. America as space of differences also implies as space of contradictions. The problem arises seeking the utility of this definition. The assertion of America as space of fragmentation highlights the level of differentiated societies within the region. The question arises, when the claiming about the totality appears, what is the necessity to affirm America as a totality, if this unity is the sum of differences? The creation of those totalities seeks to achieve some economic and political goals in a determined space and time.

**Producing reality through fictional imaginaries**

The question about the imaginaries of America is the transversal question of many phenomena that take place in the Americas. A specific imaginary, as described before, implies a specific political, economic, social and epistemological system. Thus, the imaginaries are the cornerstone of the societies. Although those visions emerged from the interaction of the human groups with their environment and other social groups, it is incontestable that the imaginaries in general are highly fictional. In other words, they are invented, and they do not seem to be an essential part of the human beings as hunger or death. Those fictions, however, become truth due to the belief of the human societies in those visions. The paradox about the emergence of reality through fiction is particular interesting. The Americas highlight the plurality of fictional imaginaries which can emerge in a geographical space. The imaginaries mentioned before are the example that the struggle for the power is not only given by the force of arguments, but the capacity to make believe a fiction as America as the land of future or America as place of resistance. Neither the former nor the latter are truth, but they also produce reality. The invasion and wars of the United States and their consequences are real. Thousands of persons have been killed defending one or another imaginary. The Latin-American revolutions rested on fictional images of themselves and they have produced changes, but also deep crisis. The imaginary of Latin-America as unity through the resistance against the imperialism produced the socialism of the 21th century. The Venezuelan revolution was a Bolivarian one. It means that the Chavistas seek to continue the construction of the imaginary developed by Simon Bolivar. As the Cuban professor Vicente Escandell (2011) claims the socialism of the 21st century continues the project of the necessary integration by Bolivar and Martí. This imaginary, as mentioned before, claims an immanent unity of Latin-America. The search of this imaginary finished with a humanitarian crisis in Venezuela. Those consequences are real, thousands of people fleeing from this country. Perhaps, the fiction is not uncovered in the crisis itself. It is uncovered, when the reality denies the fiction. The denial of entrance by many Latin-American countries to Venezuelan citizens reveals that the Latin-American unity does not exist. There is not a natural integration. The imaginaries are always fictional in certain degree. The validity of an imaginary cannot be claimed. The role of the area studies, especially Inter-American Studies, is to understand this paradox, namely, the production of reality through the fictional imaginaries.

---

4 The question about what is real, it is a complicated question that this article cannot answer due to the limit of extension. However, there are experiences as suffering, hunger, death and pain which are hardly called fictions. The article refers to this difference.
Conclusion

The article reconstructs some imaginaries about America. This is a historical reconstruction which begins with the analysis of the indigenous imaginaries in order to confront it with the European one at the time of the expansion. Then, the multiplicity of emerged imaginaries after the processes of the independence are described in to highlight the role of former colonial structures in the new countries. The article describes the US-Imaginary of the land of future, the Hispano-American imaginary of resistance and Latin-American integration, the Brazilian imaginary of condemned continent and exceptionalism and America as fragmentation by the Caribbean thinker Glissant. By analyzing the validity of those imaginaries, the article concludes that any imaginaries is always fictional. Thus, the text points out the paradox of the production of reality through the fiction.
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