Ghostly Politics:

Statecraft, Monumentalization, and a Logic of Haunting

by

Jessica Auchter

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

Approved March 2012 by the Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Roxanne Doty, Chair Shahla Talebi Richard Ashley

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2012

© 2012 Jessica Grace Auchter

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

International Relations has traditionally focused on conflict and war, but the effects of violence including dead bodies and memorialization practices have largely been considered beyond the purview of the field. This project seeks to explore the relationship between practices of statecraft at multiple levels and decisions surrounding memorialization. Exploring the role of bodies and bones and the politics of display at memorial sites, as well as the construction of space, I explore how practices of statecraft often rely on an exclusionary logic which renders certain lives politically qualified and others beyond the realm of qualified politics. I draw on the Derridean notion of hauntology to explore how the line between life and death itself is a political construction which sustains particular performances of statecraft.

Utilizing ethnographic field work and discourse analysis, I trace the relationship between a logic of haunting and statecraft at sites of memory in three cases. Rwandan genocide memorialization is often centered on bodies and bones, displayed as evidence of the genocide. Yet, this display invokes the specter of genocide in order to legitimate specific policymaking. Memorialization of undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border offers an opportunity to explore practices that grieve ungrievable lives, and how memorialization can posit a resistance to the bordering mechanisms of statecraft. 9/11 memorialization offers an interesting case because of the way in which bodies were vanished and spaces reconfigured. Using the question of vanishing

i

as a frame, this final case explores how statecraft is dependent on vanishing: the making absent of something so as to render something else present.

Several main conclusions and implications are drawn from the cases. First, labeling certain lives as politically unqualified can sustain certain conceptualizations of the state. Second, paying attention to the way statecraft is a haunted performance, being haunted by the things we perhaps ethically should be haunted by, can re-conceptualize the way International Relations thinks about concepts such as security, citizenship, and power. Finally, memorialization, while seemingly innocuous, is really a space for political contestation that can, if done in certain ways, really implicate the high politics of security conventional wisdom. This dissertation is dedicated to Janice, who once told me to do brave research,

and to Tom, without whose support I would not be where I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge several people whose help was integral to this dissertation project. My three committee members, Roxanne Doty, Richard Ashley, and Shahla Talebi, who encouraged this project in every stage of its development, were particularly integral to its success. I would also like to thank Stefan Borg, Leonardo Figueroa Helland, Anna Agathangelou, Renee Marlin-Bennett, Rosemary Shinko, Lauren Wilcox, Vivienne Jabri, Brent Steele, Maja Zehfuss, Jenny Edkins, Mustafa Tagma, Jack Crittenden, Avital Simhony, Janice Bially Mattern, Daniel Pout, Soul Park, and Yoav Gortzak for comments on various parts of this research. I would also like to thank Valarie James, for being so open about the motivations of her artwork, and James Smith, Yannick Tona, and Sam Boarer of the Aegis Trust for their assistance in Rwanda. The interviewing conducted in Rwanda was awarded an Institutional Review Board exemption.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1	GHOSTLY POLITICS: AN INTRODUCTION 1
	Memory, Memorialization, and Memory Studies7
	Memory Studies Meets International Relations
	From Trauma to a Logic of Haunting
2	MOVING FROM MEMORY AND TRAUMA TO A LOGIC OF
	HAUNTING
	Laying Out the Logic of Haunting
	Why Bodies?
	How to Look for Ghosts, or, A Note on Methodology 57
3	BORDER MONUMENTS: MEMORY, COUNTER-MEMORY,
	AND (B)ORDERING PRACTICES ALONG THE US-MEXICO
	BORDER 66
	Conceptualizing Statecraft: Ordering and Bordering
	Building the Border Wall: Border Regions as Zones of Statecraft. 68
	Building the Other Border Wall: Statecraft Along the Israeli-
	Palestinian Border
	Memorializing Border Deaths: Crosses, Specters, and El Tiradito. 90
	Aesthetic Resistances: Border Artists and Monumentalization 97
	Paupers Cemeteries: No Olvidado 109
	Counter-Memorialization: Some Conclusions

4	BONES IN A BROWN BAG: HAUNTING AND THE PLACE OF		
	THE BODY IN RWANDAN GENOCIDE MEMORIALIZATION		
	The Memorials and the Mass Graves		
	On Naming: Walls of Names and Identifying Skulls 171		
	Scarred Bodies, Scarred Spaces, Scarred Buildings		
	Memorialization and Reconciliation: Haunting and Statecraft 187		
	The Rwanda Project: Conclusions by way of Aesthetic		
	Representations		
5	VANISHING MONUMENTS: ABSENCE, THE LOGIC OF		
	VANISHING, AND 9/11 MEMORIALIZATION 201		
	Historical Absences: The Counter-Memory Movement in Germany		
	'After 9/11': Designing Monuments		
	On Rubble: Memorializing (the lack of) Bodies		
	Towers of Light: From (lack of) Bodies to (lack of) Buildings 225		
	Naming and Identifying the Dead of 9/11		
	Statecraft: The Construction and Governing of Sacred Space 240		
	Ten Years Later: Memorializing the Anniversary		
	'Too Early for Masterpieces': Artistic Memorialization of 9/11254		
	Some Conclusions: When Ruins Fall into Ruin		

CHAPTER	Pa	age
6	AFTER GHOSTLY POLITICS: SOME CONCLUSIONS 2	268
REFEREN	CES	278

GHOSTLY POLITICS: AN INTRODUCTION

Our world is imbued with the politics of memory and of memorialization. Everywhere we go we are inundated with a virtual memory industry.¹ Travel to New York City involves souvenir shopping for FDNY t-shirts, or 9/11 remembrance teddy bears. James Young describes the way in which vendors at Auschwitz hawk concentration camp trinkets and memorabilia to visitors.² Travel to Washington DC involves a visit to Arlington National Cemetery, the memorials on the National mall to various wars, or the Holocaust Memorial Museum. Travel to Athens involves visiting the hub of Syntagma Square, where prominently displayed is the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Though many tourists come to see the costumes of its guards and their elaborate shift change ceremony, the grave of the unknown soldier hovers in the background with its continuous flame, securely guarded by the guards with pom poms on their stockings, who won't let you get close to the tomb, though they will agree to pose for a picture with you. Safaris to Rwanda to see the famous gorillas now involve a visit to Kigali Memorial Centre, a monument to the 1994 genocide. Safari guides say that their tours often ask to visit additional genocide memorials.³ Other monuments seem to puzzle in terms

¹ See Gavriel Rosenfeld on the future of the memory industry, Gavriel Rosenfeld, 'A looming Crash or a Soft Landing? Forecasting the Future of the Memory "Industry", *The Journal of Modern History* vol. 81 (2009): 122-158.

² James Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

³ Michela Wrong, "It was sobering—but in a good way": Memorials for the victims of genocide in Rwanda are helping the country's reconciliation process', *Financial Times*, April 29, 2006, p. 12.

of their location. At the Arizona State Capitol there is a monument to the Armenian genocide.⁴

Then there are sites that are less of an attraction in and of themselves, but follow you wherever you go. The interstate 10 in Arizona and California is called Pearl Harbor Memorial highway. Highway 95 in Nevada is Veterans Memorial Highway, with plaques every quarter mile honoring the various wars. The signs inform the quickly passing cars that this highway segment is dedicated to veterans of various wars including World Wars I and II, the Korean War, Vietnam War, the Persian Gulf, and most interestingly, the 'global war on terror.' As cars speed by through the desert landscape, there is barely enough time to register the words on the signs. This passenger made her driver turn around and drive more slowly past the signs to be able to read the full text. There just isn't enough time to read the signs driving the speed limit, so the memorialization aspect of the road remains almost hidden, in the back of our minds but never in the forefront. The same is true of roadside car accident memorials, which cars pass so quickly that there is not time to see the names. Danger and death have now intervened into our everyday lives in a meaningful and important way, even through distant and vicarious grief.

⁴ Interestingly, in 2009 there was some debate over renovation and maintenance of the grounds of the Capitol. Wesley Bolin Memorial Plaza on the grounds includes many monuments including this Armenian Martyrs Memorial, a Ten Commandments Memorial, an Arizona Pioneer Women Memorial, an Arizona Crime Victims Monument, a Navajo Code Talkers Memorial, and memorials to various U.S. wars. Due to state budget cuts, the funding for memorial maintenance has been limited, and the names on the monument to the Armenian genocide have largely worn away, ironically indicative of much of the silencing of this genocide as the years pass. See Alex Dalenberg, 'Capitol's Monuments Fall Victim to Budget Crunch,' *The Arizona Republic*, June 14, 2009.

This project is a journey through this politics of memory. Though it does not visit each of these sites, it seeks to explore the role of the monument in memorialization. In doing so, it travels through the politics of death, memory, and forgetting. The drive for remembering after a traumatic event forces us to come to terms with loss in some way. But, as Judith Butler points out, 'loss must be marked and cannot be represented. Loss fractures representation itself and precipitates its own modes of expression.⁵ During and after a traumatic event, traditional schemas of identification and representation are ruptured and fractured. Identities, spaces, and times are thrown into disorder. The monument, the physical, concrete structure that memorializes and commemorates, then acts as an attempt to reorder these schemas by establishing some sense of collective identity based upon a shared narrative understanding of the event. Monuments try to reorder the past into a coherent narrative out of experiences that were ambiguous and traumatic. The monument is itself a physical instantiation of a discursive performance which enacts specific power relations associated with possession of a memory: this is thanatopolitics at work.

This dissertation project seeks to explore the ruptures created by losses, but moves beyond an exploration of how trauma constructs ruptures or how memorials come to be built. Rather, it focuses on instances of political haunting, the presence of the ghost as a social and political figure. Modern biopolitics rests on the sovereign distinction between life and death, and governance over life.

⁵ Judith Butler, 'Afterword' in David Eng and David Kazanjian, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003, 467-474.

The way that sovereign power operates, then, is to construct politically viable lives and marginalize both the dead and the ontologically dead, what Judith Butler might refer to as ungrievable lives.⁶ This process of literally constructing life and death is nothing less than the project of modern statecraft: the construction of subjectivity itself. I conceive of statecraft here following Roxanne Doty as 'the never finally completed project of working to fix meaning, authority, and control.⁷ As statecraft can never be fully and finally finished, it relies on an iterative biopolitical performance to govern populations. Doty continues: 'statecraft permeates all levels of society. The production of authentic national subjects extends into various realms, from official policymaking to the educational and cultural arenas and into the minute everyday practices of individual subjects.⁸ This project, then, takes statecraft as its starting point, and seeks to explore the role of practices and performances of statecraft in constructing the line between life and death. In an effort to move beyond this dichotomy, and demonstrate the power relations at play in its construction, I rely on Jacques Derrida's conceptualization of hauntology, which precedes ontology,⁹ and thus provides a basis of thinking which is in many ways prior to the ontological divide between life and death.

⁶ Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London, UK: Verso, 2004.

⁷ Roxanne Doty, 'The Double Writing of Statecraft: Exploring State Responses to Illegal Immigration, *Alternatives*, vol. 21, no. 2 (1996): 171-189, 177.

⁸ Ibid., 185.

⁹ Jacques Derrida, Specters of Marx. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Hauntology offers a way of supplanting ontology, or as Colin Davis says, replaces 'the priority of being and present with the figure of the ghost as that which is neither present nor absent, neither dead nor alive.'¹⁰ In order to explore hauntology, the project looks at instances of hauntings and the presences/absences of ghosts. It explores the role of visibility and the construction of the visible, rational, living subject. Ultimately it looks for ghosts in the construction of monuments, physical memorials to commemorate a specific event. It looks for how statecraft operates to construct certain kinds of subjectivities at sites of memory, and the exclusions this necessitates. It seeks to expose the way statecraft relies on haunting as a means of ordering, bordering, and limiting. But it also explores the role haunting can play in resistance, the way ghosts can play with our conceptions of visibility and construction of life and death, thereby opening up avenues of resistance.

This introduction first assesses the framework for analyzing memorialization and haunting by exploring the literature in the field of memory studies, a broad interdisciplinary field which offers up a wide range of perspectives on memory and memorialization. Drawing on these, my project as a whole tries to move beyond a focus simply on memory or memorials to an exploration of the way they are implicated in the larger biopolitical project of statecraft. The literatures discussed offer a solid background against which I can pose the key theoretical contribution of this project: the exploration of a logic of

¹⁰ Colin Davis, 'Etat Present: Hauntology, Spectres, and Phantoms', *French Studies* vol. 59, no. 3 (2005): 373-379, 373.

haunting, derived from Derrida's conceptualization in *Spectres of Marx*, that can shed new light on concepts such as power, sovereignty, and citizenship.¹¹

This logic of haunting draws strongly on contributions from within sociology on bodies, visibility, and haunting, but refocuses these into an analysis of spaces and bodies as they relate specifically to mechanisms of statecraft. As Rick Ashley delineates, the state 'is nothing more and nothing less than an arbitrary political representation always in the process of being inscribed within history, through practice, and in the face of all manner of resistant interpretations that must be excluded if the representation is to be counted as self-evident reality'.¹² Similarly, Stefan Borg characterizes the 'state': 'an effect of practices of identification/bordering (i.e. statecraft), animated by a desire for order, stability, and foundation, constitutive of a wide variety of subject positions, but never traceable back to a single origin'.¹³ Understanding statecraft in this sense allows for an exploration of not simply the institutions of the state, but the processes at work in the construction of the modern state, and more importantly, of the modern subject of statecraft and how s/he lives, dies, and is politically constituted. The end of the introduction to follow provides an outline for the remainder of the project.

¹¹ Derrida, *Spectres of Marx*.

¹² Richard Ashley, 'Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique,' *Millennium*, vol. 17, no. 2 (1988): 227-262, 252.

¹³ Stefan Borg, 'Euro-Crafting at Border Zones: Desires for Europe at the Greco-Turkish border and the question of a European Union "beyond the state", Paper Presented at International Studies Association-Northeast Annual Conference, Providence, RI, November 4-5, 2011, 3.

Memory, Memorialization, and Memory Studies

Memory is a defining feature of the human condition, according to Duncan Bell.¹⁴ According to Olick, it is 'the central faculty of our being in time; it is the negotiation of past and present through which we define our individual and collective selves.¹⁵ This link between memory and identity is what makes memory so salient in a world where political identities are constantly shifting and becoming increasingly important. Scholars of memory studies have focused on this relationship between memory and identity. Wars force us to divide ourselves according to our political identities, thus the criteria for defining these becomes ever more important. Because decisions of life or death are decided upon questions of and definitions of political identity, memory becomes the defining feature of our identities. As Geoffrey Cubitt outlines, it is in representation of the past that the markers for a present identity can be located. This then determines future prospects.¹⁶

Memory is a way to perceive the world that is part of us, an integral part of who we are. As Robert Eaglestone suggests, 'identity without memory is empty, memory without identity is meaningless.'¹⁷ Memory constructs our identity, it has the power of naming, of legitimizing. The fact that the identity

¹⁴ Duncan Bell, *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

¹⁵ Jeffrey Olick, *States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformation in National Retrospection.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

¹⁶ Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and Memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007, 175-6.

¹⁷ Robert Eaglestone, *The Holocaust and the Postmodern*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, 125.

was constructed through the performance of survival, in the aftermath of a trauma, makes holding onto that identity as a unique one extremely important, and can lead to the creation of extreme dividing lines with little compromise because of the fear of any threat to the sanctity of that identity, birthed by fire. In this case of the Holocaust this is literally so. These dividing lines are both a product of memory and in fact construct memory. Memory has the ability to create divisions by hardening political identities and the boundaries between them. But, memory is also itself inherently contested, contingent, and provisional.¹⁸ As Duncan Bell says, 'memory is the product of conflicts, power struggles and social contestation, always fragile and provisional.'¹⁹ Memory thus both constructs and is a construct of the past. Memory transforms and reconstructs the past that it recalls.²⁰ Recalling and working through the past is always a process which is never fully completed or definitively closed.²¹ Yet the way we remember also shapes our present.²²

Memory is a social construction. It has no fixed meaning or content, and is always in flux.²³ It is not history, not simply a narrative recounting of an event dependent upon accuracy or facts. Memory is rather the responses of individuals

¹⁸ Andreas Huyssen, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. London: Routledge, 1994.

¹⁹ Duncan Bell, 'Memory and Violence', *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 345-360, 351.

²⁰ Cubitt, *History and Memory*.

²¹ Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory After Auschwitz*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

²² Huyssen, *Twilight Memories*, 249.

²³ Cubitt, *History and Memory*, 8.

or groups to a particular event or series of events. It contains within it both a recounting of facts, but also an emotional response to these facts. Thus, memory has the ability to retroactively construct a past, to imbue a past event with a particular meaning that it may not have had when it occurred. 'Memory is not only of the past—it saturates our experience of things and so shapes the present. But at the same time memory stands in need of the present to confirm the past's reality as something still present.'²⁴ Memory blurs the lines of past and present. It is not fully of the past, because it is reliant on our present emotional responses to the events of the past. However, it is not fully of the past and at times leads us to relive a past through commemorative practices.

As Jay Winter traces, memory is a feature which has permeated society throughout history, but we can trace two definitive memory booms in recent history.²⁵ The first came in the late 1800s, with the advent of memorialization practices and monumentalization after war, and the idea that we need to account for victims of war and mourn through specific practices. This wave of memory culminated in memorialization after WWI, when numerous war memorials were constructed in order to remember the sacrifice and immense death toll that affected each and every community. Thus we saw widespread construction of monuments in each and every affected community. This memorialization was

²⁴ W. James Booth, 'Kashmir Road: Some Reflections on Memory and Violence', *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 361-377, 370.

²⁵ See Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War and Historical Memory in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

primarily defined by its contribution to national identity construction, coalesced around the state and other forms of collective national identity.

The second memory boom came during the 1960s and 1970s, primarily focused around Holocaust memorialization. Immediately after the Holocaust, attention was centered on heroic acts, victorious nations, prosecution of perpetrators at the Nuremberg trials, and reconstruction. In the 1960s and 1970s, European reconstruction had made strong progress, and there was now room for concentration camp survivors to speak out and tell their stories. Winter also cites the emerging technologies which enabled the recording, both audio and video, of these stories, as well as their mass dissemination around the world. He traces the way in which we see a shift from attention paid to the perpetrators to a more victim-centered approach, which he calls the acts of remembrance of the witness.

Siobhan Kattago offers up an alternative genealogy of the historical emergence of different types of memorials.²⁶ Pre-WWI memorials tended to commemorate heroic leaders who died in the name of the nation, she argues. After WWI, the nation-state and national memory accompanied commemoration of ordinary soldiers, culminating in the emergence of Tombs of the Unknown Soldier. After WWII, monuments emerged which represented military death as overwhelming loss. Because WWII was figured as a different kind of war which had included genocide and large amount of civilian dead, a new genre of memorial emerged which focused on victimhood, martyrdom, and loss rather than

²⁶ Siobhan Kattago, 'War Memorials and the Politics of Memory: The Soviet War Memorial in Tallinn', *Constellations*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2009):150-166.

heroic military sacrifice. Death was no longer honorable, but senseless. Memorials began to take on an abstract cast focused on private individual reflection rather than figurative heroic monuments. Ultimately the Vietnam Veterans Memorial heralded a new kind of monument that completely separated individual death from ideological cause. Both Kattago and Winter, though, acknowledge the shift we see in the 1960s and 1970s towards individual reflection at memorial sites, and the focus on individual narratives in the form of testimonies told by Holocaust survivors. Holocaust witnesses assumed a semi-sacred role as truth-tellers who experienced something which no one else had. As Winter says, 'they spoke of the dead, and for the dead, whose voices could somehow be retrieved in the telling of these terrifying stories.'²⁷

The Holocaust memoir brings up many interesting questions, both about the personal act of memorialization as it comes to the survivor speaking about his/her experiences, and about its contribution to the sense of a group identity. Biography can be seen as a tool of proper nominalization, where the proper name of the survivor is able to construct a meaningful memory which others will pay attention to. The survivor, who has been through a process of dehumanization, who has forcefully had his name removed and thereby his personhood, is claiming his proper name back for himself, for the purposes of proving that he has claimed back his humanity and is utilizing it to speak out against the perpetrators or to memorialize the event. The concentration camp prisoner who was identified merely by a number, the Musselmann, the walking dead, whose name and thereby

²⁷ Winter, *Remembering War*, 62.

life was stolen, whose story was written for him, is reclaiming his story for himself. Memoir is thus viewed as a tool to regain the power to represent oneself.

Survivors who write about their experiences take upon the task of writing for those who cannot, and in this sense both reckon with and fight for the oppressed past of themselves and others. For many years after the Holocaust, the world wanted to forget about what had happened, and so did many of the survivors. Indeed most Holocaust memoirs were not written or published until the 1960s. Even after the Nazis lost power, even after the concentration camps were taken apart, the oppression of the past continued in the form of a stigma associated with the survivor. The survivor experienced personal guilt that he had survived rather than someone else, that many of his loved ones had died, that their pasts had not been redeemed, that their stories belonged still to the Nazis. The survivor also experienced social guilt. Many survivors were accused by society of being conspirators, because many people thought that was the only way someone could have survived. There was a certain sense of guilt ascribed to the survivor for having survived, both by himself and by society. The memoir and the creation of the genre of testimony represented an effort to ensure that the factual events were recorded, and that the meaning of these events was understood so that such events would never occur again. The motivation for writing the memoir, according to Primo Levi, a famed Holocaust survivor and author, is to bear witness, the very same motive which was ascribed to explain the motivation for survival in the concentration camp. It is a way to claim back humanity. In this sense, testimony says that human beings are human insofar as

12

they bear witness to the inhuman²⁸, and thus are able to retain or redeem humanity. As Avery Gordon states, to redeem the oppressed past is to make the past come alive as a lever for the work of the present.²⁹

The uniqueness of the memoir of the survivor, which emerged out of the ashes of an oppressed past, became the genre of testimony, which demonstrates the way in which memory opens to the other by shedding the framework of identification which contained within it the potential to continue the oppression of the past. Testimony, according to Robert Eaglestone, is a genre characterized by its disruption of the processes of identification normally associated with the text.³⁰ As Agamben writes, the evolution of the (concentration) camp disabled us from the possibility of differentiating between our biological body and our political body, between what is incommunicable and mute and what is communicable and sayable. We can no longer understand ourselves or others within the traditional frameworks of comprehension. Agamben characterizes testimony as that genre which represents the very aporia of historical knowledge, where what happened in the camps appears to the survivors as the only true thing and, as such, completely unforgettable, but at the same time the truth is unimaginable. The survivors bore

²⁸ Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive.* Zone Books, 2002. Agamben also states that the human being can survive the human being. Essentially, the human being is the inhuman, for the one who is truly human is the one whose humanity is completely destroyed. Paradoxically, if the only one bearing witness to the human is the one whose humanity has been wholly destroyed, the identity between human and inhuman is never perfect, and it is not truly possible to completely destroy the human. Something always remains, and it is the witness that is this remnant.

²⁹ Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

³⁰ Eaglestone, *The Holocaust and the Postmodern*.

witness to something it is impossible to bear witness to.³¹ It is impossible to bear witness from the inside of death, because to do so one would have to be dead. At the same time, the survivors' experiences as the walking dead³² enable them to bear witness in a way that is unprecedented. The language of testimony becomes a language that no longer signifies. This is because language, in order to bear witness, must give way to non-language in order to show the very impossibility of bearing witness. Testimony is therefore this disjunction between two impossibilities of bearing witness. Thus, there has been a radical shift in understanding forced by specific events, and it is this shift that characterizes testimony as a literary form of memorialization.

Testimony has become particularly important in the case of the Rwandan genocide. Survivors' groups and government agencies have set out to collect written and videotaped testimonies. The Kigali Memorial Centre archive maintains a website which catalogues video testimony, but many of the written testimonies sit in warehouses or, for the lucky ones, perhaps in the cold store archive at the memorial. Most of the ones at the archive are written in school notebooks in Kinyarwanda. Ibuka, the umbrella survivors' organization, asked survivors to write them. Many are very similar to each other—almost all of them refer to Habyarimana in the first few sentences, indicating that the plane crash represented the beginning of their stories of the genocide. One says at the end 'murakoze', which means thank you, as if to thank the reader for taking the time

³¹ Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz*.

³² Agamben would refer to this as 'Muselmann', while in Rwanda, the term for survivors is bapfuye bughazi.

to read his testimony. It is important to keep in mind, then, that testimony need not take the form of published books that are accessible or widely dispersed to the public. In the Rwandan case, most of the testimonies taken will never be read. Some of the video testimonies that are taken by the employees at the Kigali Memorial Centre archive will be viewed by researchers or visitors to their website, but others were taken with the express instruction by the survivor testifying that their testimony not be made available to the general public. The video testimony is also an interesting feature of the Rwandan case. Many of the employees at the memorial centre who are involved in collecting, transcribing, and organizing testimonies are themselves survivors of the genocide. Watching the videos repeatedly is difficult because it brings back memories of their own experiences.

The memoir in the form of poetry is specifically interesting for this examination. Michael Taussig refers to a poetry which facilitated remembrance, and terms this idea 'speaking the past' rather than questioning or interrogating the past.³³ In this sense, poetry as an art of interruptions, of cultural and temporal montage rather than a reflection of a continuous tradition, may have the potential to redeem the past by disrupting the traditional framework with which we typically view the past. This is akin to Eaglestone's notion that grammatical dislocations of narrative flow, which are characteristic of testimony, serve to disconnect the reader from identification and thus from a framework of forced

³³ Michael Taussig, Walter Benjamin's Grave, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

mimesis which disables us from connecting with the past in an ethical way so as to redeem the past.

In addition to the focus on memoirs and testimony, a key aspect of witnessing is the collective witnessing that comes from the construction of memorial sites, which can themselves be considered forms of testimony in that they testify to the occurrence of a specific set of events through remembrance. Memorials are sites of remembrance. In this sense, they are both highly individualized in the sense that they mean something different to each individual visiting them based out of their own experiences, and also highly communal. 'Memorials can realize individual and commemorative impulses, assuage postponed demands for justice, and (re)assert political identity.³⁴ Commemoration brings up the question of what to remember and how. It ultimately privileges certain kinds of experience and excludes others.³⁵ 'Memorials provide the sites where groups of people gather to create a common past for themselves, places where they tell the constitutive narratives, their 'shared' stories of the past.'³⁶ In this sense, they are sites not of *collective memory* or *common memory*, but rather *common sites* for memory. Though they may maintain the illusion of common memory and in this sense the fixity of one concept of memory, the monument is in fact, despite its "land-anchored

³⁴ Katherine Hite and Catherine Collins, 'Memorial Fragments, Monumental Silences and Reawakenings in 21st-Century Chile', *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 379-400.

³⁵ Daniel Sherman, 'Art, Commerce, and the Production of Memory in France after World War I,' in John Gillis, ed, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 186-214.

³⁶ Young, *The Texture of Memory*, 6-7.

permanence," as James Young calls it, a performance of a multiplicity of narratives of the event being memorialized.

The monument is a physical, concrete representation of memory. In this sense, as James Mayo argues, it operates to create 'an ongoing order and meaning³⁷ However, its physicality does not imply closure or lack of contestation. Even as the monument exists as a physical structure, it also exists as a performance of specific narrative understandings of the event which are being concretized in the monument's physical form. We must not let the physical form of the monument mislead us into thinking that its meanings are closed or that it is beyond the scope of contestation. The monument is itself a physical instantiation of a linguistic performance. Trauma is then the event as a shattered, splintered event, with memory as remnant, as piece, and as ruins. The event itself shatters speech and shatters temporality because the event never fully passed; it is still experienced by many in the present, and the past event cannot be firmly and finally situated in the past.³⁸ The monument then acts as a means of attempting to place the event firmly in the past. In the aftermath of a genocide and mass atrocity, people want to re-order society in some way; they want exact facts and settled limits.³⁹ Hutchison and Bleiker state that 'in most instances, political elites

³⁷ James Mayo, *War Memorials as Political Landscape: The American Experience and Beyond*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 1988.

³⁸ Marc Nichanian, 'Catastrophic Mourning,' in David Eng and David Kazanjian, eds, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003: 99-124.

³⁹ Kora Andrieu, 'Sorry for the Genocide': How Public Apologies can help Promote National Reconciliation, *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 1 (2009): 3-23, 12.

deal with the legacy of pain and death by re-imposing order.⁴⁰ The monument is an attempt to do so by making concrete the memory of the event.

Before I go on further, it is essential to distinguish between the monument and the memorial. For this, I borrow James Young's conception of this difference. Monuments are not triumphal while memorials mourn; in fact the traditional monument is the tombstone. Monuments are instead a subset of memorials. Monuments are 'the material objects, sculptures, and installations used to memorialize a person or thing.⁴¹ In their physicality they differ from memorials which can be spaces, days, conferences, etc. The monument is, then, that physical structure which reflects the politics of memory. Monuments cannot be viewed outside of their contexts just as memories must be considered within theirs. Memory is, as James Young says, never shaped in a vacuum. It is in this sense highly political. Memory seeks to make the past present.⁴² The monument, then, is the concretization and instantiation of the past or sentiments of the past in a physical structure. As an attempt to concretize the event, the monument is itself political. It performs one specific narrative of the event. 'Memory discourse asserts that monuments and memorials often serve as attempts to relegate away, to erase conflict-ridden, politically traumatic pasts.⁴³ To do so, they represent one

⁴⁰ Emma Hutchison and Roland Bleiker, 'Emotional Reconciliation: Reconstituting Identity and Community After Trauma,' *European Journal of Social Theory* vol. 11, no. 3 (2008): 385-403, 386.

⁴¹ Young, *The Texture of Memory*, 4.

⁴² Booth, 'Kashmir Road,' 366.

⁴³ Hite and Collins, 'Memorial Fragments,' 380.

conception of the event among the multiplicity of conceptions possible, but often impose this unitary narrative as the purported truth of the event.

Memorials are generally established for the purpose of ensuring that a memory or a person or group is never forgotten. As Booth puts it, 'if the victims of mass crime are left faceless and nameless, if the hour, manner, and place of their last moments are unknown, then they are outside the light of truth, lost to forgetting. The world is left incomplete; its integrity broken; its reality undermined.'⁴⁴ Booth here emphasizes the idea that memory is linked with truth, that memory enlightens us to a reality about the world that we require to find and know our place in the world. Without memory, we are lost, because we not only lack a sense of self but a sense of how we relate to those around us and our past. We are without a sense of identity, which is where our truth is situated.

Forgetting is thus posited as a crime against our every identity. But it is generally agreed that there must be a modicum of forgetting involved in regards to traumatic events. Without some forgetting, there can be no reconciliation between opposing sides and thus no ceasing of conflict. 'Communities must make decisions and establish institutions that foster forgetting as much as remembering.'⁴⁵ Douglass and Vogler describe this tension: to remember the

⁴⁴ W. James Booth, 'The Unforgotten: Memories of Justice', *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, no. 4 (2001): 777-791, 781.

⁴⁵ Avishai Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002, 13.

dead is obsessive, to forget the dead is impious.⁴⁶ Thus both remembering and forgetting are identity-building acts.⁴⁷

Memory studies as a genre of scholarly work has focused very heavily on testimony and on the construction of monuments. Identity has remained a key feature of analysis, particularly the differentiation between collective and individual identity when it comes to memory and memorialization. However, memory studies has remained largely relegated to the disciplines of sociology, art, art history, architecture, and religion studies. The majority of studies focus specifically on one memorial site and detailing the emergence of that particular site without applying a theoretical framework, or on general philosophizing about the role of memory in society. Until several years ago, there were not any substantive theoretical approaches to memory which took into account political contexts.

Memory Studies Meets International Relations

Jenny Edkins, in her book *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*, brought memory studies into international relations, in a systematic exploration of trauma and the construction of monuments such as the Vietnam memorial in Washington DC.⁴⁸ Though numerous scholars within memory studies focus on trauma as it

⁴⁶ Ana Douglass and Thomas Vogler, *Witness and Memory: The Discourse of Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2003, 42-43.

⁴⁷ Michael Lambek, 'The Past Imperfect: Remembering as Moral Practice,' In Antze and Lambek, eds, *Tense Past*, New York: Routledge, 1996, 243.

⁴⁸ Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

relates to memory,⁴⁹ what her analysis brings to the table is a conceptualization of memory as performative, and of remembering as an intensely political activity. She argues that sovereign power produces and is itself produced by trauma. But it conceals this involvement by claiming to be a provider of security. By rewriting these traumas into a linear narrative of nationalism or heroism, the state is able to conceal its role in the production of the trauma and indeed the trauma itself. Her task in the book is to look at different memorializations that express this nationalistic re-scripting. My argument is that this is only one way, though an important one, that monuments operate. Edkins argues that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial does not participate in reinforcing sovereign national narratives, but rather encircles the memory by maintaining openness.

Maja Zehfuss also explores the relationship between trauma, memory, and politics. Her book, *Wounds of Memory*, focuses on the way in which memory retroactively constructs a past, while claiming to instead invoke a fixed truth of the past. We invoke the past as if it already existed even as doing so produces the past itself. She explores how memory is often relied on to establish certitude about a past event, but any time we explore memory, we must acknowledge that memory is contingent and uncertain. She traces World War II memory in Germany to explore how forgetting is just as much a part of memory as remembering is. Remembering is often posited as redemptive, with forgetting

⁴⁹ See Paul Antze and Michael Lambek, eds, *Tense Past*, New York: Routledge, 1996, Cathy Caruth, *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995, Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996, Douglass and Vogler, *Witness and Memory*, LaCapra, *History and Memory After Auschwitz*, Ruth Leys, *Trauma: A Genealogy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000, Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life*, Mariner Books, 2000.

posited as a crime against the past, but both remembering and forgetting are necessary.⁵⁰

Both Edkins and Zehfuss explore trauma in relation to 9/11, arguing that traumatic events are often used as a political tool to justify certain types of action.⁵¹ In this specific case, the events of 9/11 were utilized in political rhetoric to justify two wars in the Middle East. Trauma is considered to be beyond representation in many ways. It blurs the sense of time and temporality. The traumatized individual lives within the linguistic boundaries of a past world.⁵² Thus, scholars of trauma generally refer to a blurring of linear time due to the horrific nature of a specific event or set of events.

From Trauma to a Logic of Haunting

This examination of trauma is indeed essential to considerations of politics. However, though haunting often occurs after a traumatic event, indeed this is true of all of the instances of haunting I will explore, haunting is itself different from trauma. A society may be both traumatized and haunted.

⁵⁰ Maja Zehfuss, *Wounds of Memory: The Politics of War in Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

⁵¹ See Maja Zehfuss, 'Forget September 11,' *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3 (2003): 513-528, Jenny Edkins, 'The Rush to Memory and the Rhetoric of War,' *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, vol. 31, no. 2 (2003): 231-250, and Jenny Edkins, 'Ground Zero: Reflections on Trauma, In/distinction and Response, *Journal for Cultural Research*, vol. 8, no. 3 (2004): 247-270.

⁵² Karin Fierke, 'Bewitched by the Past: Social Memory, Trauma, and International Relations,' in Duncan Bell, ed, *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, 116-134.

'Haunting, unlike trauma, is distinctive for producing a something-to-be-done.'⁵³ What this means is that trauma can be linked with processes of mourning and reflection on the past, even as this leads to monument construction or memorialization in the present. But haunting is something different. Haunting is itself not a reflection on a past event. According to Derrida, haunting is a logic which disrupts the dialectical construction of classical ontology. Hauntology precedes ontology, and can therefore escape the logic of binary opposition. As Rubenstein characterizes Derrida's perspective: 'something that haunts me unsettles all the self-identical products of ontology, because a ghost—whether it be mine or another's—neither is nor is not, is neither simply present nor simply absent, neither me nor someone entirely different from me, neither living nor properly dead, neither fully here nor fully there, and arrives as a then (whether past, futural, or mythic) that takes place in the midst of the now.'⁵⁴

'Haunting raises specters, and it alters the experience of being in time, the way we separate the past, the present, and the future.'⁵⁵ Haunting is complicated. Sometimes it hardens and attempts to rigidify the lines between past, present, and future. Other times it blurs these lines and operates within the zone of non-linear time. Haunting derives etymologically from the French hanter, meaning to frequent, resort, or be familiar with. It is worth thinking about these origins in addition to the proto-Germanic evolution of the term used in reference to a spirit

⁵³ Gordon, Ghostly Matters, xvi.

⁵⁴ Mary Jane Rubenstein, 'Of Ghosts and Angels: Derrida, Kushner, and the Impossibility of Forgiveness,' *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* vol. 9, no. 1 (2008): 79-95, 86.

⁵⁵ Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*, xvi.

returning to the house where it lived. This use of the concept was reinforced by Shakespeare's works. The original meanings of haunting places an emphasis on iteration, the repetitive return to a place such that the place becomes familiar, which itself blurs the temporal relationship to the place. Indeed it is also because a place is familiar that the Shakespearean ghost returns to it. The place is no longer simply of the past, but because of the iterative return is of the past, present, and future all at once. The conception of the logic of haunting that I appeal to is similarly iterative and refers to the performative recall of the past, the frequenting of the past in memory. But, haunting is not simply the blurring of linear time; this is what we might call trauma instead. Haunting specifically blurs past, present, and future. Trauma is perhaps simply the blurring of past and present, or the invocation of the past in the present, the way it seems like a past event is still happening. Haunting involves the future in a way that invokes the notion of some specific action. In this sense, haunting as a concept offers a particular promising ground from which to explore statecraft because statecraft itself calls to mind this gesturing towards a specific action. This dissertation then explores a variety of hauntings, tracing the process by which haunting is both used as a tool of statecraft and posits resistances to statecraft, often within the same memorialization context.

According to Avery Gordon, haunting is the language and experiential modality by which we can understand the meeting of force and meaning. Haunting describes 'those singular yet repetitive instances when home becomes unfamiliar, when your bearings on the world lose direction.⁵⁶ In this sense, haunting is not simply the activity of spirits, but also a way of seeing and understanding. It is interesting to note that Gordon emphasizes the characteristic of haunting that home becomes unfamiliar, while the Shakespearean framework emphasizes that the ghost haunts a place because it is familiar. Yet both are in fact true. Haunting operates at the margins of society in a way that often seems to be unfamiliar to us. Indeed, often we are simply not haunted by what we should perhaps be haunted by. But it is the blurring of lines between familiarity and unfamiliarity that emphasizes the unintelligible and incomprehensible nature of haunting.

As Derrida argues, we must keep in mind that the ghostly is unintelligible, invisible, and uncontrollable. How, then, it is possible to trace ghostly apparitions, to trace a logic of haunting? How to comprehend the discourse of the end or the discourse about the end?⁵⁷ Or as Avery Gordon puts it, 'endings that are not over is what haunting is about.'⁵⁸ So how does one trace an ending that isn't over? It is perhaps in the responses to ghosts that the logic of haunting can be traced. The ghostly can be portrayed as a deathly threat subject to mediations or interventions. In this way, by viewing the mediations and interventions, it is possible to trace the ghostly. Hauntology, in the Derridean sense, then, is comprehending things, but incomprehensibly. Rather than tracing the ghosts

⁵⁶ Ibid., xvi.

⁵⁷ Derrida, Specters of Marx.

⁵⁸ Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*, 139.

themselves, I am exploring representations of these specters. As Derrida says, the specter is a frequency of a certain visibility, but the visibility of the invisible. We thus do not 'see' the specter, but rather represent it to ourselves as such. This does in a sense gesture to the complicated task at hand.

It is possible, however, to here lay out some of the features of a logic of haunting, which will inform the investigations in this dissertation. I must emphasize here that I am not the first to think through a logic of haunting. Derrida refers to a hauntology, or logic of haunting, throughout his work, though he does not explore the presence of a logic of haunting in specific cases. Avery Gordon as well has extrapolated a logic of haunting at play in literary work and even political action, but she is concerned more with the social world than with the play of power in relation to explicitly political concepts such as citizenship and reconciliation.⁵⁹ In this sense it is the inclusion of statecraft in an examination of the logic of haunting that is the original feature of this work, as well as tracing this through specific novel cases. I am indeed attempting to trace how haunting is used by the state, and how haunting can pose a resistance to the ordering mechanisms of statecraft, a story containing multiple narratives. I thus explore this logic of haunting from two angles: first, how statecraft uses haunting as a tool for the processes of orientation, limitation, and construction of identity integral to its functioning, and second, how haunting can in fact be posited in some contexts as a resistance to these mechanisms of statecraft. In many ways each of the three cases I will explore in this dissertation contain within them both

⁵⁹ Ibid.

an element of haunting used as a tool and haunting as resistance. The chapters to follow trace these hauntings.

Chapter 2 explores the notion of a logic of haunting and its relationship to statecraft to lay the framework for what is to follow. In this chapter, I establish the narratives of memory which result from traumatic events, and argue that studies of monumentalization, though they focus on the state as a key constructor of national monuments, fail to systematically address statecraft. I argue that it is necessary to understand statecraft through a logic of haunting. I explore this logic of haunting from two angles: first, how statecraft uses haunting as a tool for the processes of orientation, limitation, and construction of identity integral to its functioning, and second, how haunting can in fact be posited in some contexts as a resistance to these mechanisms of statecraft. I argue that ghosts do not conform to this type of ordering, and traces always leak through. It is in exploring these traces that the mechanisms of statecraft can be elaborated. I posit two key features to the logic of haunting. The first is the construction of space: the way specific sites are constructed as appropriate for memorialization through the construction of monuments, whether they be state-funded or not. The second feature is political inscription on the body. Here I am concerned with the reliance of memorialization practices on corporeality, either in the form of the body itself or the presence of figures in the monument, and with the ultimate monument: the dead body itself. This chapter also lays out a methodological framework for examining this logic of haunting through particular case studies.

27

Chapter 3 explores the memorialization of undocumented immigrants. Hundreds of undocumented immigrants die each year crossing the U.S.-Mexico border. Most of the bodies of those who die are never discovered or identified. They remain anonymous. But in recent years, an effort has been made to memorialize those who have died crossing the border. Small border monuments have sprung up in the desert, and larger monuments have been established in cities near the border such as Tucson. The memorialization of undocumented immigrants has been controversial due to their legal status, and countermemorialization discourses have arisen. This chapter explores monumentalization along the border. It first addresses the border wall as monument in the sense that it commemorates the mythological founding moment of the sovereign territorial state, demonstrating the way statecraft is dependent upon the logic of haunting. It then addresses the memorials set up, both in the desert and in larger cities, to memorialize undocumented immigrants who lost their lives. It specifically assesses aesthetic politics along the border in the form of artists who construct border memorials, both along the US-Mexico border, and art that commemorates those who die in the Palestinian territories. Exploring the concept of graffiti, it extrapolates from border art along the US-Mexico border to other border sites, including Israel-Palestine and Ireland-Northern Ireland. Aesthetic representations are often marginalized from politics, and border sites themselves exist at the margins of politics, but it is in exploring these sites that it becomes possible for alternative imaginings of the mechanisms of statecraft.

This chapter embarks on a journey through cities, anonymous desert gravesites, and small desert cemeteries haunted by the specters of immigration. It explores the contestation surrounding memorialization of death through the monument, the narratives of anonymity surrounding the memorialization of undocumented immigrants, and the counter-memory discourses that emerge in an effort to rewrite the meaning of these migrant deaths. These counter-memorial discourses, I argue, posit desert border monuments as a threat to statecraft because they cannot be situated within the (b)ordering mechanisms of the state and indeed posit a rupture to the active forgetting associated with practices of statecraft.

Chapter 4 explores the bones and bodies that lie at the center of genocide memorialization in Rwanda. In the case of Rwanda, monuments memorializing the genocide express unique political narratives. They clearly express memory in the sense that they are intended to recall a memory of the event or of the victims of the event. But they also express a narrative of forgetting unique to the Rwandan case in the sense that the monument becomes the only place where it is appropriate to remember. In all other facets of society, the memory and its traces are silenced and trauma is situated within medicalized discourses and swept to the margins of society. Genocide memory is both spatialized, situated at particular sites designed to hold memory, and temporalized, situated firmly in the past, in an effort to reorder society after the trauma of the genocide.

This chapter explores the lingering of genocide memory as exemplary of the logic of haunting in the sense that we can see a tension between the narratives of memory and the narratives of statecraft. This tension is expressed in the Rwandan case through the ultimate monument: the dead body itself. I argue that traces leak through and haunt at the margins of Rwandan society and the state, in the bones of genocide victims. I examine the role of corporeality in various memorials around Rwanda and the role mass graves and the gravesite play in memorializing the genocide. I then take up the ubiquity of bones discovered even years after the genocide, exploring the logic of haunting in Rwandan genocide memorialization which constructs the body as the locus of memory, and specific memorial sites as the appropriate spaces for its memorialization. Through interviews with genocide survivors and in depth participant observation at memorial sites around Rwanda, this logic of haunting becomes elaborated, ultimately demonstrating an underlying relationship between the mechanisms of memorialization and the performances of statecraft.

Chapter 5 explores the logic of vanishing evident in exploring the 9/11 memorial imaginary. Monuments are ways to concretize memory. A particular story of the event being memorialized must be told in order for the particular project of memorialization to occur. The physicality of monuments masks their inherent contestation, and this political contestation is never more at the forefront of our understanding than when we explore the relationship between the monument and the concept of absence. This chapter explores the phenomenon of the vanishing monument in the context of the politics of memory. Using the Holocaust counter-monument as a framework, it explores the concept of absence as it related to the 9/11 memorial imaginary, including the construction of a logic

30

of vanishing. This constitutes a particularly salient form of memorialization when the body itself is missing and the traditional gravesite cannot form the locus of memorialization, as in the 9/11 case. To explore this, I focus on constructions of space at Ground Zero and the displacement of the body from 9/11 memorialization, tracing the construction of a logic of vanishing in the 9/11 memorial imaginary. Additionally, I explore other forms of absent monuments, including the removal of Holocaust memorials in Germany in the 1980s, the destruction of monuments in Iraq after the fall of Saddam Hussein in an effort to rewrite national narratives, and the question of ruins as monument in general. The decay of monuments, like the decay of bodies, raises interesting questions about how we can conceive of the relationship between statecraft and haunting as it specifically relates to physical sites of memorialization, and ultimately enables me to explore the role of ghosts in this relationship. Chapter 2

MOVING FROM MEMORY AND TRAUMA TO A LOGIC OF HAUNTING

This chapter lays out a logic of haunting drawing from Derrida's notion of hauntology as prior to ontology, and thereby disruptive of the dichotomies created ontologically,⁶⁰ and as part of the contemporary crafting of the state and political identity. That is, what is means to be 'political' is constructed ontologically. Hauntology, then, de-ontologizes.⁶¹ Hauntology, rather than taking for granted what it means to be political, asks after the processes by which is it constructed, and in doing so implicates the practices of modern statecraft.

Statecraft is, broadly speaking, the processes of ordering, bordering, and limitation that construct subjectivity/ies through an iterative and performative process. It is nothing less than the construction of what it means to be a subject of politics and in fact the very construction of the state itself. But the practice of statecraft need not be limited to processes carried out at the institutional level. As Stefan Borg delineates,

'one of Foucault's great contributions...lies in his meticulous demonstration that those officially authorized to speak in the name of the state are not the major *doers of statecraft*. Since the state representative are themselves not major doers of statecraft, in order to succeed, statecraft must have a self-erasing quality to it, where the most important enactments of the state take place at the myriad of social practices 'at the bottom' of society in everyday practice, at the same time as the

⁶⁰ Jacques Derrida, Specters of Marx. New York: Routledge, 2006.

⁶¹ Pierre Macherey, 'Marx Dematerialized, or the Spirit of Derrida,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 17-25, 19.

constitutive function of those practices are forgotten and repressed *as such*.⁶² What this gestures to is the way in which statecraft can be seen at every level, and is implicated in everyday practices and indeed in life and death itself, and that the lines between life and death itself sustain the project of statecraft by constructing the politically qualified subjects of the state: those defined as citizens, those in need of ordering and bordering, and those beyond the limits of qualified politics, those that Judith Butler might define as 'ungrievable lives',⁶³ or Anna Agathangelou might refer to as the already 'ontologically dead.'⁶⁴

Laying Out the Logic of Haunting

Haunting is a complex sociological and political phenomenon. It is not as simple as saying that the state relies on haunting, though this is sometimes the case. Ghosts cannot always be ordered or even pinpointed. It is thus rather my task to examine the traces of these ghosts, the manifestations of these hauntings, both as tools and as resistances. It is in exploring these traces that the mechanisms of statecraft can be elaborated. In this way, I look mainly at physical memorials as a means of tracing these haunting, as an attempt to uncover them, by looking at two particular instantiations of the logic of haunting. The first is the

⁶² Stefan Borg, 'Euro-Crafting at Border Zones: Desires for Europe at the Greco-Turkish border and the question of a European Union "beyond the state", Paper Presented at International Studies Association-Northeast Annual Conference, Providence, RI, November 4-5, 2011, 11, emphasis original.

⁶³ Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London, UK: Verso, 2004.

⁶⁴ Anna Agathangelou, 'Bodies of Desire, Terror and the War in Eurasia: Impolite Disruptions of (Neo) Liberal Internationalism, Neoconservatism and the "New: Imperium,' *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 3 (2010): 693-722.

construction of space: the way specific sites are constructed as appropriate for memorialization through the construction of monuments, whether they be statefunded or not. The second feature is political inscription on the body. Here I am concerned with the reliance of memorialization practices on corporeality, either in the form of the body itself or the presence of figures in the monument, and with the ultimate monument: the dead body itself. In both of these features, it is possible to see the essential tension and contestation in how memorialization occurs, and thereby trace the effects of hauntings. It is this tension and contestation that is a key feature of haunting.

It bears mentioning here that this is not a treatise on which memorialization is appropriate or not. I do not impose this. I merely try to track the fragments of ghosts. Neither is looking for haunting about looking for death. Death is everywhere, particularly as a result of the processes of conflict and war that so often form the basis of a focus on international politics. And it is not about ghosts as the individual spirits of those who have died. The ghost of the state also lingers in the exercise of power to construct identity, narrative, and order.⁶⁵ Hauntings are rather about specific kinds of social and political and even economic practices that are themselves imbued with tension and contestation. They are about an alternative way of viewing that takes into account the ghostly, which exists and operates on the margins of what is generally considered traditional politics. Traditional politics is the state apparatus, the rational, the

⁶⁵ Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, 127.

visible. The specter disrupts this notion of visibility, because it is by nature invisible through traditional means. Indeed it further disrupts this schema because we cannot see it, while it looks at us and sees us not see it even as it is there. This spectral asymmetry disrupts all specularity. 'We do not see who looks at us.'⁶⁶ So the specter also represents that which is often invisible to us about how the state functions: the mechanisms of statecraft, of ordering and limiting and of identity construction. It represents that which is invisible to us about the power relations involved in performances of statecraft in identity construction through the way narratives are constructed about past events.⁶⁷ This is partially because these events are in fact not past in a linear conception of time, as evidenced by the lingering traces of ghosts. We need not view ghosts either as simply traces. They are as wholly existential as you or I, and indeed remind us that our own existence and our own identities are precarious, constructed, and at the margins of political life as much as those of ghosts.

Ghosts remind us that life and death are often arbitrarily assigned in an expression of power, and that certain lives and deaths are often privileged over others. As Avery Gordon writes, to be haunted is to contend with the very tangled way people sense, intuit, and experience the complexities of modern

⁶⁶ Derrida, Specters of Marx.

⁶⁷ Fredric Jameson says that a world cleansed of spectrality is ontology itself, a world of pure present, of things without a past. See Fredric Jameson, 'Marx's Purloined Letter,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 26-67, 58. What this reminds us is that as the state tries to enforce pure ontology, it must forget its origins, forget the very performativity by which it sustains itself. In order for statecraft to work, the 'crafting' of the state must be forgotten, and an alternative story of origins told.

power and personhood.⁶⁸ In this sense, it is personhood, or subjectivity, that lies at the heart of haunting and statecraft. To explore this further, it is worth delving into Derrida's discussion of spectrality and visibility. Spectrality describes those ghosts, those beings which straddle the boundaries between life and death. Derrida describes the specter in *Specters of Marx* as a paradoxical incorporation.⁶⁹ It is some 'thing' which is difficult to name, neither soul nor body, but at the same time both one and the other. The specter appears to present itself, but one rather represents it to oneself: it is not itself present in flesh and blood. Because it disrupts the traditional framework of specularity and because it is unintelligible, invisible, and uncontrollable, the specter can be portrayed as a deathly *threat* which is subject to interventions or mediations. This results in a hostility towards ghosts or a making ridiculous of ghosts, laughing about it to allay fear of the threat.

Derrida argues that the proper feature of specters is that they are deprived of a specular image. How you recognize a ghost is that the ghost doesn't recognize itself in a mirror.⁷⁰ So let's explore this mirror function further.⁷¹ In order to make ourselves universally visible, ontological, to construct ourselves as subjects, we must first hauntologize ourselves by construction of the mirror. Construction of the mirror requires a collaborative, intersubjective endeavor

⁶⁸ Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*, 194.

⁶⁹ Derrida, Specters of Marx.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ This discussion of the mirror function draws on work by and discussions with Richard Ashley.

because it must work properly in the sense that others have to see you the way you see yourself in the mirror. So we make the mirror in which we see ourselves, and in order to see the truth in ourselves. But the mirror can only be a mirror if the pane of glass is backed by a tain, which serves the purpose of reflecting rather than simply the transparency of glass. So the mirror functions as a form of our human instrumentality. But the ontologization of the self by the creation of the mirror in which we see ourselves, make ourselves visible, is not final, because we are constantly reminded of specters. We are reminded of specters because otherness in the form of the tain must be retained in order to keep the self visible. But because this otherness is present, ghosts can spring out—hauntology makes the mirror not fully function. If ghosts spring out, we are no longer simply visible, we are rather somewhat visible, and this means we are dead or dying, because the human being as self/subject is defined as that which is visible, the mirrorable, visible being of life, that which can see itself in a mirror, because, as Derrida says, ghosts cannot see themselves in a mirror. Because of this failure of the mirror to work, we get more motivated to keep at the construction of the mirror.

This repetitive construction of the mirror maintains the division between self and other perpetrated by the mirror function. The mirror makes the ultimate distinction: between living and dead, to decide what is worthy of life and what counts as nearly invisible or invisible (deathly, spectral). But this distinction is itself made using human instrumentality: the mirror is itself a human instrument. What the specter demonstrates to us is that this ultimate distinction between living and dead is not ultimate after all. What counts as worthy of life, as grievable life in Butler's terms, is a socially constructed decision. The ungrievable lives continue to haunt as specters, to disrupt frameworks of spectrality, that which distinguishes a life of value from one without, one which may as well be dead, and as a result to disrupt frameworks of statecraft. Marilyn Ivy refers to ghosts as indicators that the structure of remembering through memorialization is not completely effective. What this means is that the line between life and death that remembering the dead institutes is not secure.⁷² Indeed, Derrida's project of deconstruction, according to Antonio Negri, is precisely about 'a radical questioning of the problem of life and death.⁷³

This mirror function, derived from Lacanian psychoanalysis, reveals the basis of the politics of recognition, how we recognize ourselves and indeed how we recognize (or do not recognize) others. It allows for exploration of how the line between life and death is socially constructed. Bringing in ghosts, then, or that which is perceived as invisible in the mirror, allows for exploration of marginalized or ungrievable lives, and indeed how power in implicated in the construction of the line between life and death. It reveals the logic of haunting underlying contemporary statecraft which relies on the construction of subjectivity through decisions about life and death itself. Statecraft, then, must decide on which lives are lives precisely in order to function, in order to craft the

⁷² Marilyn Ivy, *Discourses of the Vanishing: Modernity, Phantasm, Japan.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995, 150.

⁷³ Antonio Negri, 'The Specter's Smile,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 5-16, 9.

state. To paraphrase Tom Lewis, the ghost, the specter, 'surfaces as the figure of undecideability that must be exorcized as the Other if a being is to be acquired.'⁷⁴

Thus the exploration undertaken by this dissertation of ghosts and hauntings is not simply one focused on the dead. It also focuses on the logic of haunting, that construction of the lines that delineate life from death, grievable lives from ungrievable lives. It focuses on the use of haunting as a political tool to delineate those worthy lives and worthy stories, and on the marginalization of lives considered to be less valuable or grievable, but also on the way the ungrievable and unmemorializable lives still haunt us, even if we don't notice it at first. This project is an attempt to not only trace the relationship between haunting and statecraft, but also to listen to these lives and these voices, to try to pay attention to the things we should, ethically, be haunted by, to examine and recover these marginalized and ungrievable lives. What does it mean to be haunted by these bodies? Bodies themselves narrate a story of what happened. When they die, they need to be explained,⁷⁵ rather than simply being buried, both literally and figuratively. It is these explanations that I attempt to ferret out from the mass graves and bleached bones in the desert and rubble.

Some may argue that blurring the line between life and death, as I do in this project, simply gives over to the sovereign power over death, when 'he' is already implicated in such a tremendous power over life. It renders the sovereign

⁷⁴ Tom Lewis, 'The Politics of "Hauntology" in Derrida's Spectres of Marx,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 134-167, 141.

⁷⁵ Monica Casper and Lisa Jean Moore, *Missing Bodies: the Politics of Visibility*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2009, 149.

omnipotent in that death is no longer a realm safe from sovereign intervention because the line has been blurred. But this is indeed not the case. Rather, the sovereign already has such power over death, yet this fact is obscured by the biopolitical functioning of the modern state, wherein the line between life and death is invoked as a given. Yet, the line between life and death is always already a social and political construction at the level of ontology, an exercise of power that constructs subjectivity itself. Death has been depoliticized by the sovereign, indeed, as Elizabeth Dauphinee and Cristina Masters write, 'in the context of sovereign biopolitics, death needs to be made invisible because death, the underside of this politics, also undermines the sovereign claim that its primary activity is to "make live." In other words, death is expunged from the exercise of sovereign power—obscured as a primary effect of sovereign power—relegated to these undersides that are subsequently erased'.⁷⁶ This project, therefore, is not about giving the sovereign power over death, but exposing how sovereignty is already implicated in death, and indeed in rendering invisible its incursions into death, and what types of resistances to this may exist at the hauntological level.

This is closely associated with Giorgio Agamben's concept of thanatopolitics, which he deems to be the blurring of the lines between sovereign power and biopower in the contemporary era.⁷⁷ Agamben argues that in today's society the exception has become the rule, and the realm of bare life which was

⁷⁶ Elizabeth Dauphinee and Cristina Masters, 'Introduction: Living, Dying, Surviving I,' in Dauphinee and Masters eds., *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, xii-xiii.

⁷⁷ See Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*. Zone Books, 2002.

originally situated at the margins of political order (the camp) has begun to coincide with the political realm itself. Bare life is thus the condition of contemporary life. He argues that the transformation of politics into biopolitics and the convergence of biopolitics with sovereign politics has made possible totalitarianism in the sense that the state can both make us live and make us die. The fundamental character of totalitarian politics is thus the politicization of life itself. Agamben gives as example of this the way the Nazis transformed natural heredity into a political task; thanatopolitics blurs the line between the biological and the politics, we are citizens whose very politics is at issue in our natural bodies.⁷⁸ With the emergence of thanatopolitics, every decision on life has also become a decision on death. This is the condition that Agamben says we find ourselves in today, a blurring of life and death itself, and a thorough penetration of state power in all facets of life.

Interestingly, Foucault defines one of the features of biopolitics as the gradual disqualification of the death, the way in which death shifted from a spectacle to something private, shameful, and taboo. Death was hidden away because it marked a status of being beyond sovereign power.⁷⁹ But this is no longer the case in the contemporary emergence of thanatopolitics, according to Agamben. What Agamben offers here by exploring the merging of sovereign power and biopower is precisely an opening into what power the sovereign has

⁷⁸ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, Vintage Books, 1990.

⁷⁹ Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*. London: Picador, 1976/2003, 247-248.

over death and the discourses at work that have rendered death depoliticized. Therefore what we are seeing in the exercise of contemporary politics is not simply sovereign power, or the right to let live and make die, or simply biopower, the right to make live and let die, but a thanatopolitical merging of the two in the right to make live and make die, the incursion of the sovereign in the decision about not only who lives and who dies, but what it means to live and die. Charlotte Epstein characterizes this as a feature of contemporary statecraft that is evident in the war-on-terror, which she argues has stripped security to its bare essentials: literally life and death itself.⁸⁰

This relies on Foucault's conception of biopolitics, and his conclusion that racism in fact explains how contemporary biopolitics operates. Racism, as Foucault explains it, is the underlying sentiment for genocidal politics such as the Holocaust, precisely because it operates at the biological level to differentiate between lives that count and lives that are not lives at all. The racism function tells us that if you want to live, the other must die. The death of the other is posited as that which not only guarantees my safety, but also makes my life healthier.⁸¹ Foucault aptly argues that death in this instance need not be simply rote killing, but can involve exposure to death, increasing the risk of death, expulsion, rejection, and *political death*.⁸² Judith Butler draws on this notion to elaborate ungrievable lives, lives considered to be already ontologically dead

⁸⁰ Charlotte Epstein, 'Guilty Bodies, Productive Bodies, Destructive Bodies: Crossing the Biometric Borders,' *International Political Sociology*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2007): 149-164, 155.

⁸¹ Foucault, Society Must Be Defended, 255.

⁸² Ibid., 256, my emphasis.

because they are placed outside of the realm of sovereign power even while they are subject to the at time extremely brutal exercise of this same sovereign power.

Butler's notion of precarious life examines the idea that certain lives are considered more legitimately grievable than others; that is, we value specific lives (and deaths) more than others. She analyzes this in the context of 9/11, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the Israel-Palestinian conflict, to argue that certain lives are framed utilizing nationalist and familial narratives, which forecloses our capacity to mourn in global dimensions. This is because we are unable to conceive of certain lives as *lives*. The media and the state establish the narratives by which the human being in its grievability is established.⁸³ My task is to explore the intersection of the ordering mechanisms of statecraft with the construction of identity through narratives constructing the grievability of lives, and perhaps, the way in which statecraft is haunted by these ungrievable lives.

I did not seek out ghosts or hauntings for this project. My journey started with memorials and political contestation over construction of memorials. But as I looked at this phenomenon, I began to notice traces of ghosts, to notice the effects of hauntings, and to become interested in tracing them and their political effects. I began to notice that my writings themselves were haunted with the underlying current that there was something important about these hauntings that needed to be explored. My field work in Rwanda and my explorations of the US-Mexico border and the 9/11 memorial imaginary only affirmed that these hauntings were of political importance and worth exploring and enabled me to be

⁸³ Butler, *Precarious Life*, 38.

able to tell the story. These hauntings, evident through the construction of space and political inscription on the body, impact the way we think about concepts such as sovereignty, power, and citizenship.

Though this project takes finding ghosts as its aim, my goal is in fact not to make ghosts known. Rendering ghosts intelligible would be to appropriate them within a logic of visibility, to render them visible according to an external logic which seeks to reinforce the lines between life and death, grievable and ungrievable. Indeed some have referred to ghosts as 'hovering between life and death, presence and absence.⁸⁴ But in fact ghosts do not hover between life and death. There is no between because ghosts exist prior to ontology, prior to the construction of the dichotomy of life and death. If there is no life and there is no death, ghosts cannot hover between the two. Hauntology allows us to look for ghosts in places other than the marginalized interstices of international politics, and acknowledge their hauntings in life, in death, and in the very ontological construction of meaning of life and death, and the power at play that is implicated in drawing these lines. The task here, then, is to trace the political effects of haunting and hauntings, and acknowledge that there may be some bodies and some ghosts that are unknowable, but that this is itself a hauntological status with political significance and disrupts the previously accepted order of knowledge. It is an ethical practice undertaken here: to find ghosts without rendering them visible and knowable within a logic that replicates the subjugation and

⁸⁴ Davis, 'Etat Present', 376.

marginalization of specters and the construction of certain lives and bodies as ungrievable.

Why Bodies?

Bodies are not themselves exclusive from ghosts. As Kas Saghafi writes, 'a "ghost" is a spectral apparition, a magic appearance. Yet, it is a body-the most abstract of bodies. It is a becoming-body, a prosthetic body, an artifactual body, a body without body, a spectral body. This phantomatic body, an improper body without property or flesh, has the most intangible tangibility.⁸⁵ Derrida's own work on spectrality similarly gestures to a focus on the body. He states, 'for there to be a ghost, there must be a return to the body, but to a body that is more abstract than ever. The spectrogenic process corresponds therefore to a paradoxical incorporation.⁸⁶ Here we begin to see the role of corporeality in spectrality, the importance of the 'corps' in Derrida's gesturing to 'incorporation.' In this sense, understanding corporeality, or a focus on bodies in memorialization, can help us understanding the logic of haunting. A focus on bodies has perhaps come to the attention of scholars of politics through the work of Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and Giorgio Agamben, largely centered on the emergence of the concept of biopolitics.

Agamben explores the centrality of the body in modern political thought through the idea that democracy has come to be considered the presentation of the

⁸⁵ Kas Saghafi, 'Apparitions,' Forum, Autumn 2008.

⁸⁶ Derrida, Specters of Marx, 126.

body: hence the term '*habeas corpus ad subjiciendum*, "you will have to have a body to show"⁸⁷ Corpus, he says, is the bearer both of individual liberties and the ultimate subject of sovereign power.⁸⁸ This is also why we see the centrality of the body in philosophy and science of the Baroque age. He reads the emergence of the body in Leviathan through Hobbes's distinction between man's natural body and his political body: 'the great metaphor of the Leviathan, whose body is formed out of all the bodies of individuals, must be read in this light. The absolute capacity of the subjects' bodies to be killed forms the new political body of the West.'⁸⁹

Foucault similarly has discussed the way in which the emergence of biopolitical technologies have placed the body at the center of political life, focused on ensuring the spatial distribution of individual bodies through separation, alignment, serialization, and surveillance.⁹⁰ Foucault is one of the most influential thinkers in terms of theorizing how sovereign power acts on bodies, particularly in the form of disciplinary practices. As Foucault states, 'the body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs.⁹¹ Foucault emphasizes the

⁸⁷ Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1998, 124.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 125.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 125.

⁹⁰ Foucault, Society Must Be Defended, 242.

⁹¹ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1975/1995, 25-26.

importance of techniques of visibility in control over bodies, including his key theorization of the panopticon. One of the key features of this project as a whole will be in exploring the politics of visibility: what it might mean to display certain bodies in certain contexts and not others, why some spaces are rendered invisible and others hyper-visible. Monica Casper and Lisa Moore also emphasize the importance of visibility when it comes to bodies, arguing that not all bodies are equally visible. Some bodies are hyperexposed and magnified, others hidden or missing.⁹²

Judith Butler has similarly focused on the body, specifically in terms of the relationships between gender and sex and bodies. She acknowledges that the body is material. But it is how some bodies and parts of bodies come to matter that renders bodies a focal point of an analysis based on social construction.⁹³ As Lauren Wilcox characterizes Butler's perspective: 'the materialization of bodies is theorized as a product of discursive practices of gender, rather than gender being a social formation that is applied to pre-existing sexed bodies.'⁹⁴ What she gestures at here is that while we can view bodies as material, this materiality is in fact produced by discourse in an iterative performative process. Bodies matter not simply because things happen to them, but also because they are themselves coconstitutive of the discourses within which they circulate. Like Butler, Casper

⁹² Casper and Moore, *Missing Bodies*.

⁹³ Judith Butler, *Bodies that Matter*, London: Routledge, 1993.

⁹⁴ Lauren Wilcox, 'Technologies of the Body: Theorizing Embodiment and Contemporary Warfare,' Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, March 28, 2008, San Francisco, 10.

and Moore argue that bodies are material entities, but 'our interpretations and explanations of bodily processes give meaning to their materiality.⁹⁵ Butler thus explores the materialization of bodies, and how this is productive of a 'domain of abjected bodies' which sustains the normalization of other bodies. This articulation of bodies is productive of norms that qualify some bodies as 'bodies that matter, ways of living that count as 'life,' lives worth protecting, lives worth saving, lives worth grieving.⁹⁶

It bears exploring here why political inscription on the body is so important for understanding the politics of memory in the instances I explore, and how this relates to the field of international relations. Why the body? Why dead bodies? 'Dead Bodies have enjoyed political life the world over'⁹⁷, and embodied practices have recently come to the attention of scholars of international politics as well. Rosemary Shinko theorizes embodied practices by looking at the body as a surface for resisting power in the framework of autonomy. She theorizes bodily enactments as way to challenge 'sovereign powers' efforts to render certain forms of suffering invisible, meaningless and not worth troubling over'.⁹⁸ She critiques the way in which International Relations has failed to theorize the body, specifically in ignoring the relational autonomy of bodies. By paying attention to

relational autonomy, we can look at both the physiological materiality of bodies

⁹⁵ Casper and Moore, *Missing Bodies*, 4.

⁹⁶ Butler, *Bodies that Matter*, 16.

⁹⁷ Katherine Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*, New York: NY: Columbia University Press, 1999, 28.

⁹⁸ Rosemary Shinko, 'Ethics After Liberalism: Why (Autonomous) Bodies Matter, *Millennium*, vol. 38, no. 3 (2010): 723-745, 735.

and the discursive materiality of bodies. Her emphasis on the way in which power is both inscribed on bodies, yet bodies can also offer resistance to power, emphasizes the way in which the body is not a fixed referent, but rather is both shaped by and shapes discourses of power and materiality.⁹⁹

Lauren Wilcox identifies the body as the constituent outside to International Relations, in that it is not explicitly theorized yet it at the same time functions to define the parameters of the discipline in the sense that excluding the body from our theorizations maintains the status quo operations of international relations.¹⁰⁰ She similarly explores the role of the body in international relations in a variety of contexts, including the force-feeding of prisoners at Guantanamo as a literal instantiation of a biopolitical 'make live' exercise of power. As she argues, 'the production of bodies by regimes of

sovereign/discipline/governmentality are never total—there may be no outside of power, but bodies are also capable of exceeding their production.¹⁰¹ In this way, Wilcox emphasizes the way in which bodies are not simply to be considered as sites for political inscription of sovereign power; they are not simply victims of power, rather we can theorize bodily resistance and bodies as resistance as well.

Anna Agathangelou has also explored the role of bodies in terms of the war in Iraq. She argues that liberal theory presupposes that the West is the subject

⁹⁹ Ibid., 738.

¹⁰⁰ Wilcox, 'Technologies of the Body.'

¹⁰¹ Lauren Wilcox, 'Bodies of International Relations: Theorizing Bodies, Pain, and Resistance,' Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, 2009, 17.

of reason and those outside are considered to be mere corporeality.¹⁰² The strategy in Iraq was thus to decapitate the head while leaving the body in place. She focuses on the ways certain bodies are deemed structurally impossible and ontologically dead in order to sustain a certain (re)construction of the liberal order focused on these racial and gendered corporeal reconstructions. By doing so, she offers a framework for considering marginalized bodies through this notion of ontological death, those bodies that are not biologically dead but do not count as politically viable lives. I argue that by using the framework of hauntology we can start to consider the politics of visibility that render the ontologically dead as such.

Renee Marlin-Bennett, Marieke Wilson, and Jason Walton specifically discuss the role of dead bodies by exploring commodified bodies and the politics of display.¹⁰³ They explore the exhibition of plasticized human cadavers in museums for educational purposes, arguing that in these exhibits, dead bodies are being depoliticized and commodified in a morally troubling way. Though regulations exist for dead bodies and body parts, plasticized bodies are couched in discourses of specimens rather than human beings. The spectacle of their display in often provocative positions invokes scientific authority to legitimate a specific representation of these bodies which silences and depoliticizes their histories. Spectators walk through scenes in which the plasticized bodies enact a particular

¹⁰² Agathangelou, 'Bodies of Desire,' 715.

¹⁰³ See Renee Marlin-Bennett, Marieke Wilson, and Jason Walton, 'Commodified Cadavers and the Political Economy of the Spectacle,' *International Political Sociology*, vol. 2, no. 2 (2010): 159-177.

moral economy which is only possible with the base assumption that they are no longer considered to be human. Viewers are instructed not to engage emotionally with the bodies, and this, coupled with the disbelief that what is being exhibited is actually a human body, creates a cognitive dissonance which is coopted by the exhibit to condone objectification of things whose difference we cannot understand.¹⁰⁴ Their analysis of the objectification and commodification of corpses gestures to the political importance governance of bodies, even dead ones, has in the contemporary biopolitical era. My project takes this basis as a starting point, and draws on this notion of a politics of display to look at bodies displayed for the purposes of memorialization rather than science or education.

All of these international relations scholars demonstrate in various ways and contexts the role bodies play both in being inscribed with sovereign power and in acting as resistance. But they also all share the sentiment that the body is an under-theorized part of international politics and should be brought in to explore how power works. In short, bodies matter! Indeed, as Casper and Moore argue, 'we live in an age of proliferating human bodies...bodies are made visible and seen...via a range of globalized practices.'¹⁰⁵ They explore the emergence of globalized technologies such as MRIs and sonograms which render bodies both enhanced and amplified. But there are also ways in which traditional bodily and embodied practices such as death and burial are enhanced in a globalized age, not by emergent technologies, but by existent and emergent political and social

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 172.

¹⁰⁵ Casper and Moore, *Missing Bodies*, 1.

practices which render these bodies a complex part of social and political identities and identity practices. This makes sense when we consider that bodies often serve as symbols of political order, where political transformation is symbolized by what is done to bodies, as in the expression 'cutting off the head of the king', pomp and circumstance regarding burial and reburial of political leaders, and even the idiom 'body politic'.¹⁰⁶ Dead bodies themselves are significant for politics, especially since as Henry Giroux lays out, 'cadavers have a way of insinuating themselves on consciousness, demanding answers tto questions that aren't often asked'.¹⁰⁷

The idea here is that what is done with dead bodies is a key part of our identity, whatever that may be. In the case of Rwanda, dignified burial of the corpses of the victims of the genocide becomes essential to memorialization and reconciliation. Rwandan identity becomes dependent on the way they treat these dead bodies: the products of the genocide, and what they do with society: the other product of the genocide. In the case of undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border, their bodies themselves becomes sites of political practices and political contestation. Many believe that their bodies should not be buried on US soil, and thus their bodies themselves become the locus of contestation over the meaning of citizenship. This scenario also results from the

¹⁰⁶ Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies*.

¹⁰⁷ Henry Giroux, 'Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability,' *College Literature*, vol. 33, no. 3 (2006): 171-196, 174.

increased mobility of bodies in the contemporary age.¹⁰⁸ And in the case of 9/11, the disappearance of bodies and the creation of rubble and ruin become key to imagining national identity and concepts of power.

Bodies themselves have an intimate link to identity construction because they are always situated within social contexts. 'All discourses and practices rely on the actions, regulations, interactions, and positioning of human bodies and the agents inhabiting them. But because society is stratified along lines of gender, race, class, sexuality, age, disability status, citizenship, geography, and other cleavages, some bodies are public and visually dissected while others are vulnerable to erasure and marginalization.'¹⁰⁹ Dead bodies are particularly complex because they are situated within a multiplicity of constructions including burial or cremation rituals, social norms about death, loved ones left behind. When these bodies are also situated within logics of national trauma, genocide, threat, their meanings take on additional significance for the study of political practices. Though death itself is always a political practice, the dead body is both symbolic and ontologically powerful in terms of identity construction.

Dead bodies are interesting because of their complex potentials. As Katherine Verdery writes, the most important property of bodies is precisely their ambiguity. Corpses suggest the lived lives of complex human beings. They do not mean the same thing to everyone, yet there is at the same time a shared

¹⁰⁸ As Casper and Moore argue, 'the human body has never been more *visible* and rapidly mobile (and mobilized) than it is in the first decade of the 21^{st} century.' See Casper and Moore, *Missing Bodies*, 1.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 9.

consideration that there is something important about the dead. All human communities have customs concerning what is to be done with dead bodies, and a dead body, she argues, is therefore meaningful because it is mediated through specific culturally established relations to death.¹¹⁰

Dead bodies are not human beings, because they are no longer possessed with the vitality and sense of self-identification that we associate with living beings. Neither are they simply things, for they possess the sacred status of having once been imbued with self-identification. As Jenny Edkins details, rationally the corpse is an inanimate object, but our cultures tell us otherwise: 'the body may not be alive, but it is grievable.¹¹¹ Dead bodies are not objects or subjects, and in many ways, they invoke that line between life and death, by reminding us that they are our loved ones, yet at the same time they are not fully anymore. But they certainly remain imbued with some sense of the identity they held while alive, because we make pilgrimages to the gravesite to visit them. We associate our loved one with their dead body and their gravestone. This is true of the pilgrimages to the mass graves in Rwanda by loved ones to visit their lost family members, and the drive of 9/11 victims' family members to want a piece of rubble from the towers because of the feeling that that rubble is somehow imbued with the essence of their loved one, may contain just a piece of their loved one. Dead bodies matter to us, precisely because they are not simply dead bodies. In this sense, we are reminded that the line between life and death is socially

¹¹⁰ Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies*, 28.

¹¹¹ Jenny Edkins, *Missing: Persons and Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011, 126.

constructed, evident in the multiple potentialities of dead bodies themselves and their complex and shifting identities.

Naming and identifying bodies matters. Identification becomes a prerequisite for membership in a political community, so that the subject can be situated within the sovereign apparatus. Naming has a tremendous linguistic and discursive power. When we think about a skull displayed at Nyamata Memorial in Rwanda with the name Patrice scribbled across it in pencil, we think not only of the fact that Patrice's loved ones wanted to be able to identify him among the rest of the skulls there, but also that they wanted to declare his identity to others, to reclaim his subjectivity by naming and thereby giving identity to. When we cannot identify bodies, it becomes disruptive. Dead undocumented immigrants in the Arizona desert disrupt our ability to conceptualize citizenship, as their bodies merge with the American soil. In the 9/11 memorial imaginary, the lack of bodies means our identity is thrown radically into question, and must be replaced with the sacralization of space, thereby imbued with the identities of those lost, and also the larger national identity which comes to displace that of the individual. If we think of the flags flown after 9/11 at commemoration ceremonies, one for each of the victims killed, it becomes clearer. At Arlington National Cemetery, one cross marks each dead soldier. At Srebrenica, one cross marks each victim of genocide. But in Tempe, AZ, each September 11, thousands of American flags fly, one for each victim of 9/11. Our conceptualization of nationalism has changed after September 11.

55

Dead bodies are themselves highly politicized but are often absent or elided from political discourse about war and conflict, the very things that are productive of dead bodies en masse. 'During war, human bodies are thrown together in perhaps the most desperate of circumstances—bodies collide, limbs are severed, flesh is seared.'¹¹² We know that conflict occurs and produces grave loss; this is not up for debate. But international relations as a discipline has focused more heavily on what happens during conflict or conflict resolution than on the effects of these phenomena including dead bodies and memorialization practices. Thus a focus on memorialization is inherently a focus on the politicization of dead bodies, political inscription on dead bodies, and embodied practices in international politics in general.

If we think more about the traditional focus of international relations: war and traumatic events, what is the result or after-effect? It is useful to imagine someone who builds a bomb shelter for a time of war, and stays in it for the duration of the war. What do they see upon exiting the shelter? The war is no longer going on, but what they see has radically changed. They may see dead bodies and will likely see reconfigured spaces. Their farm may no longer be a farm; it may now be a graveyard. It is no longer productive of crops the way it used to be. It doesn't mean it will never be a farm again, but the trauma has literally scarred the landscape. If we think about borders, we can see the same thing. Border crossings, viewed as a traumatic event, have literally reconfigured space with piles of bones, pauper's cemeteries, clothing and other objects that

¹¹² Casper and Moore, *Missing Bodies*, 142.

have been left behind, increased border patrol, and the construction of fences. Some of these things, such as increased border patrol, are clearly security responses to border crossings, but these cannot be understood except in the context of responses to a traumatic event. If International Relations has heretofore largely ignored the rotting bodies left after its primary object: war, then exploring dead bodies in a variety of context can help to shed light on many of the questions of power at play.

How to Look for Ghosts, or, A Note on Methodology:

A project that sets out to look for ghosts, to trace hauntings by looking at their traces in monuments, must utilize certain tools. Method is itself a potential obstacle to this, in that method often privileges a certain distance between researcher and subject, and this project implicates the researcher in the very thing being studied. It is impossible, after all, to visit a genocide memorial with the entirely objective eye of the researcher and not be affected by what is being seen. Indeed I argue that this struggle, this dichotomy, is both a superficial and unnecessary one. It is according to an ethical commitment to the subject at hand that I reject a false objectivity in this research design. As Luce Irigaray says, 'isn't it the method, the path to knowledge, that has always also led us away, led us astray, by fraud and artifice?'¹¹³ This research project, therefore, does not fraudulently claim an objectivity which is not there. Rather, it celebrates the interrelationship between 'researcher' and 'subject,' a primarily ethnographic

¹¹³ Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985, 150.

approach which is itself political in that it locates the researcher within networks of power, emphasizes self-reflexivity throughout the research process, and focuses on the importance of problematizing normalized instances of power relations that operate at the level of everyday practices.¹¹⁴

This does not mean, however, that the research here is not without grounding or operates by an 'anything goes' philosophy. Though the methods undertaken by this research may not themselves operate according to positivist standards of objectivity and replicability, they are not unreliable. Though the method itself, as a largely ethnographic one, is not necessarily replicable, the observable implications are, and this is what lends rigor to both the way the research is carried out and the results.

The primary method utilized is discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is employed in a variety of ways, and its proponents do not necessarily all agree on what constitutes a discourse analysis. Its detractors are similarly unclear. For the purposes of this research, I define discourse analysis as a research tool which allows for examination of discourse as a set of processes and practices which operate in the construction of identity and subjectivity. Discourses can be many different things; they need not be language-based, but can involve sets of practices and even objects. Identifying discourses is not always easy, as multiple discursive systems may overlap at any given time, similar to the way any given individual might at any time hold multiple varying and overlapping identities

¹¹⁴ See Timothy Pachirat, 'The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches From the Kill Floor,' in Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009, 143-162.

which are sometimes in agreement and may sometimes come in conflict with another. Similar to identities, discourses are social constructions and are constantly in the process of being remade and reshaped; they are never fully and finally developed. Because they shift and change, discourse analysis is seen by many to be unreliable, but we need not confuse a subject of study that changes for an unreliable tool of study. In fact, it is precisely because discourses are constructed that makes tracing the process of their construction such an interesting task.

I regard language as a social and political practice capable of constructing identity, deviating from the commonly accepted definition of language as a tool for registering and comprehending information and data.¹¹⁵ More specifically, I propose to draw out a general structure of hierarchies and assumptions that order knowledge.¹¹⁶ Proponents of discourse analysis argue that we cannot know real causes, but rather can examine the processes by which outcomes occur. Language and discourse are more ambiguous than actions and can therefore escape the control of the individuals,¹¹⁷ thus discourse is larger than the sum of the words that make it up because it is also the construction of a reality; it is structure and

¹¹⁵ Lene Hansen, *Security As Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

¹¹⁶ Jennifer Milliken, 'The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods,' *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1999): 225-254.

¹¹⁷ Roxanne Doty, 'Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, '*International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37 (1993): 297-320.

practices.¹¹⁸ The construction of meanings is simultaneously one of identity and difference. Or rather, discourses construct identity by delineating both what the identity is and how it differs from other identities, with emphasis on the borders between the inside identity and the outside difference. Discourse analysis is an enabler of access to meaning, the structure of expression. Discourse studies illustrate how textual and social processes are intrinsically connected and describe the implications of this for the way we think and act in the world.¹¹⁹ Discourse is a structure that both reflects and constructs the meaning of things through the way it is ordered. Discourses create and recreate the common sense of societies, meaning that discourses both reflect and shape the general view on a particular issue. Because of this they often appear natural to our sensibilities.

In order to flesh out my cases, I engaged in a variety of methods for each case to establish the multiplicity of overlapping discourses at play. I draw on an ethnographic framework, which I understand to be one which attempts to invoke the lived experiences of others as well as the researcher. Tim Pachirat elaborates that ethnography privileges insider meanings, conflicting interpretations, ambiguity, and thereby challenges the boundaries of the political.¹²⁰ Ed Schatz differentiates ethnography from qualitative methods more broadly in that ethnography need not focus on generalization or prediction, and has two main

¹¹⁸ Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, 'Methodological Reflections on Discourse Analysis,' *Qualitative Methods, Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2004): 28-30.

¹¹⁹ Jim George, *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re) Introduction to International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1994.

¹²⁰ Pachirat, 'The Political in Political Ethnography.'

characteristics: first, in-depth participant observation focused on immersion within a cluster of related subject positions, and second, a certain sensibility which tries to ferret out the way the people under study attribute meaning to their particular social and political realities.¹²¹

I adopt this ethnographic framework in somewhat of a different manner than most. That is, I did not spend a year immersed within a particular community. Rather, this project takes as its methodological base immersion within particular sets of discourses which attempts to explore meaning construction and in fact privilege the relationships between 'researcher' and 'researched' in a way that does not treat the 'object of study' as an 'object.' Lisa Wedeen characterizes this as a Foucaultian approach to ethnography, which analyzes the work discourses do: 'their underlying assumptions, omissions, implications, and effects, as well as their historical conditions of possibility.'¹²² Thus, this project adopts what Schatz might call the 'ethnographic sensibility'¹²³ rather than a strict in-depth immersion in a particular community ethnographic project.

This is not to say, however, that immersion in a particular community did not form part of this project. Indeed, in addition to immersion within specific sets of discourses, I also engaged in field work both in Rwanda and along the US-

¹²¹ Edward Schatz, 'Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics,' In Schatz, ed, *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009, 1-22.

¹²² Lisa Wedeen, 'Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science,' *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 13 (2010): 255-272, 267-268.

¹²³ Schatz, 'Ethnographic Immersion.'

Mexico border. The field work in Rwanda had an ethnographic cast, in the sense that immersion within the community was attempted to as large a degree as feasible in order to, as Schatz would say, 'grant descriptive and/or explanatory priority to the ways in which "insiders" on the whole understand their existence.¹²⁴ I engaged in field work in Rwanda for one month, which was composed of interviews, participant observation at memorial sites, and immersion in the culture of the memorial sites from multiple perspectives, including the memorial site employees, founders, visitors, and survivors, established both through participant observation and interviews. As noted earlier, ethnography emphasizes a style of participant observation in which the researcher acts as both actor and spectator.¹²⁵ Participant observation relies precisely on this notion in the sense that it emphasizes both the participant entering the world of others as a way to ascertain their subject positions, and the observer necessarily removed from the goings-on in the sense that the observer can always leave, which forces the observer to remain aware of the power relationship at work that enables them to leave the circumstance while those being observed must remain in theirs.¹²⁶ Thus my information-gathering field work in Rwanda involved my own participation in visiting memorial sites and direct engagement with my interviewees, rather than formalized interviewing for data-gathering.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 7.

¹²⁵ Wedeen, 'Reflections on Ethnographic Work.'

¹²⁶ Paul Rock, 'Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnography,' In Paul Atkinson et al, eds, *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage, 2002, 32-37, 32. See also Timothy Pachirat, *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011, for an example of this idea.

Our discussion of methodology necessitates a note on case selection. Why these three cases? The first feature of these cases that stand out is that they are all contemporary cases. They tell us something about current global processes, an importance facet because of the shifting nature of memory and its relation to history. Some of the cases are overly about the state and memorialization, such as Rwanda. But others are less obviously political, such as the case of border monuments. Immigration politics is obviously a political matter, but what are the politics of visibility at play in considering the dead bodies of undocumented migrants? This allows for exploration of a variety of scenarios, of multiple levels of visibility and invisibility in terms of bodies and memories. Each case allows for examination of a different concept in contemporary international politics. The border monuments case engenders an exploration of how citizenship is constructed and maintained and how sovereignty is produced and produces citizenship. The 9/11 case sheds light on contemporary production of nationalism derived from memorialization of contemporary traumas rather than historical ones, marking a shift in roots of nationalism in the post-9/11 US political imaginary. The Rwandan case allows for exploration of reconciliation and the relationship between the international community and the state, as well as contemporary responses to atrocity, what it might mean to 'secure,' especially in the carrying out of statecraft in a literal sense in an era of genocide reconstruction. But what all three cases have in common is that the features and concepts explored are all facets of statecraft. They are all associated with ordering mechanisms that are productive of certain types of identity and identities.

Studying ghosts necessitates a focus on individuals and concepts hitherto ignored by much of international relations. John Sabol, a scholar of ghosts at the battlefield of Gettysburg, defines a ghost researcher as 'a historian of individuals, the common everyday person who ordinarily would not enter history as an historical figure.¹²⁷ Though Sabol speaks of the scientific search for the presence of paranormal beings, his characterization is suitable for this version of 'ghost research' as well, which focuses on the common everyday person, the victim of genocide who is not a political official, the migrant who dies crossing the US-Mexico border, and the missing person from the World Trade Center buildings. These individuals may not normally be considered political, and are not the focus of international politics. But they remind us that the human aspects of international relations that are often marginalized from scholarly explorations and from policy considerations are often just as important as the more overtly political factors for exploring some of the key concepts of international politics. As Avery Gordon states, hauntings signal to us that something is missing so that we can begin to look for it.¹²⁸ This project asks after the missing performances of statecraft, the invisible bodies that speak to exercises of biopower.

It is important to note, that though this project focuses on bodies, bodies are only one location at which it is possible to look for the instantiations of hauntings. Haunting is precisely troubling to our ontological givens because we cannot link it to the representable truths of the body. Haunting occurs

¹²⁷ John Sabol, *The Politics of Presence: Haunting Performances on the Gettysburg Battlefield*. Authorhouse, 2008, 26.

¹²⁸ Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*.

everywhere, even in absence of a physical memorial site, because identities are never complacently constructed fully and finally. Indeed, the ultimate goal of this exploration of ghostly statecraft is to explore how the state requires the ghost to maintain and reproduce identity construction over time, even while there can be ways in which hauntology offers a resistance to the ontologizing impetus of statecraft. Chapter 3

BORDER MONUMENTS: MEMORY, COUNTER-MEMORY, AND (B)ORDERING PRACTICES ALONG THE US-MEXICO BORDER

Hundreds of undocumented immigrants die each year crossing the U.S.-Mexico border. Most of the bodies of those who die are never discovered or identified. They remain anonymous. However, in recent years, an effort has been made to memorialize those who have died crossing the border. Small border monuments have sprung up in the desert, and larger monuments have been established in border cities. Cemeteries in border towns have created sections to house remains found in the desert, referred to as Juan Doe cemeteries. The memorialization of undocumented immigrants has been controversial due to their legal status, and counter-memorialization discourses have arisen.

This chapter explores monumentalization along the US-Mexico border as a means of exploring the ordering and bordering mechanisms of statecraft. It first addresses bordering as a mechanism of statecraft through an analysis of the border wall along the US-Mexico border. Though this region is its focus, it also uses the Israeli-Palestinian border and the Ireland-Northern Ireland border as shadow cases. It then explores the memorials set up to memorialize undocumented immigrants who lost their lives crossing the US-Mexico border. It embarks on a journey through anonymous desert gravesites and small desert cemeteries haunted by the specters of immigration. It explores the contestation surrounding memorialization of death through the monument, the narratives of anonymity surrounding the memorialization of undocumented immigrants, and the countermemory discourses that emerge in an effort to rewrite the meaning of these migrant deaths. These counter-memorial discourses, I argue, posit desert border monuments as a threat to statecraft because they cannot be situated within the (b)ordering mechanisms of the state and indeed posit a rupture to the active forgetting associated with practices of statecraft.

Conceptualizing Statecraft: Ordering and Bordering

To recall the earlier discussion of statecraft, it functions in order to craft and fix meaning and identity and order. As statecraft can never be fully and finally finished, it relies on an iterative biopolitical performance to govern populations. This chapter, then, taking statecraft as its starting point, seeks to explore the role of practices and performances of statecraft in constructing the line between life and death and therefore what it means to be a politically qualified subject of the state, and the implications of the deaths of those deemed to not be such qualified subjectivities. Since statecraft is never a finished process, it is possible to ask after its construction by looking at a multiplicity of instances of resistance. This chapter argues that resistances to statecraft can be found in the way the deaths of undocumented immigrants are memorialized, both in the case of formal memorials and informal sites of memory. These immigrants are situated within a narrative that posits them as a threat to American security, both physical and economic, while they are alive. But what happens when they are dead? What threat do these corporeal remains or the monuments commemorating those who were killed pose to the specific crafting of the state? How are they situated within

a logic of border security, or further, of statecraft itself? And what resistances can the bodies of undocumented migrants pose?

Building the Border Wall: Border Regions as Zones of Statecraft

International border regions have generally been dismissed as marginal places. But in recent years border regions have become highly politicized by virtue of their status as zones of indistinction, in need of sovereign intervention to be re-ordered. The border wall is an attempt at such a reordering. The monument comes to acquire unique significance in a landscape largely without monuments, the barren desert that characterizes the border between the U.S. and Mexico. Thus the monument built to mark this very division appears even sharper to the eye. The border wall built between the states takes many forms as it winds across the desert. At times it is barbed wire, at times a large fence and physical wall, at times a border checkpoint along a road that is heavily trafficked. Exploring the border wall allows us to examine the contemporary situation at the border. Statecraft is not a generalizable phenomenon; that is, it is highly contextual and is a crafting, a process with a multiplicity of instantiations. Therefore to look at contemporary statecraft at border sites involves exploring processes (bordering) rather than essential characteristics of the state (border). As Mark Salter says, 'sovereignty and boundary maintenance are inextricable'.¹²⁹ This is why studying the crafting of the state relies on an exploration of the

¹²⁹ Mark Salter, 'The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Borders, Bodies, Biopolitics', *Alternatives* 31, (2006): 167-189, 168.

variety of boundary-maintaining practices.¹³⁰ The border is thus the site of a multiplicity of replicable practices that are repeated throughout society to 'state' the state. Bordering is not solely geographical, but is oriented towards subject production.¹³¹

The border wall appeals to this notion of subject production, to a sense of nationhood derived from attachment to territory, one of the primary characteristics typically associated with a nation-state in world politics. I argue that the border wall performs a commemorative function in that it is intended to recall the originary moment of the state, rather than a traditional memorialization of war or sacrifice or triumph. In laying out and fixing borders, the border wall is a performative monument that memorializes the very founding of the state itself, in a purely figurative sense. By fixing this territory, the border wall beckons to a shared past tied to this territory which belongs to 'us' and not 'them'. As Roxanne Doty puts it, 'regaining control of our borders conjures up a mythic past, an age of purity, when the inside was clearly and unambiguously differentiated from the outside'.¹³² The wall specifically gestures to a statecraft built on an American melting pot philosophy yet paradoxically dependent on a self/other logic.

¹³⁰ It bears mentioning here that though bordering may be a feature of statecraft, bordering does not always take the same forms or have the same effects. Many contemporary borders remain lines across which people and objects cross effortlessly, while others are strongly secured through a variety of violent policing practices. However, this chapter focuses on one specific instantiation of the practices of statecraft and bordering: the contemporary U.S.-Mexico border.

¹³¹ Thanks to Rick Ashley for this point.

¹³² Roxanne Doty, 'The Double Writing of Statecraft: Exploring State Responses to Illegal Immigration, *Alternatives*, vol. 21, no. 2 (1996): 171-189, 180.

The border wall has not always existed to define the boundary between two states. As William Langiewiesche remarked in 1992, 'the boundary between the United States and Mexico is in places merely a trace in the dirt'.¹³³ Historically, the U.S.-Mexico border has been quite porous, with Native American groups living in swaths of territory that spanned both sides of the border, migrant workers crossing north to work for a specific growing season, and little if any identification required to cross in either direction. The border has always been a social construct rather than a physical one. As Joel Levanetz states, 'because humans created boundaries, they are inevitably political'.¹³⁴ Peter Andreas refers to the border as a political stage, in that the border area is the locus for both the coercive hand of the state and the symbolic performance of state identity.¹³⁵

The border was originally marked in the 1800s, by obelisks known as boundary monuments. According to the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol history of the border, they were erected as a result of a joint U.S.-Mexico commission to lay out the new borders which had been agreed upon by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848 at the conclusion of the Mexican-American war, which reassigned large swaths of territory from Mexico to the U.S. Surveyors from both countries negotiated the boundaries based on antiquated maps and topographical

¹³³ William Langiewiesche, 'The Border', *The Atlantic Monthly*, (May 1992): 53.

¹³⁴ Joel Levanetz, 'A Compromised Country: Redefining the U.S.-Mexico Border', *The Journal of San Diego History* 54, no. 1 (2008): 40.

¹³⁵ Peter Andreas, *Border Games: Policing the US-Mexico Divide*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.

features. The original 52 obelisks erected to demarcate the border were increased to 258 by the end of the 1800s. Obelisk 258 is located at the San Diego/Tijuana border nexus, the area around which was dedicated in 1971 by Pat Nixon as Friendship Park,¹³⁶ which has become a representation of border enforcement in recent years as the park has been split by the border fence and all cross-border activity has been halted in the park.

In 1993, the first fence was constructed between San Diego and Tijuana along a fourteen-mile length of territory.¹³⁷ In 1994 the construction of the border fence took extreme effect in the form of several operations to stem the flow of illegal immigration. Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego/Tijuana, Operation Hold the Line in El Paso/Juarez, and Operation Safeguard in Arizona were all intended to physically block the crossing of undocumented immigrants. These operations all entailed increased border enforcement and policing. Peter Andreas argues that the policing apparatus of the state is most evident at the borders, in the way it constructs and performs the boundaries between insiders and outsiders, and in the way it physically maintains a line drawn in the sand.¹³⁸ The walls were built with corrugated metal landing mats that were originally used by the US military for runways in temporary battlefield air bases. The Border Patrol was able to purchase these secondhand from the Pentagon cheaply. In San Diego, migrants have punched the wall so full of holes that a second parallel wall has been built a

¹³⁶ 'Century-Old Obelisks Mark U.S-Mexico Boundary Line', last modified August 30, 2010, http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/about/history/did_you_know/obelisk/obelisk.xml.

¹³⁷ Levanetz, 'A Compromised Country', 39-42.

¹³⁸ Andreas, *Border Games*.

few hundred feet north of concrete pilings with more advanced technological features such as lights and sensors to prevent crossings.

Operation Gatekeeper strengthened the wall between San Diego and Tijuana. The physical fence extends out even to sea to stop migrants from crossing the border by swimming across. The result of the fence is that those who try to cross end up swimming into a strong current which essentially sweeps them out to sea. Before construction of the border wall for Operation Gatekeeper in 1994, one or two people died each month crossing the border. After its construction, Enrique Morones, founder of the nonprofit group Border Angels, which tries to prevent migrant deaths, estimates that now two immigrants die every day attempting to cross the border, from a combination of violence (by Border Patrol or vigilantes), dehydration and exposure, and other accidents such as falling over the wall.¹³⁹

Dot Tuer compares the fence between San Diego and Tijuana specifically to the Great Wall of China; it divides the civilized from the uncivilized, yet by its very presence warns of imminent barbarian incursions. What is visible, the fence itself in its imperial authority, tells only a partial story, because much of the action takes place not at the fence itself, but over it, around it, and through it, where people slip through. She argues that the fence performs both a military and political function. It is a barrier that arrests the viewer's gaze. The singular fixation on the fence heightens tensions between nomad and imperial space, and it

¹³⁹ Miriam Raftery, 'Dying to Come to America—Immigrant Death Toll Soars; Water Stations Sabotaged', *East County Magazine*, September 2008.

is the haunting emptiness of the landscape, juxtaposed with the omnipresent fence which divides the landscape into horizontal grids, that becomes 'a repository for the fissures of history'.¹⁴⁰ The fence takes attention away from the topographical features of the landscape, and focuses our attention on the role of the sovereign complex in territorializing the landscape.

Tuer also argues that the border fence slices through space and time.¹⁴¹ It is itself a symbol of the will to contain migration, to construct the identity of those situated on both sides, and to impose a will upon the landscape itself. The fence imposes upon the landscape the concept of sovereign territoriality. Before the fence, there is just desert, brush, and land. After the fence, there are citizens, ownership, geography, territory, governance, and enforcement. This is the construction of space. But the desert is also a fluid continuum of time, from the goddesses of the Aztecs through to the present day. At the border wall, temporality blurs. The border wall represents the past, the history which defines relations at this site and on either side, the quest for differentiation of the two sides through the history of the creation of the wall itself. It also represents the present, by replicating a logic of statecraft and constructing and perpetuating a specific current political and economic relationship between two sides. But it also gestures to a future, a future without immigration, a future decided once and for all, fully ordered and (b)ordered. The imposition of both space and time, Tuer concludes, works to create discordance in the landscape and ultimately a

¹⁴⁰ Dot Tuer, 'Imaging the Borderlands', in *Running Fence*, ed Geofrrey James, North Vancouver: Presentation House Gallery, 1999, 106.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 103.

contested territory which holds the secrets of undocumented histories, ancient cosmologies, and finally and perhaps most importantly, the secrets of life and death itself.¹⁴² The fence is itself an attempt to impose upon the disorder of the landscape a certain order, yet this order can never fully be formed. Because territoriality is at its heart mythological, dependent upon statecraft that is constantly performed and re-formed, there can never be this final or ultimate ordering and bordering. Space and time are imposed by the wall, but even the sheer brute physicality of the wall cannot fully and finally impose notions of space, time, and order.

The wall itself is also not a fully fixed feature. It remains under construction and even if/when finally completed, still entails a performance of bordering. An interesting way to conceive of the wall as performative is by exploring the effort to raise money for its construction. I have mentioned previously that statecraft operates at multiple levels through a variety of social and political and economic practices. One of these practices which reinforces the crafting of the border associated with statecraft is the public effort to raise money for the building of the border wall. Buildtheborderfence.com is a website effort that began in mid-2011, asking Americans to contribute towards the approximate 50 million dollar cost of building the border wall.¹⁴³ This grassroots effort exemplifies the local level at which performances of statecraft can occur.

¹⁴² Ibid., 107.

¹⁴³ 'Chip in for a \$50m Border Fence', *Belfast Telegraph*, July 20, 2011.

Sebastian Rotella argues that the fence has not stopped illegal border crossing, but did anybody really think it would? It has rather 'created a demarcation, a semblance of order.¹⁴⁴ It is this semblance of order which gets to the heart of the border fence. How does it create this semblance of order? It is precisely because of the fence's memorializing function, its status as a monument. The border wall/fence memorializes the founding moment of the state by the construction of the state's sovereign power to decide on the exception, a theme to which we will return, to decide on the borders of the state and to expel the abject to that territory which lies beyond those borders. But it is only ever the semblance of order which is created, not order in its finalized concrete form. This is why the process of production of borders is not completed, but rather ongoing. The border fence is not the demarcation of an already-existing territorial border, but rather the very production of a border, the exercise of a sovereign power which presumes to have the right to make that boundary. As Prem Kumar Rajaram states, 'sovereign territoriality is always being constituted and challenged, exclusions are ongoing. Each advent of the stranger at the threshold of the norm must be dealt with; and each response to the stranger reinforces the sense of what it is to be part of the normal community'.¹⁴⁵ This critique of territoriality emphasizes that borders are constantly being produced and reproduced. However, integral to statecraft is the forgetting of this constitutive

¹⁴⁴ Sebastian Rotella, 'El Brinco (The Leap)', in *Running Fence*, ed Geoffrey James, North Vancouver: Presentation House Gallery, 1999, 99.

¹⁴⁵ Prem Kumar Rajaram, 'Disruptive Writings and a Critique of Territoriality', *Review of International Studies* 30, (2004): 201-228, 220.

process: the fixity of the state must be assumed in order to maintain its authority. Because it is assumed, it is not questioned, not even up for question. The unattached, non-territorial condition of the stranger, as Rajaram puts it, or the immigrant without documents, as I would put it, reminds us that we are oppressed and repressed by the sovereign territorial discourse. It reminds us that indeed our identity need not be bound up with sovereign territoriality: that this sovereign territoriality is a myth, and that the state operates through biopolitical power and the production of bare life at the border. Rajaram emphasizes that life is only coherent before its exception: bare life. And indeed our political selves only exist through the sovereign production of bare life at the imagined border. As Roxanne Doty puts it, 'for the citizen to live, the undocumented must be permitted to die.¹⁴⁶ The relationship between the state and the immigrant is constantly being resituated as the state attempts to maintain its norms, its perpetual normalization techniques for the very maintenance of an identity of the state. It is this revelation of the hidden abject who has been portrayed as the other at the door of the state, and in the interstitial (or interstateal) spaces, both outside of, between, within the state, which puts into question the myth of the originary moment of the state.

Here it is worth returning back to the idea of abjection and exploring it further. The 'illegal immigrant' constitutes the abject for the United States. Julia Kristeva describes the status of abjection as that of marginalized groups.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁶ Roxanne Doty, 'Bare Life: Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, forthcoming.

¹⁴⁷ Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Abjection literally means that which has been cast off or thrown away.¹⁴⁸ This etymology indicates several things. 'Thrown' or 'cast' implies a forceful ejection, while 'away' indicates a distancing between that which did the throwing and that which was thrown. It also implies a denial of agency to that which was thrown, that this object had no say in the matter. The figurative use of the term 'abject' is to indicate something which has been downcast or brought low. Abjection is not simply expulsion, but expulsion to a lower level, debasement, disgusted *down*grading. Kristeva depicts the abject as that which was once part of the self but is no longer because the self has forcefully expelled it due to its disgust with the abject. The abject is the waste, the excrement of the self, where the process of expulsion is private and hidden. The abject is necessary to the self, but it is also necessary to the self that the abject be expelled from it. However, at some point, the self comes into contact with the abject, and is forced to confront that which was once part of the self but no longer is, to confront the very process of expulsion which the self has tried so hard to hide. The reason this process is hidden is because the very thought that the abject was once part of the self, necessary to the self, is a disgusting one. The encounter therefore is a reminder of this need, this dependence and vulnerability on something so disgusting, so reviling. The fear of the encounter with the abject is what drives the identity formation and concretization of the state.

¹⁴⁸ More precisely, it comes from the Latin abjectus, from ab- meaning 'away, off' and jacere meaning 'to throw.' From the Online Etymology Dictionary, available at http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=abject

The immigrant is that which is outside of the state, that which is other to the state. The state is defined by its citizenry and by those who do not fit into the requirements for citizenship. The immigrant, documented or not, is that which is different from the citizen, the constitutive outside to the citizen, the ultimate other to the state. However, prior to the founding of the state, that very immigrant may have once inhabited the land which defines the state. California, Texas, and New Mexico: each was once part of Mexico. Those Mexicans who left California when it was lost in war to the United States once inhabited this American territory. That very person, that very figure who immigrates to the United States from Mexico, is precisely the one which was ejected from California forcefully, precisely the one who was once part of the state but was expelled from it for noncompliance. The immigrant thus poses a fear, a threat to the United States, to the state broadly speaking, because it shows what has previously been hidden, namely the violence of the act of abjection and the need to repeat that violence in the process of repeated statecraft. The immigrant is that which has been expelled from the state and returns to highlight this very expulsion, and to demonstrate the need which the state had and has for the immigrant. The immigrant is also the citizen. The United States was founded by immigrants; the immigrant myth is essentially the founding myth of the state. The state needs to both embrace and expel the figure of the immigrant.¹⁴⁹ The border wall is thus a mechanism of statecraft which seeks to memorialize a myth propounded by the state of its own

¹⁴⁹ For more on this specific point, see Bonnie Honig's discussion of the play between xenophilia and xenophobia in 'Immigrant America? How Foreignness "Solves" Democracy's Problems', *Social Text*, no. 56 (1998): 1-27.

founding, which is not dependent upon a narrative of the immigrant. This myth seeks to elide the dependence of the state upon the figure of the immigrant in order to define the identity of the citizen. As Roxanne Doty argues, 'successful practices of statecraft are practices that produce the state's powerful image and simultaneously conceal this production'.¹⁵⁰ This example highlights one instantiation that the foreigner comes to assume and the way in which the foreigner puts into question the state's founding myth, highlights its very mythologicality. We are able to see the paradox of the need that the state has, both to cast out the foreigner-within-the-state, and pose the foreigner as that which was never part of the state in the first place. The encounter with the foreigner brings this paradox to light and exposes this *need* which sets into question the very founding claims of the state.

Sebastian Rotella describes the border fence as both symbol and reality. It assumes multiple personalities, 'juxtaposed against children playing soccer, shacks, satellite dishes, mansions, jets descending into the Tijuana airport'.¹⁵¹ It is the site of decorations with murals and political graffiti. Those who live in the interstate-al spaces which compose the border are characterized by Rotella as 'border denizens' whose lives are a continuous series of leaps back and forth. He describes their world as a shadow world that defies notions of law and order, culture and nationhood. The fantastic becomes routine. It is in this world of

¹⁵⁰ Doty, 'The Double-Writing of Statecraft', 176.

¹⁵¹ Rotella, 'El Brinco', 99.

specters that statecraft is truly exposed in its dependence upon construction and sovereignty over the state of exception.

The state of exception is described by Giorgio Agamben as 'the suspension of law itself',¹⁵² which is not a status of martial law or the laws of war, but rather represents the very limits of law itself by pointing to its suspension. The state of exception is a biopolitical state, in which 'law encompasses living beings by means of its own suspension'.¹⁵³ That is, it eliminates the legal status of the individual, reducing him to pure biopolitical life, purely subject to sovereign power precisely because he is unclassifiable within the legal mechanisms of the state. For Agamben, the ultimate example of the state of exception is the concentration camp, in which we can observe the intersection of sovereign power, the power to let live and make die, and biopower, the power to make live and let die, derived from Michel Foucault's notion of biopolitics. Biopower is no longer the individualizing exhaustive surveillance of the panopticon, but the control over the species as a whole.¹⁵⁴ The intersection observed in the camp has the effect of making live and making die. This is the ultimate state of exception, where everyone is turned into bare life. In the camps, this means one could no longer be killed because everyone was already the walking dead.

¹⁵² Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005, 1.
¹⁵³ Ibid., 3.

¹⁵⁴ Michel Foucault, Security, Territory, Population. London: Picador, 2009.

The state of exception is a technique of government in that it suspends law in order to engage in statecraft itself: in order to declare itself as the ultimate power. Mark Salter theorizes that this state of exception is in fact present at the modern day border. The sovereign is no longer he who has a monopoly on legitimate use of force within a territory, but rather he who has the power to decide, to exclude or include at the border. Entry at the border is a moment of crisis, where we must confess our deviances to the sovereign and try to situate ourselves within the sovereign apparatus. At the border, we are all reduced to muselmanner. Muselmann, a term used by Agamben, translated as muslim, refers to he who submits himself fully to God. Agamben uses the term to signify he who is fully submitted to the sovereign's power, he whose biopolitical existence is determined and controlled and limited by the state. Salter uses the term to signify that at the border, we are fully imbued in the state of exception, fully subject to the sovereign, in complete submission to the sovereign apparatus.¹⁵⁵ I

¹⁵⁵ Mark Salter, 'When the Exception becomes the Rule: borders, sovereignty, citizenship', Citizenship Studies 12, no. 4 (2008): 365-380. Judith Butler also theorizes the state of exception. She uses Guantanamo as an example, where it is part of US territory, but at the same time is in Cuba. American law operates, but at the same time it is beyond the scope of US law and beyond the scope of legality/illegality. It is the ultimate non-place, where men are reduced to bare life. She is most concerned with the idea that we use narratives to place individuals within hierarchies of value, to decide what constitutes a grievable life. This has very real implications when it comes to referring to an American soldier who was killed in Afghanistan as our 'brother' and an Afghan civilian who was killed as 'collateral damage'. See Judith Butler, Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence, London: Verso, 2004. Agamben himself goes further than Salter and Butler, who both locate the state of exception as a non-place almost at the fringes of society (in the case of the border, literally). Agamben argues that the state of exception is in fact everywhere. We are all bare life. He warns that we still live under the sign of totalitarianism and fascism. Totalitarianism is the politicization of bare life. The state of exception is no longer confined to the camp, to an enclosure which we can define as outside of our society and not worry about. Today we are all at the mercy of thanatopolitics, of that intersection between sovereign power and biopower which forces us to live and forces us to die, which decides on which lives matter. See Agamben, State of Exception.

will return later to the argument that memorialization of the undocumented immigrant can potentially pose a challenge to this notion.

Even the signs along the border reinforce a message of danger and conflict and the theme that only the state can decide who enters and who crosses.¹⁵⁶ The border can be considered the ultimate expression of the state of exception because it is the ultimate zone of the unclassifiable or unrepresentable being.¹⁵⁷ It highlights the fact that the state of exception is not only a technique of government, but also the very 'constitutive paradigm of the juridical order'.¹⁵⁸ As Walter Benjamin states, 'the state of emergency in which we live is not the exception but the rule'.¹⁵⁹ By this, Benjamin indicates that the rule has become the creation of a state of emergency, an appeal to a state of crisis, a state of exception, as a tool of statecraft. It is by appealing to exceptionality that it becomes easier to forget about the active ordering and bordering the state is engaged in. The state of exception is an idea to which this chapter shall return, as it is integral to understanding border monuments in multiple contexts. It is important to conceive of bordering as a mechanism of securing the state in this context. After all, as Nicholas De Genova points out, overstaying one's visa is

¹⁵⁶ Lawrence Herzog, 'Rethinking the Design of Mexican Border Cities,' in *Fluctuating Borders: Speculations about Memory and Emergence*, eds. Rosalea Monacella and SueAnne Ware. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT University Press, 1999: 41.

¹⁵⁷ Susan Coutin calls this a space of nonexistence in which the undocumented individual is placed, because they are physically and socially present, yet are officially and legally negated as illegal. See Susan Bibler Coutin, *Legalizing Moves: Salvadoran Immigrants' Struggle for U.S. Residency*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2000, 27-47.

¹⁵⁸ Agamben, *State of Exception*, 7.

¹⁵⁹ Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968, 257.

not dramatic. Hence the border itself appears as the theater for staging the spectacle of the 'illegal alien' that the law itself is productive of.¹⁶⁰

Yet it is important to keep in mind that this understanding of sovereignty is not simply about entry at the border, but about entry as the precondition for qualified life itself. Thus it comes back to life and death, or as Achille Mbembe puts it, the ultimate operation of sovereignty is the capacity and power to dictate who must live and who must die.¹⁶¹ Denial of entry at the border and the creation of the border as spectacle simply facilitates the death of those deemed qualified only to die. As Henry Giroux says, the new regime of biopolitics that exists in the contemporary era operates to privilege certain lives over others and relegates people to spaces of invisibility and disposability. They are literally conferred upon the status of living or ontologically dead, and the state no longer feels obligated to prevent their death.¹⁶²

Building the Other Border Wall: Statecraft Along the Israeli-Palestinian Border

This section explores the walls built between Israel and the Palestinian territories to further explore the conceptualization of walls as monuments, and of the bordering practices and performances of the state. The wall surrounding the

¹⁶⁰ Nicholas De Genova, 'Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 31 (2002): 419-447, 429.

¹⁶¹ Achille Mbembe, 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1 (2003): 11-40.

¹⁶² Henry Giroux, 'Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability', *College Literature*, vol. 33, no. 3 (2006): 171-196.

West Bank is statecraft at its finest.¹⁶³ The building of the 437 mile wall, known as the Separation Barrier¹⁶⁴, composed of a combination of fences and concrete barriers, literally has rewritten the boundaries of the state in a manner favorable to Israel. The wall, referred to by its detractors as the wall-of-shame, extends further into the Palestinian territories than the agreed-upon border of the West Bank, which some argue exemplifies annexation of Palestinian territory under the mark of security.¹⁶⁵ The wall extends further into West Bank territory, but encompasses Israeli settlements within its bounds, perhaps the reason for its extension. Security is the story which legitimates the literal crafting of the state through the building of the monument. In this sense, the state literally invokes bordering as a mechanism of its own survival, since Israel argues that building border walls is necessary for its own security, to guard against attacks by its neighbors.

Building began in mid-2002, and the first segment of the wall, composed of a mixture of fencing and concrete walls in the areas closer to population centers, was completed in August 2003. In October 2003, the UN General Assembly voted to demand that Israel cease construction and destroy the wall. In November 2003, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan referred to the construction

¹⁶³ This will be the focus of this limited discussion, though the Gaza Strip is also encircled by a fence. See Hanan Greenberg, 'Army Building New Gaza Barrier', *Israel News*, April 14, 2005.

¹⁶⁴ In this sense it gestures to the separation required for the maintenance of the state, and the way in which otherness, and border-construction (literally in this case) is part and parcel of the crafting of the state.

¹⁶⁵ Interestingly, there is a group of Israelis who find the wall problematic, but for different reasons. They argue that by building the wall, Israel has renounced its claim to the whole territory of Israel which they are entitled to.

of the wall as a 'deeply counterproductive act' that was detrimental to the economic and general wellbeing of the Palestinian people.¹⁶⁶ In December, the General Assembly voted to refer the issue to the International Court of Justice for resolution. In 2004, the International Court of Justice ruled that the wall being built along the West Bank border with Israel was a violation of freedom of movement and needs to be destroyed because it establishes a border which is not agreed upon by both parties. The fear by many is that the border wall represents a 'fait accompli'; the court ruling states the danger that 'the route of the wall will prejudge the future frontier between Israel and Palestine.'¹⁶⁷ In this sense, the concern is that the wall's route will hamper future peace negotiations. 'Israel's security concerns, the world court found, do not condone seizing land that restricts the ability of Palestinians to move about.'¹⁶⁸ But immediately after the court's ruling, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon stated his plans to continue building the wall.

Along the wall are several exercises of resistance, specifically graffiti.¹⁶⁹ Street art in general does not generally attract much attention, but in Israel it does get attention due to the volatile political climate.¹⁷⁰ Pink Floyd's Roger Waters

¹⁶⁶ Warren Hoge, 'UN Seeks Ruling on Israel's Barrier', *The New York Times*, December 10, 2003, 6.

¹⁶⁷ As cited in 'Court Rules Israel's Barrier Illegal', *The Seattle Times*, July 10, 2004, A6.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Interestingly, this is also true of the Peace Walls in Belfast. The walls, which separate Catholic and Protestant neighborhoods in Northern Ireland, are the site of graffiti and murals, often to commemorate those who died in the conflict.

¹⁷⁰ Talia Moscovitz, 'Through the wall: the West Bank wall as global canvas', *Honors Junior/Senior Projects*, Northeastern University, 2007.

visited the wall in 2006 to graffiti 'tear down the wall' on the Separation Wall near the town of Bethlehem. Waters wanted to protest against the oppressive nature of the wall through not only this artistic practice, but through cancelling his musical performance in Tel Aviv and holding it in Neveh Shalom, a mixed Arab-Jewish community, instead, after being lobbied by Palestinian groups.¹⁷¹ Another example is the British artist Banksy, who painted murals on the West Bank wall in 2005 and 2007. His murals include images of a dove holding an olive branch in its beak, wearing a bulletproof vest with crosshairs focused on it, a shadowed rendition painted on the wall in Bethlehem of an Israeli soldier examining the documents of a Christmas donkey, an image of a rat holding a slingshot, a form of Palestinian resistance, near a border checkpoint, a ladder that goes up the side of the wall, two children digging a hole through the wall, and a soldier being frisked by a young girl in a pink dress.¹⁷² Banksy plays with the deviant label normally associated with graffiti as vandalism by vandalizing a wall that has itself been deemed deviant by the international community. He asks 'How illegal is it to vandalize a wall, if the wall itself has been deemed unlawful by the International Court of Justice?'¹⁷³

¹⁷¹ 'Waters Writes on West Bank Wall', *BBC News*, June 22, 2006.

¹⁷² See Sam Jones, 'Spray Can Prankster Tackles Israel's Security Barrier', *The Guardian*, August 5, 2005, and 'In Pictures: Banksy Returns to Bethlehem', *BBC News*, December 3, 2007. Banksy tells of a Palestinian man who commented that his artwork made the wall look beautiful, but then said, 'we don't want it to be beautiful, we hate this wall. Go home'. The reception of the work emphasizes that art is not always political resistance. Pointing to the ways in which the wall can be used in an aesthetic manner may also contribute to the bordering practices.

¹⁷³ As cited in Nigel Parry, 'British Graffiti Artist, Banksy, Hacks the Wall', *Thresholds*, issue 2, October 1, 2006.

Palestinian artists also participate in what they consider to be artistic resistance against the wall. For example, artist Trash created an art piece along the wall which depicts a leg and foot being kicked through a wall that is painted to appear shattered by the foot.¹⁷⁴ The person kicking is thus perpetually stuck between two sides, moving from one side to the other, but caught in the moment of resistance. Abdel Hamid, a painter from Ramallah, painted a 130-foot long section of the wall with jumbled Arabic letters, which unscrambled spell out the Palestinian Declaration of Independence. Additionally, the wall is used for advertising, as in the case of a seafood restaurant in Bethlehem which posted its menu on the barrier. Additionally, the barrier is constantly being written and rewritten by a multiplicity of performances. These performances have even been commercialized in the form of a website which allows people to enter a message online, pay 30 euros, and have their message spray-painted on the Palestinian side of the barrier. Messages have included marriage proposals, birthday wishes, and overtly political statements.¹⁷⁵ Other graffiti on the wall that is explicitly political invokes comparisons between the Nazi oppression of the Jews and the Israeli oppression of the Palestinians, including a portion of the wall painted with the phrase 'from Warsaw ghetto to Abu Dis ghetto'.¹⁷⁶ Other language invokes what it means to have life itself in a politically qualified sense, stating, 'we want to live

¹⁷⁴ 'Banksy Returns'.

¹⁷⁵ Daniel Estrin, 'West Bank Security Barrier Draws Artists and Advertisers', *Forward*, August 25, 2010.

¹⁷⁶ Moscovitz, 'Through the Wall'.

like evry body'.¹⁷⁷ There is also art on the Israeli side of the wall, specifically focused on landscapes and maps. These geographical images evoke a 'Jewish topography and land in which the threatening "Other" beyond has become invisible and has disappeared altogether'.¹⁷⁸ While the images on the Palestinian side of the wall gesture towards a sense of oppression and hopeful liberation, the images on the Israeli side gesture to a future that is fully and finally fixed, ordered, and bordered.

Though the wall in the West Bank is the primary focus of this discussion, it also bears acknowledging more recent bordering practices along Israel's external borders with Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon. Israel is currently completing a wall on its Sinai border with Egypt, began in 2011, primarily to stem the tide of African immigrants, some 16,000 of whom entered in 2011 alone via that border.¹⁷⁹ The border is marked with signs that state: 'Border Ahead, No Entrance'¹⁸⁰, marking the decisive fact that this border is not a crossing point, not an opening, not an edge, but a definitive closure, a prohibition to the other in the name of peace. In September 2011, Netanyahu referred to the Israel-Egypt border as a 'border of peace', then invoked the idea that to continue this peace, 'there must be security and to this end a fence is necessary. Its rapid construction is

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. 45.

¹⁷⁸ Christine Leuenberger, 'The West Bank Wall as Canvas: Art and Graffiti in Palestine/Israel,' *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, and Culture*, vol. 17, no. 12 (2011).

¹⁷⁹ Additionally, Israel fears the results of the Arab Spring and potential dangers that could arise. See Joe Kaufman, 'The Israel-Egypt Border Fence', *National Review*, January 2, 2012.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

important for both peace and security'.¹⁸¹ The idea that peace necessitates securitization, often through military procedures, or in the case of the wall surrounding the West Bank, territorial incursions, serves to legitimate bordering in the name of security, the very survival of the nation itself. In January 2012, Israel announced plans to build a wall along the border with Jordan when the Egypt wall is completed due to fears that migrants would try to cross at the Jordanian border once the Egypt border is completely sealed off.¹⁸²

Also in early 2012, Israel announced plans to construct a wall along their border with Lebanon. Interestingly, in order to construct the wall on its Lebanese border, Israel must coordinate with Lebanon, a country with which it is still technically at war. This coordination is necessary to guarantee Lebanese protection along the Lebanese side of the border to avoid sniper attacks on the Israeli construction crews.¹⁸³ The idea that Israel must liase with its enemy in order to guarantee its security from that same enemy, who is opposed to the construction of the wall,¹⁸⁴ gets at the paradox inherent within bordering. The state must posit the other as a threat to its very identity in order to perform practices of bordering. This walling on all territorial boundaries of the state takes the notion of fully and finally fixed borders to its furthest extent. Like the US-Mexico border, the border wall in Israel reinforces the conceptualization that

¹⁸¹ 'Israel to Build Wall Along Jordanian Border: Netanyahu', *Xinhua News*, January 1, 2012.

¹⁸² 'Israel Plans Jordan Border Fence to Stop Migrants', AFP News, January 1, 2012.

¹⁸³ 'Israel Mulls Building Wall Along Part of Lebanon Border', AFP News, January 3, 2012.

¹⁸⁴ 'Israel to Construct Barrier on Lebanese Border', *Xinhua News*, January 3, 2012.

qualified lives need to be protected, while ungrievable lives need to be kept out. I turn now to a discussion of these lives deemed ungrievable by exploring monuments built to undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border.

Memorializing Border Deaths: Crosses, Specters, and El Tiradito

Along the border fence between the US and Mexico, there are often monuments which memorialize those who have died crossing the boundary.¹⁸⁵ In 1998, migrant activists in Tijuana erected crosses to all of the migrants who perished in California as a result of Operation Gatekeeper, which had the effect of forcing migrants to cross in harsher and more dangerous areas to avoid border patrol enforcement. The crosses were arranged chronologically from west to east in order of death. They were erected along a section of the border wall that had previously been a gathering point for migrants crossing the border. Nearby, a shrine has been created along the road that follows the border.¹⁸⁶ More recently, in October 2009, the pro-migrant Defense Coalition hung 5,100 white crosses on the border wall on the Tijuana side to commemorate those who have died trying to cross. The number represents those who have died in the 15 years since the U.S. strengthened border control.¹⁸⁷ Along Boulevard Aeropuerto in Tijuana,

¹⁸⁵ Herzog, 'Rethinking the Design of Mexican Border Cities', 40.

¹⁸⁶ SueAnne Ware, 'Borders, Memory and the Slippage In-Between', in *Fluctuating Borders: Speculations about Memory and Emergence*, eds. Rosalea Monacella and SueAnne Ware. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT University Press, 1999, 78-97.

¹⁸⁷ '5,100 Crosses at Mexico Border Mark Migrant Deaths', *San Diego Union Tribune*, October 30, 2009.

there is a permanent memorial with white crosses and decorated painted coffins along the border fence. It has crosses with names, ages, hometown, and date died. For those anonymous victims, the crosses and coffins read 'no identificado'. SueAnne Ware describes this monument as seen from a moving car: 'the names seem to flick through the air one by one, like ghosts.'¹⁸⁸ It is worth pointing out that monuments along the border fence itself are largely on the Mexican side, as if to mark the fence in some way, to alter its stark meaning from a certain perspective. The border wall thus also exists within the larger context of memorialization which occurs along the wall and beyond the wall, which I now turn to.

Border crossings at the U.S.-Mexico border violate the immigration laws of the United States of America. But beyond the legal aspects of these crossings, there are moral, ethical, and political questions which arise that question the very originary myths of statecraft and the conceptions of citizenship, humanity, and memory. Following Judith Butler's model of grievable life, in this section I assess the way in which undocumented immigrant deaths are framed as ungrievable and thus unmemorializable lives. They are framed as such because to memorialize them would be to bring into question not simply the fixity of the border, but the founding myth of the state which relies upon the differentiation between the self and the other. The state must posit the life of the other as ungrievable and unmemorializable as a prerequisite of statecraft itself.

¹⁸⁸ Ware, 'Borders, Memory and the Slippage In-Between', 81.

As Butler delineates, no subject can emerge without being differentiated. A subject emerges through excluding other possible subject positions. A subject thus emerges through a process of abjection, jettisoning those dimensions of oneself that fail to conform to the norm of the human subject, in this case the citizen. The criteria for the citizen are not simply legal criteria, but 'citizen' emerges as a moral and social status which is linked not only with a political identity but with a level of value associated with that particular life. Butler goes on in regard to the process of abjection: 'The refuse of such a process includes various forms of spectrality and monstrosity, usually figured in relation to nonhuman animal life'.¹⁸⁹ Spectrality is an apt framing for this discussion.

Spectrality describes those ghosts, those beings which straddle the boundaries between life and death. Derrida describes the specter in *Specters of Marx* as a paradoxical incorporation.¹⁹⁰ It is some 'thing' which is difficult to name, neither soul nor body, but at the same time both one and the other. We cannot see the specter, while it looks at us and sees us not see it even while it is there. This spectral asymmetry disrupts all specularity, because we do not see who looks at us. Because it disrupts the traditional framework of specularity and because it is unintelligible, invisible, and uncontrollable, the specter can be portrayed as a deathly *threat* which is subject to interventions or mediations. What the specter demonstrates to us is that this ultimate distinction between living and dead is not ultimate after all. What counts as worthy of life, as grievable life

¹⁸⁹ Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (London: Verso, 2009), 141.

¹⁹⁰ Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

in Butler's terms, is a socially constructed decision. The ungrievable lives continue to haunt as specters, to disrupt frameworks of spectrality, that which distinguishes a life of value from one without, one which may as well be dead, and as a result to disrupt frameworks of statecraft.

It is thus my argument that ghosts haunt the U.S.-Mexico border. These specters are not ghostly apparitions simply because they have died, but because of the way in which they contest the notions of the bounded citizen-subject which the state attempts to produce as final and once-and-for-all. The state both produces and presupposes certain operations of power that work through establishing a set of ontological givens, which remain uncontested and uncontestable within the particular modes of intelligibility that the state asserts.¹⁹¹ The ghosts that haunt the border are undocumented immigrants who have died crossing the border. They continue to haunt in the interstices of political space: the memorial spaces of society, the 'Juan Doe' graveyards, and the bleached bones scattered in the desert, disrupting the ontological givens and assumptions of subjectivity which the state (re)produces.

I now turn to a discussion of several specific border monuments to explore the narratives behind their construction and functioning, as well as the countermemorial narratives which challenge the memorialization of the deaths of undocumented immigrants. I first explore monuments on both sides of the border, including El Tiradito Shrine in Tucson, Arizona, a wishing shrine which has become the center for immigrants rights groups and vigils, and the role of artists

¹⁹¹ Butler, *Frames of War*, 149.

in border memorialization. I then turn to an analysis of the Juan Doe graveyards scattered around the Southeast, followed by a discussion of anonymous remains discovered and undiscovered in the desert which act as poignant memorials. These memorials need not be taken up in explicitly political projects in order to posit a potential resistance to statecraft; they are already mediated within discourses of the everyday social and political practices of life and death that sustain the contemporary biopolitical order.

El Tiradito, a Catholic shrine in Tucson, was not established in the context of immigrant memorialization. Rather, it has evolved as a locus of such sentiment over time, as immigrants rights groups use the site for protests or simply as a meeting area. El Tiradito is in fact a gravesite, though there is some dispute as to the story behind it. The most popular story, according to the Tucson-Pima historical commission, is of a gambler who fell in love with another man's wife, and was murdered by that man, shot and killed at the site.¹⁹² Another story is of a man who fell in love with a beautiful woman from afar. He went to ask her family to marry her, but found out she was promised to someone else, so he committed suicide. Because the Catholic Church is opposed to suicide, the man could not be buried in the church cemetery, so he was buried where he fell, and his friends and family brought flowers and candles. The last story involves a woman who sent her grown son to Tucson to find her husband who had gone up there for work years earlier. The son found the house of his father, and met his

¹⁹² Trista Davis, 'El Tiradito Shrine an Ode to Local Hispanic Folklore', *El Independiente*, October 23, 2009.

father's new young wife at the door. The father was not home so the son waited for him to arrive. When the father arrived home, he was jealous to see a younger man with his wife, so he killed his son without knowing who he was.¹⁹³ These stories are all based around the central themes of love, loss, and rejection. It is also called the Wishing Shrine, because it is said that if you light a candle and return the next day and it still lit, your wish will come true. Many people leave love letters there hoping for their heartbreak to be healed.¹⁹⁴ This wishing is perhaps why migrants rights groups have adopted the site, in addition to the shrine's central role as a community site.

The site is an emotional place, fitting for the ceremonies held there by immigrant rights groups. El Tiradito is in an unassuming neighborhood in downtown Tucson. The sweet perfumed smell of flowers lingers there from the offerings left at the shrine, mixed with the oily smell of frying tortillas from the Mexican restaurant immediately next door. The low light of candles lit there casts a soft glow in the evenings, yet the place also resembles a museum site, as it is run by the Tucson historical society and even has an informational plaque. Yet it seems almost more solemn, more sacred. Banners hang from trees, newspapers are crumpled and folded into decorations. Mexican religious candles litter the site, as does a recently left offering of bread, pieces of orange peel, and a love letter. One of the times I visited was shortly after the shootings in Tucson in early 2011 that killed several and wounded Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords. At El

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

Tiradito was a newspaper with the cover page photo of Giffords held in place by candles, and another photo of her held the place of honor at an altar on the site.

El Tiradito means the discarded one, after the man who was killed there. discarded by love and by the church, since he was not buried in the church cemetery. Immigrant rights groups meet at the shrine to memorialize the migrants who died crossing the border from the US to Mexico. They meet 'to remember the new *tiraditos*—migrants who have died in the desert on their way to find work in the US'.¹⁹⁵ There has been a weekly prayer vigil there, sponsored by Derechos Humanos, No More Deaths, and Interfaith Immigrant Coalition, every Thursday night at 7 pm since 2000. Each prayer vigil opens with a prayer: 'O God we pray for all the migrants who have died in the desert. Bless them with eternal life and comfort their families who mourn. Turn hearts from violence and xenophobia, so that reconciliation and peace may reign on the border. Amen.¹⁹⁶ This conception of the new tiraditos, the new discarded ones, are perhaps not so new after all, but simply a current instantiation of the abject of the state. The term discarded literally implies something that used to belong but was thrown away, rather than something that was simply rejected, or not allowed in. In this sense, it fits with the conception of the abject as that which was cast out. Tiradito is derived from the Spanish 'tirar', meaning to throw, to throw away, to discard, to cast out, or to dispose of.

¹⁹⁵ Ricardo Elford, 'Discarded Migrants', *CMSM Forum*, Fall 2010, accessed 1/25/11, http://www.archchicago.org/immigration/pdf/Immigration/Discarded_Migrants.pdf.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

Aesthetic Resistances: Border Artists and Monumentalization

There have been various artists who work with themes of immigration and who work with memorialization. Their installations and projects remind us of the important intersection between aesthetics and politics, not simply in making a political statement, but in reinforcing or resisting traditional notions of politics. As Louise Amoore and Alexandra Hall argue, artists are especially well-placed to consider the deployment of signs interwoven with bordering practices, and they can intervene in a way that reconfigures the space constructed through sovereign bordering practices.¹⁹⁷ Here I focus on three artists and their installations: first, Valarie James and her memorials to border crossers, second, Neil Bernstein's sculpture, 'Golden Gates/Bridge over Troubled Borders', and third, Oaxacan artist Alejandro Santiago and his 2501 migrants sculptures. I choose these three artists for several reasons. First, there are not very many artists whose work memorializes undocumented immigrants. Second, these three artists represent work that comes from opposite ends of the spectrum. James's work is emotional in nature and has not met with vandalism. Bernstein's sculpture is structural and has existed as a site of contestation since it was built: it has been repeatedly vandalized by vigilante groups, and thus offers an interesting site to explore counter-memorialization discourses. Santiago's piece is in Mexico, and represents memorialization of undocumented migrants from the places they left

¹⁹⁷ Louise Amoore and Alexandra Hall, 'Border Theatre: On the Arts of Security and Resistance', *Cultural Geographies*, vol. 17, no. 3 (2010): 299-319.

rather than in the US, an alternative perspective. They thus represent different aesthetic and memorialization discourses.

Valarie James lives south of Tucson in a desert town called Amado. Amado is along the traditional route of border crossers through the Arizona desert. In her area, she often finds articles of clothing and other artifacts¹⁹⁸ left by migrants. In 2004, while walking, she found a diaper bag containing baby clothes, a birth certificate, and other documents. She started collecting the artifacts she found, including 'kids' backpacks and school notebooks, women's bras, blue jeans, shirts, and shoes. She regularly finds *bordados*, white cotton cloths embroidered by wives and mothers and sweethearts with flowers and words of love'.¹⁹⁹ She finds the clothing draped on trees and rotted into the ground. She finds a pair of desiccated jeans: 'In these humble, busted-up jeans is the story. It's like an ache for me, a kind of poetry: snagged, torn, ripped asunder, forgotten'.²⁰⁰ Her art collects these artifacts together in various forms, including mixing cloth she finds into papier-mâché, or simply arranging the objects she finds in a specific installation. She tells me that she did not go out looking for these objects or for work related to memorialization. Rather, she says, 'like so many border residents, we had to do something to express the powerlessness we

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ I use the term artifact very purposefully, to gesture towards the almost anthropological or archaeological nature of found objects in the desert. Indeed folklore professor Maribel Alvarez refers to her work as a cross between anthropology and archaeology. See Margaret Regan, 'Tales from the Outskirts: Amado', *Tucson Weekly*, July 22, 2010. Because of the harsh sun and heat, objects fade quickly, and bodies decompose quickly, reminders less of recent death than of some ancient left object that is ours to discover. The nature of these artifacts has the tendency to place distance between the finder and the object. It is James's art to recover this distance.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

felt. Seriously, it was and still is so intense here. I literally stumbled into things, never went out looking for it, not once. Things, people, uniforms were everywhere all over the ground I walk with my dogs everyday. The art is about a "sense of place" more than anything else. As an artist, even as a kid, I always worked with natural substances and found objects, what changed was what I was beginning to find.²⁰¹ Her work can thus be considered a response to changes around her, and, I would argue, the changing nature and results of specific bordering practices of statecraft. Specifically, it is as a result of securing practices that migrants are forced into desert areas with more and more harsh conditions.

One of her main projects is the Las Madres/No Mas Lagrimas installation, a memorial made from fabric she has collected, the first memorial to undocumented migrants who died crossing the desert by focusing on the mothers they have left behind.²⁰² The sculptures are made by mixing these found clothing and other objects with desert plant materials. There are three life-size sculptures of women, each representing more than 1,000 dead migrants. Because the sculptures are organic, the elements take their toll on the figures, melting the resin coating and making the figures appear to be crying, something intended by the artist to evoke an emotional response in the viewer. The figures are affected by the elements, exhibiting the same deteriorating changes as 'our own fragile bodies when exposed to the sun, the wind and the rain.²⁰³ By drawing on these themes,

²⁰¹ Valarie James, Email Interview, November 28, 2011.

²⁰² Carol St. John, 'Transforming Tragedy Into Art', *Hispanic News*, March 22, 2007.
²⁰³ Ibid.

James gets at the theme of life and death itself, memorializing the death of a body or bodies that were in a struggle for life itself, one of the reasons why the body crossed the border in the first place, and exposing thus both the body's biological struggle for life in the harsh desert conditions, and the body's biopolitical struggle for qualified life in a zone of indistinction where certain bodies matter and others fade into the desert.

One of the most powerful ways in which James's work takes effect is by situating resistance in the body: of the migrant and of the viewer of her artwork. Rosemary Shinko has discussed the way in which the body is not simply a locus of political inscription, rather it can act as a site for conceptualizing and enacting political resistances as well. She cites the example of Leymah Gbowee, who threatened to strip naked outside the room where peace talks in Ghana were occurring when she realized that the parties were planning on leaving without hammering out a peace agreement. Her act was framed as an act of desperation because it was situated in the body of the mother, and relied on bodily resistance to the norms about what the mothers body should and shouldn't do, shattering the distinction between the public and private realm. Shinko reads this act to understand the body as performative, as a site of cultural norms but also as a way to resist the imposition of these norms: 'the task would be to locate within Gbowee's whole sequence of bodily enactments those instances which reflect stylized repetitions of gender conformity, but more significantly to be attentive to those instances where the repeatable patterns were altered, cast in slightly divergent, unfamiliar ways'.²⁰⁴

Valarie James's work expresses a similar focus on embodied practices. Her art involves exhibition of objects that recall bodies, including articles of clothing and evidence of the existence of bodies including documents such as birth certificates. Her Las Madres project invokes the body of the mother in the same way Leymah Gbowee does. The sculptures in the installation are themselves made from articles of clothing and found objects, so the bodies of the mothers are literally constituted by the attributes of the children.²⁰⁵ In addition to the bodily nature of the sculptures themselves, her work evokes a physical and bodily response from the viewer. As she states, 'There's something that happens when a viewer touches a piece of found embroidery or a child's dress or is confronted by mounds of shoes that doesn't happen otherwise. Border "issues" become contextualized-what is so often a political and contentious debate seats itself in the viewer's body, in the heart. Seeing people moved to tears is a powerful thing to witness'.²⁰⁶ Her work represents the point at which political responses become situated within bodily ones, and reminds us that political

²⁰⁴ Rosemary Shinko, 'Ethics After Liberalism: Why (Autonomous) Bodies Matter', *Millennium* 38, 3 (2010): 723-745.

²⁰⁵ The children metaphor is an extremely powerful one here. Not only is the mother a symbol of resistance, as Shinko has illustrated, but the child seems to be the point of departure for the work of both Valarie James and Neil Bernstein. Both were prompted by the artifacts of children, yet both also recall the vital relationship between parent and child that sustains life itself, and in this way politicizes the biopolitical processes at work that render migrants abject.

²⁰⁶ James, Email Interview. Her point about audiences being moved to tears is also a powerful one. Tears represent the ultimate emotional bodily response, but they also replicate the sculpture of Las Madres as well, where the mothers appear to be crying.

practices are themselves already situated within bodily ones. If enactment of border policies is enactment on the bodies and bodily functions of undocumented migrants, even to the point of their deaths in harsh desert conditions, then it only makes sense that resistance to bordering takes place on an embodied plane as well.

Her work aims to invoke the abject by deconstructing the boundary between citizen and foreigner. Her work recalls the everyday and thus offers a resistance precisely by showing us that the everyday can be political, that there is a way in which present performances of statecraft are imbued with governance over biopolitical and biological processes of everyday living (and dying), including deaths at the border. These practices sustain a specific conceptualization of self and other which James disrupts with her work. As she states, 'I hope that the viewer has the opportunity to have a contemplative experience in front of a memorial or an installation, to "feel" their feelings; the unease of displacement, the ache of separation from one's family, from culture. I hope the viewer is able to identify on a personal level with the "other" through common and often vernacular objects'.²⁰⁷ James gets at the way in which memorialization can draw attention to issues of displacement, and by doing so, render our own placement(s) uneasy, lead us to ask after the process by which our placements might lead to others' displacements. Her work plays with ideas of visibility that get at the earlier discussion of spectrality. If dead migrants are abjectified, rendered invisible by the same practices of statecraft that also allow

²⁰⁷ James, Email Interview.

for their deaths at the border, her work seeks to make them visible through an artistic practice of memorialization, to ask after many of these silences and invisibilities to tell the stories of those leaving these objects. She thus aims to allow migrants to speak rather than speaking for them: she states, 'I am the shepherd of the work, not the face of the work. It belongs to the collective unconscious and history. All we're doing is picking it up and putting it together, archiving it and presenting it for generations to come'.²⁰⁸

Interestingly, James has encountered very little resistance to her work, despite the fact that immigration is an extremely contested issue, particularly in border states and the part of Arizona in which she lives and works. She attributes this to the fact that her work is 'undeniable, indisputable. Memorials are about death. You insult the dead at your own risk'.²⁰⁹ Her argument, that somehow death presents itself as beyond mastery, as beyond politics, gets at the way in which memorials allow for the memorialization of life and death rather than coopting either. Death is that common human element, which at the same time can be disruptive. Because of this, it opens up spaces for resistances through memorialization.

Neil Bernstein describes his project as offering water, shelter, and 'a sense of accomplishment for migrants'.²¹⁰ It was built along a well-known trail for migrants crossing the Arizona desert from Mexico in Arivaca. The sculpture is a

²⁰⁸ Regan, 'Tales from the Outskirts'.

²⁰⁹ James, Email Interview.

²¹⁰ Neil Bernstein, 'Controversial-art-inspires-debate', Santa Fe New Mexican, August 10, 2008.

30-foot high and 40-feet long structure built with piping which is filled with water for the migrants who cross.²¹¹ Because it provides water, it gets at the very biological processes at stake in crossing and in securing the border. The sculpture is painted with metallic gold and covered in golden fabric, 'symbolizing the "Veil of Tears" illegal immigrants and their families endure'.²¹² As a result, Bernstein views it as a 'beacon of hope for the hopeless'.²¹³ It is lit up to help migrants find it in the desert. Bernstein was inspired by his treks throughout the desert area near Tucson after working in New York in the Twin Towers during 9/11. He narrowly missed being in the North Tower on 9/11, and knew many of the victims.²¹⁴ On one of his walks through the desert, he found the shoes of a 3-year old little girl who died in the process of crossing the desert from Mexico, which inspired him to create an area of refuge for the migrants crossing and also a symbolic art piece to bring the issue of immigration at a human level to greater attention. As he states, 'when you're out in the desert, there's no line in the sand, there's no entry port. What I wanted to do is create a monument where migrants could feel welcome'.²¹⁵

Interestingly, the bridge is constantly producing and reproducing itself. Aside from the fact that it has been rebuilt several times due to vandalism that set

²¹¹ Kathy Engle, 'Bridge over troubled borders: Artist created "Veil of Tears" tribute in Arivaca', *Green Valley News and Sun*, February 21, 2008.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Bernstein, 'Controversial-art-inspires-debate'.

²¹⁴ Tom Sharpe, 'Artist's Monument to Migrants finds trouble in Santa Fe', *Santa Fe New Mexican*, July 21, 2008.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

out to destroy the installation, it has also been the subject of a different type of what we might normally think of as vandalism. Bernstein has in fact asked migrants to graffiti the sculpture. He took portions of the bridge back and forth across the border so that migrants could sign it.²¹⁶ Migrants and their families and others from both sides of the border have also been encouraged to donate photographs and other objects to be placed on the bridge as symbols.²¹⁷ In its new location at the Santa Fe museum, the installation has also been the subject of graffiti. An American flag hung backwards at the site was painted with various messages, including the statement 'libertad, esperanza, amor, fe', 'Donde esta la justicia?', 'si tu quieres todos la puedes', and 'Santa Fe Art Nazis' with a swastika.²¹⁸

It is imperative to address the vandalism surrounding Bernstein's installation. When built in the desert in Arivaca, it was met with resistance. According to Bernstein, 'we were followed, repeatedly threatened and shot at before the bridge was finally demolished by redneck vigilantes with pickup trucks'.²¹⁹ The first piece was destroyed by two men who identified themselves as Minutemen. They stated, 'we don't want no Jews from New York down here putting stupid art up in our territory'.²²⁰ The sculpture has been destroyed six

²¹⁶ Bernstein, 'Controversial-art-inspires-debate'.

²¹⁷ Engle, 'Bridge over troubled borders'.

²¹⁸ Jackie Jadrnak, 'A Public Display of Dissent: Art Project Gets Some Feedback in the Form of Spray Paint', *Journal Santa Fe*, August 8, 2008.

²¹⁹ Bernstein, 'Controversial-art-inspires-debate'.

²²⁰ Sharpe, 'Artist's Monument to Migrants finds trouble in Santa Fe'.

times. The final destruction of the piece was on July 31, 2008, when at the Museo Cultural in Santa Fe. It was cut from its straps and fell onto the roof of the museum.²²¹ Given the expense to build each time, it was not rebuilt at the museum. Bernstein cites plans to show the piece in New York and Washington DC in the future.

So the question is, why was Bernstein's piece met with such resistance? It seems as though it is not a matter of providing water to migrants crossing, which has indeed been a contentious issue in recent years with groups such as No More Deaths placing water stations in the desert. But this seems to be a peripheral issue to Bernstein's installation. The main issue seems to be with the existence of the structure itself, the memorial function of the piece. Thus it is not the practical significance, but the symbolic significance, that its opponents take issue with. So what does the piece represent, beyond a beacon of hope for migrants? The sculpture is no longer placed in the desert, so it bears questioning what it represents when it no longer acts as a shining welcome for migrants in the desert.

Alejandro Santiago's art offers a unique perspective because it focuses on the emptiness and absence and loss in the places that undocumented migrants come from, rather than on their deaths in the United States. Santiago was born in Teococuilco, Mexico, in the 1960s, and left to work in Europe. When he returned to Mexico, he found that more than half of his village was gone: left to the United States, totaling 2,500 people. Santiago decided to re-populate his community by

²²¹ Zane Fischer, 'Justice for All: But Especially for the Artist', *Santa Fe Reporter*, August 5, 2008.

constructing 2,500 ceramic figures to represent this migration, plus a figure representing his own return to his home community, thus the name of the installation: 2501 Migrants. Each figure is slightly different, and Santiago attempts to 'integrate art with the names and faces of daily life.'²²² The figures are smaller than life-size and clay-colored. One commentator describes them as 'crude but ingeniously expressive figures...lifelike both in their collectivity and their subdued individuality'.²²³ Another describes their 'googly eyes', noting that they look like 'C-3PO's long-lost pre-Columbian ancestors'.²²⁴ The sculptures are hewn with tools, sometimes a machete, and the bodies and faces look scarred and worn, evocative of the travails the bodies of the migrants have gone through in their crossings.

Like Valarie James' figural work, Santiago's work focuses on the individual and their physical and bodily human experience. As Reed Johnson elaborates, 'the closer you look, the more singular each appears. "They overflow their condition of stone and transmit their humanity," says museum director Abad'. They draw on the biological, human features, the very things that subject one to sovereign power, as a means of individualizing migrants. Santiago himself even engaged in an illicit desert border crossing in order to physicalize the

²²² Jorge Pech Casanova, '2,501 Migrants by Alejandro Santiago Ramirez: A Brief Comment on the Significance of the Project', accessed December 4, 2011, http://www.2501migrants.com/home.html

²²³ Scott Norris, 'Alejandro Santiago's "2501 Migrantes" in Oaxaca', Art Culture, May 5, 2009.

²²⁴ Reed Johnson, 'Mexico's Alejandro Santiago Evokes the Toll of Immigration with Clay Figures', *Los Angeles Times*, April 7, 2006.

representations he is sculpting.²²⁵ What makes Santiago's figures so interesting for our discussion here is their haunting nature. Scott Norris characterizes their presence as 'almost inexplicable, almost ghostly', stating that we have trouble knowing who/what we are looking at, whether we are looking at the living or the dead, the migrant with a job in the U.S., or the migrant who died crossing the desert. Like specters, they disrupt our conceptions of visual symmetry because we look at them, even as they are not truly there, indeed the intention is for the viewer to recall their absence even while looking at the figures, and, as Norris says, 'for the most part they ignore you'.

The figures will be exhibited first in Santiago's home village in Mexico, then in a location in the desert that spans Mexico and the U.S., intended to represent the path of the migrant. The figures thus start out as a memorial to the absences and losses produced by mass migrations from Mexico to the U.S., then come to act as a figural memorial to migration and the migrants themselves, as these figures follow the same path across the border as their predecessors, the migrants they are modeled after. The figures will remain in the desert, though many of the migrants moved on from the desert to lives in El Norte. The migrants who remain in the desert died there, their bones mingling with the sand. It is these migrants we now turn to.

²²⁵ Ibid. Johnson further elaborates: The feeling of vulnerability felt during Santiago's border crossing inspired him to leave the figures naked. Thus even as his work memorializes the absences of migrants, it also memorializes their crossings.

Paupers Cemeteries: No Olvidado

There are many migrants who are buried throughout the Southwest, but there are specific towns whose graveyards are full of grave markers for undocumented migrants whose remains were found in the nearby deserts. Holtville, CA is one of these towns, located about 120 miles east of San Diego. The pauper's cemetery opened in 1995, shortly after the increased border enforcement that occurred with Operation Gatekeeper. A section of Terrace Park Cemetery was set aside for the indigent, which has mostly meant undocumented immigrants since its opening. In 2001, there were 121 undocumented migrants buried there.²²⁶ SueAnne Ware describes the cemetery there in 2007 as having over 400 grave markers, many anonymous migrants.²²⁷ By 2008, news articles cite 656 gravesites,²²⁸ a testimony to the increase in crossing deaths. This area's landscape is problematic: muddy earth is beginning to collapse onto the graves of undocumented immigrants.

At the cemetery there is a stark division between the private part of the cemetery and the indigent part where undocumented immigrants are buried. The main part of the cemetery is grassy, covered with flowers, quiet and almost idyllic, the sort of atmosphere one expects from a cemetery, a peaceful final resting place. The indigent part of the cemetery is barren desert, not covered with grass, without flowers, replicating the harsh desert conditions in which these

²²⁶ Ben Fox, 'Unknown Immigrants Fill Pauper Cemetery', *The Spokesman-Review*, May 29, 2001, A3.

²²⁷ Ware, 'Borders, Memory and the Slippage In-Between', 81.

²²⁸ Raftery, 'Dying to Come to America'.

migrants died. The land is beginning to cave in where the gravesites are located, their resting places emulating the fact that their deaths were not easy ones.²²⁹ The main part of the cemetery is adorned with carved headstones made of traditional marble. The grave markers on the other side are simple bricks.

The bricks are engraved with the name of the deceased: in most cases in Holtville they read John or Jane Doe as indications of their unidentified status; part of the problem of identification lies in the fact that many migrants travel without identification of any sort, so it is impossible to even pinpoint which country they are from. Additionally, many lose their identification along the way or at times it gets stolen. Another issue is that bodies are often not discovered until weeks or months after the death, making identification more difficult.²³⁰ Border Angels, a nonprofit group which sets up water stations in the desert and tries to prevents deaths among people crossing in the San Diego area, sets up handmade wooden crosses at each brick. The group has a monthly pilgrimage to the cemetery in Holtville to bring these crosses and flowers to commemorate those who have died crossing the border. Border Angels also petitions the government to provide grass to cover the barren desert gravesites and to pay for headstones.²³¹ Many of the wooden crosses at the gravesites read, 'no olvidado', meaning 'not forgotten'.232

²²⁹ Ransom Riggs, 'Strange Geographies: Death at the Border', March 9, 2010, accessed July 24, 2010, www.mentalfloss.com/blogs/archives/49478.

²³⁰ Fox, 'Unknown Immigrants Fill Pauper Cemetery', A3.

²³¹ Raftery, 'Dying to Come to America'.

²³² Fox, 'Unknown Immigrants Fill Pauper Cemetery', A3.

It is in this memorialization that these crosses posit a resistance to statecraft. For, what is not forgotten? Surely, it refers to the individual themselves in some way, yet the individual is unidentified, so how can he/she be remembered? S/he cannot be remembered in her unique characteristics, in his/her personality or job or family or friendships, because these are all unknowns. Perhaps it is his/her very anonymity which is not forgotten, the very fact that he/she is without these identifying characteristics that we usually associate with remembering a deceased. The most compelling part of this is that it is ultimately an untraditional remembering, because it does not rely on recalling time spent with the individual or who that person was. It is not mourning based on loss of one with potential, for how can this be evaluated when the person is unidentified? It is mourning for mourning's sake, mourning at its most basic level, of human for human, grief without regard for classifying a life a grievable life²³³, grief simply because it is life. Yet it is precisely this disruption of the identification of the deceased and the classification of grievable life which makes the Juan Doe graveyards sites of contestation. Beyond this, it is the very idea that they are buried that posits a resistance to statecraft. If statecraft ca be imagined to operate according to the creation and maintenance of a distinction between 'us' and 'them', then 'our' territory is marked specifically by its buriability, the fact that 'we' can be buried there. 'Our' soil is buriable, distinguishing 'us' from 'them'

²³³ Indeed it disrupts the very possibility of doing so, because you cannot classify without first identifying.

based out of where the bodies lie so as to order society.²³⁴ The very fact that territory then, is rendered universally buriable, is significant for conceptualizing the resistance engaged in by migrants rights groups such as Border Angels.

In Texas outside of Brownsville lies Kenedy County, population 417. Bodies turn up everywhere, found by ranchers, Border Patrol, hunting guides, and oil field workers. One ranch manager has personally found five people dead in the last ten years. Some of the deceased were recently died, some simply piles of bleached bones. A former county sheriff, Rafael Cuellar, Jr., used to receive anonymous phone calls about a group crossing that had left someone behind, giving very general information about the location. Searchers would look for them, sometimes finding them alive, usually finding bones months later. 'The dead were often arranged as reverential still lifes by a sibling or a friend who was with them at the end. Hands were folded across chests. Voter registration cards were laid out beside them. Crosses made from tree branches stood above them. Holy cards rested on their chests'.²³⁵ The county cemetery is again divided into immigrant and non-immigrant. Plain pine crosses mark the graves of undocumented immigrants. There are also aluminum markers which tell the information known: 'unknown male', 'john doe', 'unknown skeletal remains'.²³⁶ There are spaces in between the markers, where there once were bodies which ended up being identified, exhumed, and returned to family in Mexico or Central

²³⁴ Katherine Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*, New York: NY: Columbia University Press, 1999, 108-110.

²³⁵ Pamela Colloff, 'The Desert of the Dead', *Texas Monthly*, November 1, 2006.
²³⁶ Ibid

America. These absences between the makeshift markers are the exception: the majority of the graves remain unidentified. The corporeality of the remains speaks loudly by virtue of their anonymity. They are made into a symbol of immigrant death, a phenomenon which also remains anonymous.

Death in this instance comes to be represented specifically through the body. By corporealizing death, it is in fact also politicized. The body is itself a physical monument, but in this case commemorates a disruption because the body is of an anonymous person, an undocumented individual who comes to represent this lack of documents in the eyes of the state. These undocumented immigrant gravesites are not simply graves: they can also be conceived of as sites of politics and of political contestation. The bodies interred are not simply bodies, but symbols of a larger political debate about documentality, but beyond this about sovereignty, citizenship, and identity. Because they lack documents, even dead they can pose a threat to the sovereign ordering mechanism because they cannot be situated within its logic. Mark Salter discusses the way that documents such as a passport or other identity documents in the zone of an airport act as identification, but more than this they place the holder within an ordered system; they locate us where we belong, they situate us within the logic of the functioning of the state apparatus.

Salter theorizes the international airport as an example of this, as a heterotopia, an intersection of governmentalities, where domestic and international, political, economic, and social all operate together. The airport is a state of exception, where we submit to security checks which we would otherwise not submit to, saying to ourselves, 'only at the airport!'²³⁷ The international airport is representative of the border itself, which is polysemic. This means that the border means something different to different people crossing it. For example, John Doe can easily pass through the border crossing with his American passport, situate himself within the sovereign apparatus with his documents, and conform to the *customs* of the state as he passes through *Customs*. Jose Doe may have a harder time because he may not be able to situate himself within the sovereign apparatus as easily. Mohammed Doe may be subject to an altogether different sort of crossing where he is constituted as a threat to the sovereign apparatus. Salter theorizes that for the sovereign who privileges territoriality, mobility is a deviance. When we cross the border, we must confess this deviance in order to be let back into the state. The border crossing agent knows how to identify us, how to situate us, according to our paperwork, our name. It is the ultimate location where we fully submit to the sovereign apparatus and agree to the state of exception.²³⁸ But what happens to those who do not or cannot submit, who cannot identify or locate themselves within the sovereign apparatus?

Undocumented immigrants befuddle the sovereign system of identification because they are without these identifying, placing, ordering documents. Thus, even dead, they are buried on 'American' soil, yet they are not clearly identified

²³⁷ Mark Salter, 'Governmentalities of an airport: heterotopia and confession', *International Political Sociology* 1, no. 1 (2007): 49-67.

²³⁸ Interestingly, we submit ourselves to such an extreme that we are willing to be physically located in one place while our data double is in another. Salter discusses the way in which at the Ottawa airport, one enters US customs before one even gets on the plane. One is officially in the US, yet physically still in Canada. We have handed our electronic double fully over to the state, to travel without us.

as 'American', and in fact never can be as a result of their death. Beyond disrupting law and order by crossing in the first place, they are seen as challenging the rule of identification and placement by which we bury our dead as well. Ever since the First World War, the US has privileged identification when it comes to the dead. The most important thing is to name the individual, then place them in their appropriate context. The undocumented immigrant disrupts this very possibility. As such, his/her gravesite is never simply a grave, but is rather imbued with the politics of documentality. We can explore documentality beyond simply the idea of documents in their physicality. For undocumented immigrants, it is not simply their lack of physical papers, but their disruption of the social ordering system which involves registering and classifying. Maurizio Ferraris argues that physical objects exist concretely, while social objects rely on inscriptions, which are the traces of their existence.²³⁹ Social acts, then, exist by virtue of being written, even if they are simply written in people's heads.²⁴⁰ This gestures towards the idea that our physical documents simply serve as evidence of our classification within a larger schema.²⁴¹ What frightens about the undocumented immigrant is not his lack of papers, because this does not matter

²³⁹ Maurizio Ferraris, 'Documentality'. Working Paper. New York, Italian Academy, October 11, 2006, accessed January 25, 2011,

 $http://www.italianacademy.columbia.edu/publications/working_papers/2006_2007/paper_fa06_Ferraris.pdf$

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 11.

²⁴¹ Even in the attempt to gain legal status, the undocumented immigrant must situate him/herself in relation to the ordering mechanisms of the state. As Nicholas De Genova details, legalization requires documentation from the individual that they had continuous unauthorized residence in the US, indication of a verifiable past as the condition of possibility for a documented future. Thus undocumented immigrants are included under conditions of 'enforced and protracted vulnerability'. See De Genova, 'Migrant ''Illegality''', 428-9.

once he is dead. Rather what is so terrifying is that he does not fit in to the larger logic which surrounds all of us, which identifies, places, and limits us. Even dead, he does not fit in; his biopolitical life, and indeed his death, cannot be appropriated by the state. He cannot be defined or situated, and as such poses the ultimate threat to this logic of identification, situation, and limitation: it exposes the inability of the state to fully and finally identify, situate, and limit.

Counter-Memorialization: Some Conclusions

In positing the undocumented immigrant as a disruption to the logic of statecraft, it is important to address how counter-memorialization discourse expresses this idea.²⁴² Why does the memorialization of undocumented immigrants who die crossing the border create such controversy? Neil Bernstein's piece is exemplary of this in the way in which it spurred often violent responses by those who did not want it to do its memorial work, something different than the anti-immigrant sentiment which results in the sabotage of water stations.²⁴³ Part of why Bernstein's work is so interesting is that it blurs the line between water station and memorial, calling our attention to the biopolitical work memorials can do. Counter-memorialization discourses such as this express not only the contestation surrounding memory and the supposed concretization of memory through the monument, but also expose the integral need for forgetting in

²⁴² This project does not entail a thorough detailing of counter-memorialization sentiment or actions. It rather argues that counter-memorialization is evident in specific practices of statecraft itself, in the construction of the distinction between grievable and ungrievable lives that the project has explores.

²⁴³ Raftery, 'Dying to Come to America'.

statecraft. Memorialization in specific contexts can pose a threat to this sovereign forgetting, by both reminding us of what we have forgotten, namely the abject, and by reminding us that we forgot it, indeed that we needed to forget it to imagine the state as something already constructed and sovereign. By exposing the abjection and our need for the abject for construction of our own identities as citizens, memorialization of undocumented immigrants reminds us that the sovereign state is not fully and finally formed and crafted, and that statecraft is an ongoing performance and practice of territoriality, identity, and sovereignty.

Some may argue that for the memorialization of undocumented migrants to truly impact statecraft, it must have demonstrable institutional effects, such as changes of policy. My point here, however, is not that memorialization of undocumented migrants necessarily effects policy changes. Rather, it looks beyond the institutional level at practices of statecraft at multiple levels. Recall the discussion of statecraft earlier in which I emphasized the way in which the doers of statecraft are not always congruent with policymakers. Statecraft is sustained by a myriad of political and social practices. Thus the point of this chapter is simply that dead undocumented migrants haunt statecraft by reminding us that the state is crafted through social and political processes that constitute categories such as citizen, and construct the lives of citizens as grievable and the lives of others as ungrievable.²⁴⁴ My hope in drawing attention to these lives that

²⁴⁴ The effects are thus immeasurable. As Amoore and Hall point out, the effects of art are often 'wrought in the cracking of daily ritual, the dislocation of habit and fragmentation'. Amoore and Hall, 'Border Theatre', 305. They go on: art often works through a technique of defacement, which makes us see anew that which we thought we already recognized as familiar and mundane.

have been constructed as ungrievable is to open up for the potentialities of resistances, and acknowledge the small everyday practices of resistance that are currently being played out in memorialization practices. Resistance always remains a potentiality, but it is in exploring what we should, perhaps ethically, be haunted by that such openings are created. We are perhaps not haunted by these undiscovered remains in the desert, but we have the potential to be. As Casper and Moore argue, 'some bodies are conspicuously missing in action',²⁴⁵ but simply because these bodies are invisible *to us* does not make them invisible. Their visibility is in fact that of spectrality, that Derridean sense that disrupts specularity because the bones watch us even as we do not see them. The bones haunt the concepts of statecraft, order, and citizenship that we take for granted, and every once in awhile, we find traces or effects of these hauntings.

By way of conclusion, I'd like to address the corporeal remains left in the desert, both unknown and ungathered. At first blush it might seem as though these remains are beyond the bounds of the political, as though they have little impact because they are undiscovered. But it is perhaps these remains which act as the most poignant representations of border monuments precisely because of their lack of discovery and attention, especially interesting given that bones often define land in that borders of territories are often determined based out of where bodies lie.²⁴⁶ They go beyond the anonymity of Juan Doe cemeteries to a further level of anonymity. They are not simply undocumented or unknown in name, as

²⁴⁵ Monica Casper and Lisa Jean Moore, *Missing Bodies: the Politics of Visibility*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2009, 3.

²⁴⁶ Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies*, 26.

in the unidentified grave sites. They are unknown in their very being. Their ontological status of undiscovery is itself political, because it gestures to a power relationship, gestures to the narratives of statecraft, of territory, crossing, economics, social relationships, all of which lead to their existence in the first place. Simply because they are undiscovered does not mean that they are beyond the realm of politics: 'undiscovered' is itself a politicized status.

In this sense, the dead body itself is a site of contestation, not simply a form of resistance for those who build memorials.²⁴⁷ The body itself becomes a contested site in relation to the emergence of subjectivity; it is these questions of subjectivity raised by the memorialization of undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border that offer up the most interesting implications for conceptualizing how statecraft functions through a myriad of social practices. Therefore, the dead body of the migrant need not be taken up and mediated by explicitly political projects; rather it testifies to the way in which this particular instantiation of sovereign power is reliant on bordering practices which label certain bodies as ungrievable lives. Acknowledging the grievability of bodies in the desert is the first step towards a possible resistance.

²⁴⁷ Thanks to Vivienne Jabri for this point.

BONES IN A BROWN BAG: HAUNTING AND THE PLACE OF THE BODY IN RWANDAN GENOCIDE MEMORIALIZATION

Let me tell you a story that was told to me by a visitor to Rwanda. As he visited the genocide memorial sites with a guided tour some fifteen years after the genocide, he noticed a peculiarity about the gates to the sites. Every so often he would see a small box or a brown paper bag placed outside of the gates. The brown paper bag is itself not a peculiar sight in Rwanda, as non-biodegradable plastic bags are not allowed in the country. But this visitor asked his guide what was in these bags; perhaps trash of some sort that had inadvertently been left there, someone's bag lunch perhaps? The guide responded that in the bags were bones, human remains. In these inconspicuous brown paper bags were the remains of genocide victims that had recently been found in surrounding areas. Rather than burying these bones in a cemetery, they were brought to the memorial site so that they could be buried in the mass graves there. Sometimes they would have been in the box for some time, as in rural areas people may not be traveling in the direction of the memorial site very frequently. When they did travel that way, they would bring with them the bags or boxes of bones.

I have no way of knowing if this story is true or not. I did not see any of these bags or boxes with my own eyes at any Rwandan memorial sites, but it would not surprise me to have seen them. This is because in Rwanda, memorialization is heavily concentrated at specific sites. Each year, even seventeen years after the genocide, numerous remains of genocide victims are discovered. At Ntarama genocide memorial, which I visited in July 2011, six bodies had been discovered so far that year in the surrounding area and the front of the church was crowded with these coffins, draped in purple and white. This is a particularly weighty contrast: the new shiny fabric over these coffins as compared with the dusty shelves at the back of the church which hold skulls and bones of the victims that had originally been found inside. At Kigali Genocide Memorial, numerous newly found remains are buried in the mass graves each year, usually during the April commemoration ceremonies.

In short, Rwanda is haunted. But it is not simply that the dead do not rest in peace. It is not that spirits wander back to their destroyed houses or whisper in the ears of their killers, though this may be the case. 'The ghost is not simply a dead or missing person, but a social figure'.²⁴⁸ The ghost is the sign that a haunting is taking place. So the fact that there are ghosts in Rwanda matter only insofar as they are empirical evidence, if you will, that haunting is happening as a social and political practice and process. Haunting is used by the state in an attempt to re-order society after the trauma of the genocide. But haunting also posits a resistance to these ordering attempts, and reminds us that memorialization, even monumentalization, is always an ongoing performance.

This chapter thus seeks the traces of these ghosts, seeks to find traces of hauntings by exploring physical memorial sites and the contestation they engender. Through this process, I will focus on two key features: first, the

²⁴⁸ Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, 8.

construction of particular spaces as the appropriate sites of memorialization, and second, and relatedly, the role of bodies and bones in Rwandan genocide memorialization. Bodies and bones have a particularly strong role to play in Rwandan genocide memorialization.²⁴⁹ As Monica Casper and Lisa Moore detail, 'war produces missing bodies, both literally and figuratively, while amplifying the visibility of other bodies'.²⁵⁰ In Rwanda, this is perhaps amplified given the situation of genocide in that literally hundreds of thousands of human beings simply disappeared, and unidentifiable bodies cropped up in their place, in churches, in fields, in rivers. Achille Mbembe characterizes the Rwandan case: what is striking is the tension between the petrification of the bones and their strange coolness on one hand, and on the other, their stubborn wil to mean, to signify something.²⁵¹ The question pursued here then is not where are the missing bodies, but rather why some bodies are visible in some spaces, and what logic of haunting underpins this presence and absence of bodies, and thereby what signification is performed by the role of bodies and bones in Rwandan genocide memorialization. On true crime television shows, photos of the crime scene blur the body perhaps because of the gruesome nature of the scene. They also do the same with bones, which are not gruesome, yet considered to be a question of dignity. Given the customary taboo associated with showing bones, it is

²⁴⁹ And, as Erin Baines notes, in the genocide itself. See Erin Baines, 'Body Politics and the Rwandan Crisis', *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3 (2003): 479-493, for an exploration of the human body as the surface upon which genocide as a nation-building process was inscribed.

²⁵⁰ Monica Casper and Lisa Jean Moore, *Missing Bodies: the Politics of Visibility*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2009, 134.

²⁵¹ Achille Mbembe, 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1 (2003): 11-40, 35.

significant that in the Rwandan case, they are not only shown but are displayed. The question becomes what the politics of visibility are that dictate this particular form of memorialization.

Visibility becomes a key question in looking for ghosts, because they disrupt traditional conceptions of visibility, or as Avery Gordon characterizes, 'a kind of visible invisibility: *I see you are not there*'.²⁵² Unlike many other traumatic events and even other genocides, Rwandan memorialization focuses on the body as the locus of memory. In Srebrenica, thousands of white crosses memorialize the 7,000-8,000 victims of the genocide there, one cross for each victim. One of the Rwandan survivors I interviewed tells me that this same memorialization is impossible in Rwanda. It is easy to place 7,000 crosses or identify 7,000 separate bodies. But how can this be done with 1 million bodies?

This chapter, then, seeks to explore the logic of haunting that is at play when some bodies are rendered invisible, while others are overtly placed on display; why some spaces are sacralized and others normalized. Judith Butler in *Precarious Life* examines the idea that certain lives are more legitimately grievable than others; that is, that we value specific lives and deaths more than others. She analyzes this in the context of September 11th, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, to argue that certain lives are framed in nationalist and familial narratives, which forecloses our capacity to mourn in global dimensions. This is because we are unable to conceive of certain lives as *lives*. The media and state establish the narratives by

²⁵² Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*, 16, emphasis original.

which the human being in its grievability is established.²⁵³ Rather than looking at grievability of lives, I am interested here in display-ability of lives, specifically bodies. This is of course connected with grievability of lives, but in the Rwanda case, it is not as much about labeling certain lives as grievable, but about why certain bodies are displayed in certain ways and why certain spaces become grievable spaces, but not others.

I explore this through looking at monumentalization: tracing hauntings through their manifestations in monuments. This chapter first lays out the framework for this analysis. I then trace the uses of bodies and bones in Rwanda to explore the political inscription on the body which is taking place there, the way the body itself is politicized by a variety of groups, not simply the state. Throughout I make the argument that with the use of bodies in memorialization in Rwanda, what is being memorialized is bare life itself. By looking at the role of naming, this logic becomes further elaborated. I then focus on spatiality and why specific spaces become memorials but not others, why some spaces are considered grievable or grieving spaces and therefore sacralized, and the role of physical scarring in these spaces. By way of conclusion, I offer up an exploration of the implications a logic of haunting has on our conceptualization of statecraft through examining state and other practices of reconciliation and their results, a way of analyzing the policy implications of the analysis presented in this chapter.

²⁵³ Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London, UK: Verso, 2004, 38.

This chapter seeks to trace a social and political process that takes on particular manifestations, including the levels of visibility or elision of bodies, construction and conceptualization of spaces, and construction and pervasiveness of particular types of discourses. I argue that looking at specific physical sites allows for examination of the processes at work. I am looking here for why bodies are visible at some times and not others, and the analysis seeks to explain this through exploration of the logic of haunting. The question then, is how the state invokes the specter of genocide in the project of statecraft, and what types of resistances can be conceived to this project. This chapter relies on field work conducted in Rwanda in July and August 2011, drawing on in-depth participant observation at memorial sites around Rwanda and interviews with visitors to and employees at these sites, as well as interviews with genocide survivors, political officials and community leaders.

Genocide memory is exceedingly important in Rwanda. When asked why we remember, various responses from survivors were 'in order to prevent', 'to have a better future,' and 'to not forget the past.' These three responses all indicate some of the key facets of memory. Memory is often felt to be the key to a future that is without conflict. The message in Rwanda is that reconciliation can only come from memory. But memory is also seen as compulsory in many ways—it is not a choice in a post-genocide Rwanda. One survivor said in our interview, 'Genocide has happened. As it happened, you cannot avoid to remember it', however painful remembering might be. He says that it is not Rwandans' choice to commemorate, but genocide happened. So 'life has to continue and we have to commemorate.' The notion seems to be that the pain is firstly unavoidable, and secondly can be managed in the service of a better future.

Memory is also posited as a counterpoint to forgetting; remembering allows us to not forget. As WJ Booth says, 'remembering is a duty rooted in filiation; and forgetting is an offense against those debts shared by a community.'²⁵⁴ This characterization of memory elides the fact that all memory entails some forgetting²⁵⁵ and that memory is not simple by any means. But it also gestures to the instrumentalization of memory in the service of political tools such as reconciliation and the future. Every single survivor I interviewed said that they felt that physical memorial sites and commemoration ceremonies were the best ways to remember the genocide in Rwanda. One said that genocide memorials should be constructed in every sector as well as at the national level,

²⁵⁴ See WJ Booth, 'Kashmir Road: Some Reflections on Memory and Violence,' *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 361-377, 370. Other examples of scholars who emphasize the problems with forgetting include Cubitt 2007, who says that not forgetting is a human moral obligation, Geoffrey Cubitt, *History and Memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007. See also Adorno 1959, who remarked after WWII that the desire for forgetting is one expressed by the perpetrators of an injustice, and that the threat of fascism within democracy was being forgotten in the name of coming to terms with the past. See Theodor Adorno, 'What Does Coming to Terms with the Past Mean?' In Geoffrey Hartman, ed, *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959/1986. Douglass and Vogler also argue that there is a tension between remembering and forgetting, labeling forgetting the dead as impious. See Ana Douglass and Thomas Vogler, *Witness and Memory: The Discourse of Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2003, 42-43.

²⁵⁵ As Susan Buckley-Zistel writes, forgetting is an intentional silencing of some aspects of the past, which is a coping strategy to help survivors move on with their lives, especially in a context where they have to live with the perpetrators. See Suzanne Buckley-Zistel, 'We are Pretending Peace: Local Memory and the Absence of Social Transformation and Reconciliation in Rwanda,' In Clark and Kaufman, eds, *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction, and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2009, 125-144, 126. Avishai Margalit notes that 'communities must make decisions and establish institutions that foster forgetting as much as remembering'. See Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory*, 13. Lambek argues that both remembering and forgetting are identity-building acts. See Michael Lambek, 'The Past Imperfect: Remembering as Moral Practice,' In Antze and Lambek, eds, *Tense Past*, Psychology Press, 1996, 243.

and that these should be used together with commemoration ceremonies focused around education to transform knowledge. This emphasis on communal memory and shared physical sites is what makes an exploration of memorial sites in Rwanda so salient.

The monument is a physical, concrete representation of memory. However, its physicality does not imply closure or lack of contestation. The monument is itself a physical instantiation of a linguistic performance. In the case of Rwanda, the monument replicates the emergence of the conception of genocide in general. 'A word that did not exist in Kinyarwanda until 1994—jenoside hangs from a sign near the entrance' of the Kigali Memorial Centre.²⁵⁶ The linguistic disruption (there was no word for an event like this before it happened) is replicated in the traumatic social disruption and in the disruption of any linear conception of time: past, present, future as clearly distinct from one another. Trauma is then the event as a shattered, splintered event, with memory as remnant, as piece, and as ruins. The event itself shatters speech and shatters temporality because the event is never fully passed; it is still experienced by many in the present, and the past event cannot be firmly and finally situated in the past.²⁵⁷ As one visitor to Rwanda says, 'The danger is that with all the tragedies

²⁵⁶ Rory Carroll, 'In Memory of Murder: Can Art help ease Rwanda's pain?' *The Guardian* March 24, 2004, p.12.

²⁵⁷ Marc Nichanian, 'Catastrophic Mourning,' In Eng and Kazanjian (eds) *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003, 99-124.

happening around the world, people think of the Rwandan genocide as something that's over. From what I saw, however, it is happening; it's not a past thing'.²⁵⁸

The monument then can act as a means of attempting to place the event firmly in the past. In the aftermath of a genocide and mass atrocity, people want to re-order society in some way; they want exact facts and settled limits.²⁵⁹ Hutchison and Bleiker state that 'in most instances, political elites deal with the legacy of pain and death by re-imposing order.²⁶⁰ The monument is an attempt to do so by making concrete the memory of the event. Thus, memorials are attempts to reorder the past into 'a coherent narrative out of experiences that were ambiguous, traumatic, and unspeakable.²⁶¹ But this reordering is never fully and finally completed. As James Smith, who assisted in designing the Kigali Memorial Centre, tells me, memorialization in Rwanda is actually more about processes and commemoration than the monument, even at memorial sites: 'memorials aren't static.'

Memorials can have tremendous power in the sense that such power is attributed to them. They are just things: objects, spaces, structures, until they are

²⁵⁸ Clive Owen, 'In Rwanda, it's as if genocide is still going on.' Aegis Students, April 8, 2010. Available at:http://www.aegisstudents.org/in-rwanda-it%E2%80%99s-as-if-genocide-is-still-going-on/.

²⁵⁹ Kora Andrieu, 'Sorry for the Genocide': How Public Apologies can help Promote National Reconciliation, *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 1 (2009): 3-23, 12.

²⁶⁰ Emma Hutchison and Roland Bleiker, 'Emotional Reconciliation: Reconstituting Identity and Community After Trauma,' *European Journal of Social Theory* vol. 11, no. 3 (2008): 385-403, 386.

²⁶¹ Kay Schaffer, 'Memory Work and Memorialization in the new South Africa,' In Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela and Chris van der Merwe (eds) *Memory, Narrative, and Forgiveness.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009, 362-381, 365.

imbued with some sort of social meaning related to the conception of the event. In Rwanda, this is heavily entwined with narratives of prevention. Memorial sites are seen to have the power to prevent. One of the survivors I interviewed said that if there had been a Rwandan genocide memorial in Darfur, genocide would not have happened there. This conception of the memorial as having the social and political power of prevention is one which demonstrates the performative power memorials can have. Though we can debate whether or not a genocide memorial in Darfur would have prevented any killings there, the notion that the memorial could have the power to do so makes memorialization seem like a necessary post-atrocity measure. Indeed the same survivor said that there should always be memorials after atrocity, because they provide evidence that the genocide in fact did happen.

From here, this chapter follows the following path. First, I explore corporeality in Rwandan genocide memorialization through assessing 4 of the main memorials in Rwanda: Kigali Memorial Centre, Nyamata, Ntarama, and Murambi. I then address the phenomenon of mass graves more generally in Rwanda, specifically focusing on the unearthing of graves at Murambi and Nyanza Hill. I move on to address the effects of naming and identification in a context such as Rwanda where there are hundreds of thousands of unidentified bodies buried in mass graves. I explore the effects this has on conceptualization of the body, mourning, memory, and space.

The Memorials and the Mass Graves

Mass graves in Rwanda are everywhere, from small roadside memorials to memorials at universities, to larger memorial sites. When one drives along the main roads from one large city to another, numerous small roadside mass graves are visible. It is almost an oxymoron, 'small', yet 'mass' graves. Before the mass graves, there were simply bones, piles of bones stacked alongside the road or outside of a church or school.²⁶² These remains were almost unintentional monuments, where the bones were simply stacked out of convenience. At these sites, the bodies lay as they fell, even more than a decade later. The documentary film 'Our Memory Our Future' states that all around the country there existed genocide memorial sites, along the roadside, in schools, and in churches where 'bones lie on the floor, waiting for someone to give their existence some meaning.²⁶³ Thus, memorials already existed, but they were largely corporeal; bodies lay where they had died. In this sense, they were memorials to bare life in and of themselves, and many believed they needed to be situated within a larger memorial or educative context in order to hold 'meaning.' The solution was the establishment of memorials, still corporeal in nature, still focused on the body, yet involving notions of burial. Many believed that leaving the bodies in situ was undignified to the victims, especially as it left the bodies vulnerable to animals,

²⁶² Helena Cobban, *Amnesty After Atrocity? Healing Nations After Genocide and War Crimes.* Paradigm, 2006.

²⁶³ 'Our Memory Our Future,' Video made by Aegis Students, 2005. Available at: http://www.facebook.com/video/video.php?v=503090398504&oid=2214536704 and http://www.facebook.com/video/video.php?v=503090403494&oid=2214536704

and that they needed to be buried. This is where the impetus for mass graves as memorial evolved.

Mass graves are themselves unique among graves. Graves traditionally serve as memorials, usually to individuals. Thomas Laqueur refers to the phenomenon of gravesites from wars, stating that 'bodies, of course, being in the ground, are hidden and cannot be their own memorials, but markers of their skeletal uniformity serve the purpose.'²⁶⁴ He goes on to say that at war memorials with multiple gravesites, the visitor is forced to imagine what a million dead men look like. But this is not the case for mass graves, where there are not individual markers of each death. Their inherent 'mass'-ness does testify to the lost lives within, but not in an individual sense. It is therefore useful to keep in mind as we discuss the Rwandan context that the graves are qualitatively different from traditional gravesites due to their 'mass'-ness, and that in fact bodies are not always in the ground, and even when they are, are not always invisible to the gravesite's visitor.²⁶⁵

²⁶⁴ Thomas Laqueur, 'Memory and Naming in the Great War,' In John Gillis, ed, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994, 150-167, 161.

²⁶⁵ A short history of the war gravesite is perhaps in order here. In the early 1900s and previously, a decent burial was considered important, but to the majority of the working classes, individual burial was not seen as important. During WWI, the war dead were simply buried where they fell, anonymous and without markers. But after WWI, the era of naming the soldier emerged. Soldiers started being identified and their gravesites marked with crosses. In March 1915, the British Field Marshal said that registering graves should be the responsibility of the state. Naming came to be of utmost importance, and millions of dollars were spent building cemeteries which remembered the names of individual soldiers. During the war, certain groups would even run into the heat of battle to place a cross on a gravesite, risking their own lives. See Laqueur, 'Memory and Naming in the Great War.'

The conflict between whether to bury victims, thereby returning them some sense of dignity, and following historical Rwandan traditions of burial, or to retain the evidence of the brutality of the genocide by the stark corporeality of bones, has been at the heart of the impetus to memorialize through monument. The presence of bones, whether on display or in mass graves, has been a point of contestation between survivors, government officials, international organizations, and other groups. The fear of burial of many survivors is that 'with burial of their friends and relatives would come amnesia, indifference and the rewriting of history.²⁶⁶ Yet many others believe that the piles of bones do not form a fitting memorial. Wrong tells of one of her friends who refers to the display of skulls and bones in Rwandan monuments as a form of necrophilia. Wrong details the way in which the construction of monuments, especially the Kigali Memorial Centre, has managed to mediate between these two perspectives. It has buried the bones and brought dignity to the victims, while at the same time 'the very permanence of bricks, mortar and cement assuaging survivors' fears of evanescence.²⁶⁷ James Smith, the head of Aegis Trust, who helped design the Kigali Memorial Centre, says that he spent two years talking to survivors about what they wanted in the memorial. Some felt that the only way to show the gravity was with a pile of bones. But the President of IBUKA, the umbrella survivors' group in Rwanda, called the bone display a 'banality of memory.' The

²⁶⁶ Michaela Wrong, "It was sobering- but in a good way": Memorials for the victims of genocide in Rwanda are helping the country's reconciliation process," *Financial Times*, April 29, 2006, p. 12.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 12.

establishment of a bone room which I will address was a concession to the survivors who wanted it as evidence.

The Kigali Memorial Centre is the main memorial to the genocide. Preparations for the 10th anniversary of the genocide in 2004 began in 2001 with the goal of building a memorial to the genocide. In 2002, the mayor of Kigali visited the Holocaust Centre in the UK and asked Aegis Trust, a UK-based genocide prevention and awareness group who designed and run the memorial in the UK, to come to Rwanda to help set a Rwandan genocide memorial. It was formed with the main mission of giving a decent burial to victims and to create a place of learning. It was established on the 10th anniversary of the genocide using funds from mostly British sources.²⁶⁸ A July 2003 report lists three primary objectives of the memorial: 'to develop the Gisozi burial site into a dignified memorial for the victims and a place where survivors and others in the community can remember their family members of neighbors', to create a center for education on the origins and consequences of genocide, and to promote community engagement, reconciliation, and combat genocide ideology.

However, its establishment was not without controversy. One survivor details the controversy surrounding its establishment shortly after: 'When the

²⁶⁸ Additionally, funding came from the Belgian and Swedish governments, and the Clinton foundation, largely Bill Clinton's personal funds which many believe results from guilt that as U.S. president during the genocide, he knew what was happening and did nothing. See Declan Walsh, 'Digging Deep: The British Brothers who are Building Hope in Rwanda; Ten Years After the Genocide in Which 800,000 Died', *The Independent*, April 2, 2004, p. 14-15. Funding efforts originated from Rwanda itself, who began building graves on the Gisozi site. The government contributed 1 million dollars to the effort, which itself was controversial because many felt that the money should have been put towards infrastructure development or even financial compensation for survivors who were continually struggling. See Carroll, 'In Memory of Murder.'

Kigali Memorial Centre was opened in 2004 people criticised the Aegis Trust, the genocide prevention organisation who established it, saying it would traumatise survivors. So why do so many survivors turn up there? Yes, some break down, collapse and need counsellors. But talking and crying is part of the healing process.²⁶⁹ The memorial was never intended to be a static representation or concretization of memory. Stephen Smith of the Aegis Trust says that "this museum is neither permanent nor static" and that it is intended to be a conversation between the community and the building. In this sense, it must change over the years because narratives always change as time passes. In order for it to remain relevant, it must evolve.²⁷⁰

The Kigali Memorial Centre has been the focus of controversial discourse. On the 10th anniversary of the genocide, Paul Kagame, President of Rwanda, and head of the RPF which had ended the genocide through their takeover of the country, spoke at the newly opened memorial. He symbolically laid flowers at a gravesite and lit a flame set to burn for 100 days, the length of the genocide, in the courtyard at the memorial. He then spoke to the gathered crowd, saying, 'God forbid, but if a similar situation was to occur anywhere else...when that duty calls to protect people who are caught up in a genocide, please enlist us. We will be available to come and fight to protect those who will be targeted,'²⁷¹ a jab at the

²⁶⁹ Beata Uwazaninka-Smith, 'Trauma is part of who we are,' *The Independent*, March 29, 2006, p. 23.

²⁷⁰ 'Our Memory, Our Future.'

²⁷¹ Indeed, in 2008, when George W. Bush pledged 100 million US dollars to equip peacekeepers in Darfur, Rwanda was the first nation to step up and offer to deploy peacekeepers. See Chris

Western countries who did nothing to stop the Rwandan genocide.²⁷² Kagame also accused the French government of being complicit in the genocide, arguing that they trained and armed the perpetrators of the genocide rather than protecting the victims, and that they knew the forces that they helped were going to commit genocide.²⁷³ Thus the Kigali Memorial Centre opened with divisive remarks about the past and a gesturing towards the future in the form of genocide prevention in other countries.

The tension surrounding memorialization has also been expressed in violence. There have been two grenade attacks at the Kigali Memorial Centre. The first was in 2008 during the week commemorating the anniversary of the genocide, where one guard was killed. The second was in April 2009, also during the time of genocide commemoration, where one person was injured.²⁷⁴ Grenades were also popular tools of the interahamwe militias who carried out much of the genocide, so these attacks recall the genocide at the very site established to recall the genocide. Thus the site which is intended to commemorate the genocide cannot do so without revealing the sentiment behind the genocide itself, to recall not only the memory of those who were killed, the victims, but also to recall the hatred of the perpetrators, those whose hands wielded grenades and machetes.

McGreal, 'Bush shaken by Memorial to 800,000 Rwanda dead,' *The Guardian*, February 20, 2008, p.16.

²⁷² Rodrique Ngowi, 'Western Leaders Absent as Rwanda Mourns, 10 years after the Genocide,' *The Independent*, April 8, 2004, p. 24.

²⁷³ As a result of this, France withdrew their representative from Rwanda. See Ngowi, 'Western Leaders Absent as Rwanda Mourns', 24.

²⁷⁴ James Karuhanga, 'One injured in grenade attacks on Gisozi Genocide Memorial,' *The New Times*, April 16, 2009, Available through BBC Monitoring International Reports.

The monument can never simply serve as a memorial to the victims, but rather must serve as a memorial for the genocide as it was. The grenade attacks on the centre remind us that there always exist alternative narratives, and that any monument always contains within it a multiplicity of such narratives.

The Kigali Memorial Centre has become a site for visits from world leaders, representing its symbolic importance as a genocide memorial site. This is demonstrated by the remarks made by these leaders. George W. Bush visited in 2008, and used his visit as an opportunity to draw attention to the crisis in Darfur, which he has called genocide when others have shied away from the label.²⁷⁵ Bush, who famously wrote in the margins of a report on Rwanda 'not on my watch', has decided to pursue sanctions and funding to peacekeepers in Darfur rather than sending in any troops.²⁷⁶ These world leaders use their visits for their own political ends, to allay a sense of guilt for non-intervention, and in doing so leave their mark on the memorial in ways beyond simply signing the visitor's book. Those who visit the memorial. Through their own memorialization practices there, they play a role in constructing and reconstructing the meaning of the site, and thus the meaning of the event which the site is intended to commemorate.

The Rwandan Prime Minister, Bernard Makuza, wrote in the visitors' book of the Kigali Memorial Centre: 'You are the stone on which we will build a

²⁷⁵ George W. Bush, 'The President's News Conference With President Paul Kagame of Rwanda in Kigali,' *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* vol. 44, issue 7, February 5, 2008: 238-244.

²⁷⁶ Jennifer Loven, 'Bush urges the world to face "evil" in Africa; At Rwandan Genocide museum, seeks end to strife in Kenya, Sudan,' *Toronto Star*, February 20, 2008, p. AA03.

Rwanda without conflict.²⁷⁷ Thus even as it is a memorial site, a place at which to recall the past and mourn it, it is never fully temporally situated. The memorial centre always gestures at a future: at a future for Rwanda which emphasizes reconciliation rather than memorialization, even at the official memorial for the genocide. We must keep in mind, therefore, that the monument is as much a political tool, used in the service of reconciliation and used by foreign dignitaries as representative of particular agendas, as a tool of remembrance.

We must return to the design of the monument. Kigali Memorial Centre is shaped like a cross and sits atop a hill. An obviously new structure, 'at first sight it could be mistaken for a hacienda.'²⁷⁸ In this way, it first appears as an everyday sort of building, which blends into the hillside. Its architecture is not abstract or striking. It looks new, recently built, but does not look any different from a house. As such, it gestures to the everyday, neighbor-killing-neighbor, nature of the genocide which it stands in for. As a building which is not especially architecturally innovative, it does not seek to speak to us by standing out from its surroundings. In this sense, it does not shout out to the society in which it is situated, but quietly memorializes within its rooms and gardens.

259,000 bodies were originally buried there, with more added every year.²⁷⁹ Many of these bodies were already here in Gisozi, which started as a

²⁷⁷ As cited in James Smith, 'Our Memorial to 50,000 dead is no empty historic exercise: Debate around the Murambi genocide site in Rwanda is expected and necessary', *The Guardian*, November 21, 2006, p. 33.

²⁷⁸ Carroll, 'In Memory of Murder.'

²⁷⁹ No one is sure precisely how many bodies are buried there currently, even the employees of the memorial site themselves. As Declan Walsh says, 'the true figure is anybody's guess.' See

mass hillside grave site where bodies that were scattered around Kigali started to be buried in 1999. James Smith, the founder of Aegis Trust, tells me that when he arrived on scene to help develop plans for the memorial, the building that now houses the exhibit portion of the memorial was already built by the city of Kigali, and it was full floor to ceiling with bones. In this sense, part of the construction of a mass grave here was simply practical: there had to be somewhere to bury all the bodies. After the memorial was established, many other bodies were exhumed from other parts of Kigali to be buried in the mass grave here, an odd disruption of the corpse's rest in order to properly memorialize it. There are also bodies that continued to be found years after the genocide that have been added to the grave at the Kigali Memorial Centre. Even in 2004, 10 years after the genocide, plumbers were reticent to respond to calls for unblocking latrines because they would find corpses and end up exhuming the dead.²⁸⁰ So the impetus associated with burial is an important one related to memorialization in Rwanda. My audio guide at the memorial centre tells me that the main purpose of the memorial is 'burying the victims in dignity' and reinforces that it is intended to 'provide a dignified place of burial for the victims of the genocide.' James Smith reinforces this idea in our interview by saying that the site is first and foremost a burial site intended to bring dignity to the victims.

Walsh, 'Digging Deep', 14. Most estimates range between 200,000 and 300,000. Efforts are increasingly made to identify the victims buried there, but the task is nearly impossible after so much time.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

The mass graves represent somewhere special for victims to be buried, where the whole country and world can remember, says James Smith.²⁸¹ On top of the mass graves are large flower displays. Some have been there awhile, and the flowers are decaying, the dead flowers symbolic of the lives wasted. As I stand looking at slab after slab of concrete, birds chirp loudly in the surrounding trees. I see a small sign asking visitors not to step on the mass graves, which is perhaps good since they could easily be mistaken for a concrete walkway, but also reminds one of the practicalities of having large concrete mass graves. On the flower bundles are messages: in English, 'never forget', and in Kinyarwanda, 'Ntituzabibagirwa', meaning we will never forget you. The personal nature of this is striking. It does not simply say 'we will never forget', but rather 'we will never forget *you*.' This individuality in the face of the anonymity of the mass graves emphasizes the importance of remembering individuals by virtue of their individuality and subjectivity, even in a mass atrocity setting such as a genocide. One might argue that the primary challenge in memorializing a genocide, that makes it different from other types of conflict settings such as war, is in overcoming the numbing that might be associated with large numbers of deaths in relatively short amounts of time. While war typically also has large numbers of

²⁸¹ Indeed, on the day I interviewed James Smith, earlier that morning, Mrs. Museveni, wife of the President of Uganda, had visited the memorial. Museveni himself had visited earlier in the week. An interesting feature of her visit is her response to the memorial. As James Smith relays it to me, she was extremely affected by visiting the memorial. Mrs. Museveni knew what happened during the genocide. Numerous bodies had floated up the river to Uganda. She didn't come to the memorial to learn what happened, she already knows this. She rather came to see the human consequences. She left saying, 'I will never be the same,' not because of the facts, but because of the human elements that are presented at the memorial. She was apparently very touched by the presentation of the individual stories and the photo room at the site, which fits with the stated goal of the memorial site: countering the dehumanization of genocide through dignified burial, photographs, and telling individual stories.

casualties, they are generally gradual, battle by battle, and the remains of the dead are usually dealt with after each episode, whereas genocide tends to produce large piles of bodies and therefore the question of establishment of mass graves arises.

The mass graves at Kigali Memorial Centre are thus unmarked, but also not unmarked. They are marked by the flower arrangements, and by a halffinished wall of names, which I will return to later in this analysis. As I stand near the mass graves, an entire delegation being videotaped like movie stars walks to the mass graves and lays down flowers that say 'never again genocide.' They are fresh, sweet-smelling flowers that perfume the air in front of the purple cloth with a cross on the front which marks the last nearly-full mass grave on site. The flower is, of course, the classic symbol of mourning, historically and contemporarily placed on gravesites. In this instance, the existence of fresh flowers indicates that the memory of the genocide is a lived experience, not simply a relic of the past. The placing of the flowers remains continuous, investing the site with renewed vitality, even for the short period of time until the flowers wilt. The need to place something alive in the realm of the dead can be seen as the desire to recover life from death.

But, aside from the flowers, the mass graves remain nameless, a peculiar inherent quality of mass graves themselves. Michael Taussig describes the way in which massive common graves from the brutality of the Holocaust which remain unmarked or which do not ascribe individual names are representative of secrecy on a mass scale. This nameless quality, this silence, this carefully crafted invisibility of the public secret of the event, ultimately becomes the most significant monument imaginable.²⁸² That which is invisible becomes the most apt at representing the invisibility of those victims of a totalitarian thanatopolitics. Genocide renders their names invisible, and rips the names from their attachments to bodies. The question is whether the most fitting memorial to genocide is reclaiming names for bodies, or whether memorializing their non-personhood is more fitting to memorialize their personhood. This question of naming is one which we will return to later.

There are three gardens on site at the memorial: the gardens of unity, division, and reconciliation. Yet as I walk from the mass graves, I come across the garden of reconciliation first; a reminder that sometimes in Rwanda, reconciliation is forced immediately after death, after burial. There are multiple gardens on site, meant to encourage contemplation. There is a rose garden, dedicated to the victims. They are spread out to emphasize the beauty of individual roses, and there are multiple species meant to place emphasis on the individuality of each victim. I look at each rose as I might look at one gravestone or one name, to try to contemplate that one life. Yet the roses are themselves anonymous, not evocative of the singularity of the name, but rather representative of the specter of anonymity that also characterizes the mass graves.

Inside the building on the grounds of the memorial is a museum which offers up the story of the genocide. The exhibit has heavy emphasis on the indifference of the international community, and details the way in which French

²⁸² Michael Taussig, Walter Benjamin's Grave. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2006, 19.

advisors trained the perpetrators of the genocide. The exhibits contain machetes used in killings, photos of corpses, as well as hate radio excerpts. One room contains belongings retrieved from mass graves around Kigali: beautiful cloths and patterns, a dirty torn Superman bed sheet and Ottawa t-shirt. All call to mind the kind of person who would have worn them, who was wearing them as they were buried: the mischievous child with Superman sheets, the elegant woman wearing the yellow dress with a blue bird pattern, the teenager who might have worn the Cornell University sweatshirt. One of the most intense sections of the museum is the children's memorial. There are enlarged photographs with information about the child; favorite foods, hobbies, last words, and cause of death. One child's last words to his mother were not to worry, because the UN would come and save them.

What is interesting about the mass graves at Kigali Memorial Centre is the lack of bodies. It is almost hard to tell that they are mass graves, except that one section of the mass graves is still open, and individual coffins are evident. James Smith tells me that there is only space for 5 more coffins in the mass graves. They have already had to knock down the outer wall of the memorial to make room for three more mass graves, and now those are nearly full. They aren't sure what will be done in April when it comes time to bury more bodies. But at the mass graves, we do not see the bodies that form the locus of memorialization. The bodies become perhaps even more poignant of a memorial by virtue of the fact that they are anonymous and unseen. Bodies that are not visible are bodies nonetheless. The visitor stands and imagines thousands upon thousands upon thousands of people right in front of them, but does not see them. The logic of haunting that renders these bodies invisible, yet memorializes them, is very different from the exposed bodies at the mass graves at Nyamata, which are not only rendered visible but also displayed for visitors.

Nyamata was a church in Bugesera province. In 1992, when there were massacres in the region, people sought refuge at Nyamata, and they were saved. This is why they sought refuge here again in 1994. Approximately 10,000 people sought refuge inside this small church. On April 11, 1994, soldiers threw grenades to open the gate door to the church. The scars of the grenade are still evident on the concrete floor. The soldiers proceeded to kill everyone inside the church, even playing soccer with victims' heads. No one is exactly sure how many survivors there were. My guide tells me, however, that only four people survived. The church has been left as a memorial site.

For several years after the genocide, the church was left in its same condition. Jean Hatzfeld describes entering the church memorial and smelling death. In the sacristy like some sort of ritual sculpture was 'the entwined and mummified bodies of a mother and her child, still pierced by the wooden spikes used to mutilate them to death.²⁸³ There were heaps of skulls and other bones showing signs of machete strikes. The physicality and corporeality of these remains memorialized the dead in the mode of ruins, leaving an accurate portrayal of the brutality that occurred by leaving the bodies as they fell. But this conflicts

²⁸³ Jean Hatzfeld, *Life Laid Bare: The Survivors in Rwanda Speak*. New York: Other Press, 2000, 160.

with the memorialization impetus for giving people a decent burial, and also conflicts with financial considerations, including the high cost of preservation. This caused survivors and others to find problems with the stark corporeal memorialization of leaving the bodies in situ because perhaps the victims are unable to be laid to rest, or as one survivor says, they 'cannot bury their humiliation beneath the earth.'²⁸⁴

At Nyamata this was solved by the construction of a memorial that was intended evoke the 'true' nature of the genocide and what occurred there, maintaining the impact of the bodies and their loss, while still giving dignity to the victims. This is a warring impetus that is seen in much of Rwandan memorialization discourse. Inside the church now there are rows of wooden pews covered with stacks of the clothes of the victims. All of them have acquired a reddish hue from dust from being exposed to the air. The floor is also covered with reddish dust, evoking the sensation that one is walking on floors reddened with blood. Walking around the church, it is almost impossible not to brush up against the clothing. One hat is torn and cut by machete strikes. On a large pile of clothing at the back of the church someone has laid a large wooden cross on top. There are also plastic flowers laid on top of the clothing and several bundles of natural flowers which are wilted and dead and crumbling into dust that mingles with the dust of the clothing that is itself also disintegrating.²⁸⁵ At the front of the

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 204.

²⁸⁵ It is worth mentioning here that this itself is controversial among the museum and preservation community. It is perhaps inevitable that, displayed in the condition in which they are currently, the clothing at Nyamata will not last beyond another several years. However, due to the way it has been displayed, it is perhaps too difficult to remove the clothing. It would likely do more damage.

church is a large altar with items left on it as if they are a cobbled together museum display. There is a watch, a machete, an identity card, and a rosary. Over the altar is a white cloth which is no longer white and appears to be covered by a large blood stain. The story told by one of the survivors, according to my guide, is that a pregnant woman was butchered on top of the altar during the genocide, and the cloth has been left there.

In addition to clothes, there used to be bodies, for several years after the genocide. Then the decision was made to bury the bodies in mass graves behind the church, but to leave the clothes. Now at Nyamata, inside the church, there are no bodies, aside from down some stairs underneath the church. Bodies are not on display inside the church; clothing is. But clothing is itself corporeal in that it is evocative of the body that wore it. Only bodies wear clothes. The display of clothes is itself a political display which relies on embodied practices. As Rosemary Shinko writes, 'clothing and other forms of bodily adornment provide contextualized frames of reference for understanding the ways in which bodies become culturally meaningful.'²⁸⁶

Clothing, in this instance, is interestingly disaggregated from the bodies it once belonged to and defined. If, as Shinko elaborates, 'dress is a site where

http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p503054_index.html, 10.

Some have suggested enclosing the clothing under glass cases to preserve it, but it seems unlikely that this will occur given the way it would dilute the impact of the memorial. It seems that perhaps the site is destined to decay. The other issue with this is that visitors are not prevented from touching the clothing or the objects on the altar, which hastens their decay.

²⁸⁶ Rosemary Shinko, 'This is not a Mannequin: Enfashioning the Body of Resistance,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association Annual Conference 'Global Governance: Political Authority in Transition', Le Centre Sheraton Montreal Hotel, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, Mar 16, 2011,

politicized embodiment emerges in response to various local, national and global influences and where power is both formative and transformative'²⁸⁷, then what kind of political implications are there when clothes are separated from bodies, yet both overtly displayed? This is true of most memorial sites in Rwanda, where mass graves have been dug up to re-bury the bodies with dignity. Yet when these bodies are exhumed, the clothing is removed, washed, and displayed separately. The washing is itself interesting, since the clothing is being displayed as evidence, yet this evidence is literally watered down and sanitized for the purposes of display. Bodies are disaggregated from their clothing. Clothing becomes a frame of reference for understanding bodies, even when the clothing is separated from the bodies themselves, both then on display. What message does the clothing at Nyamata send? The clothing itself represents politicized embodiment by recalling the individuals who wore particular pieces of clothing, yet the way the clothing has all acquired a reddish dusty hue is indicative of the homogeneity that has come to characterize Rwandan genocide memorialization and the difficulty of individualization in a mass grave. Even the clothing, an individualizing factor, has been stripped of the bodies, which are now simply bone, and the clothing itself becomes as homogenized as the shelves of bones.

The clothes at Nyamata are overwhelming, they just go on and on for miles. A visitor near me says a prayer with lowered head. I hear someone in the background say, 'are there more mass graves over here?' At Nyamata, there are two sets of graves. Underneath the church, down a set of stairs, is a display of

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 14.

skulls and bones, and the special grave of one Tutsi woman. The story goes that she refused to marry a Hutu when young. He got revenge by killing her child, sexually abusing, and mutilating the woman. She is laid to rest in a coffin covered with a white satin cloth and lace, with a large wooden cross over it, in a place of honor amongst skulls and bones on display. Some of the skulls have bullet holes, others machete strikes. The other set of graves is outside the church, and includes a minor memorial composed of two individual graves of Italian aid workers and the large set of mass graves in the back of the church which the visitor can descend into. Going down into them is like descending into catacombs. A smell of dust and mildew grips the visitor as s/he descends, first faced with a row of skulls, then a set of coffins covered in purple and white cloth. At first it may seem as though one is descending down into a display of coffins, but there are only a few of these, unlike the numerous skulls that start to surround the visitor. The sheer number is overwhelming: thousands and thousands. I walk down the narrow passageway and am literally surrounded by bones on rough wooden shelves. I see a small child's skull, a skull with one horizontal machete slash, one that is shattered.

The combination of the display and the smell, as well of the feeling of being closed underground, is enough to provoke a nauseous feeling. What to do in this position? Turn around and leave? Some visitors immediately rush out of the stairs, unable to take it. Others stay and force themselves to see the entire display, perhaps trying to look into the empty eyes of the skulls on display, trying to envision them as individuals, but overwhelmed by the sheer number. Above ground, they appear to be sanitized white tiled slabs. But underground it is completely different.

The underground mass graves at Nyamata represent an encounter with bare life, both literally and symbolically. Life has been stripped bare to the bone and is displayed for the visitor. But bare life as a political phenomenon is also on display. Bare life is not simply natural life, but 'life exposed to death'.²⁸⁸ Bare life is a human victim who may be killed but not sacrificed,²⁸⁹ meaning that his death is not considered a violation of law because the sovereign is permitted to kill without committing homicide and without it being a sacrifice. Bare life, in Butlerian terms, then, is that life which is constructed as ungrievable, or as Agamben says, 'in modern biopolitics, sovereign is he who decides on the value or the nonvalue of life as such.'²⁹⁰ What is on display at Nyamata in the mass graves is life that has been stripped bare by the inscription of sovereign totalitarian power, especially when we conceive as genocide as perhaps the ultimate case of the exercise of biopower and the instrumentalization of life.²⁹¹

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 83.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., 142.

²⁸⁸ Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995, 89.

²⁹¹ As Agamben says in regards to the Holocaust, 'the Jew living under Nazism is the privileged negative referent of the new biopolitical sovereignty and is, as such, a flagrant case of a *homo sacer* in the sense of a life that may be killed but not sacrificed. His killing therefore constitutes, as we will see, neither capital punishment nor a sacrifice, but simply the actualization of a mere 'capacity to be killed' inherent in the condition of the Jew as such. The truth—which is difficult for the victims to face, but which we must have the courage not to cover with sacrificial veils—is that the Jews were exterminated not in a mad and giant holocaust but exactly as Hitler had announced, 'as lice,' which is to say, as bare life'. See Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 114.

Bare life relies on a conceptualization of the power which renders that life bare. For this, it is useful to explore Agamben's concept of thanatopolitics, or the politics of death, which can be considered an intersection of biopower, the Foucaultian conception of individualizing power which constructs the subjectivity of subjects and has the power to make live and let die, and sovereign power, which has the right to let live and make die. Agamben argues that the emergence of thanatopolitics can be seen in Hitler's Germany, where we see the intersection of making live and making die.²⁹² The characteristic feature of this is that people in fact do not die, but rather, 'corpses were produced, corpses without dead, nonhumans whose decease is debased into a matter of serial production.²⁹³ The production of bodies after genocide, then, is this precise production of corpses. And many argue that the display of bones replicates this logic of genocide, rendering these lives ungrievable. One of the visitors I interviewed said of Nyamata that displaying bones there in the mass graves is not proper memorialization: 'for the mass graves, it may sound childish, but if I were them, I wouldn't want to be stared at by strangers. I felt as if I was disturbing them. It shouldn't be like that. We just go into the mass graves and we don't even know the name of the people in the graves. We just stare at the bones, the skeleton, their head, it's just strange because we just see it, and for me, I feel it's a bit scary, it's a grave and we should pay respect to them, these victims, so I felt very bad

²⁹² Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*. Zone Books, 2002.
²⁹³ Ibid., 28.

and very sorry for them.' The site of the grave perhaps comes to overshadow the meaning of the life.²⁹⁴

When I personally visited Nyamata, what I found truly eerie was that as I came up into the light from the underground mass graves, a yard worker was trimming the grass behind the church with a large machete, the primary instrument which was also used to kill during the genocide. The sound of a swinging machete is a sound unlike any other in the world, and to hear this sound as one emerges from a mass grave containing thousands of bones, bones which used to belong to or be part of people who were killed by machetes, is eerie.

Ntarama is considered to be sort of a sister memorial to Nyamata, perhaps due to their relative proximity to one another. But Ntarama is quite different than Nyamata. Ntarama, for one, is a much smaller site. But the story is very similar. Thousands of area residents fled to the church seeking safety. But on April 15th and 16th, 1994, militia forced their way in through using grenades to open the door, and approximately 5,000 people were slaughtered inside and on the grounds of the church. After the genocide, it is said that UNAMIR took and hid many of the bodies, so there are many fewer than 5,000 remains on site.

Immediately after the genocide, things remained largely as they were when the genocide happened. 'Bones are scattered between the pews, the bullet holes and grenade blasts have not been plastered over, piles of decaying clothes lie in the corner.'²⁹⁵ Stray dogs picked at the bones and the building itself was

²⁹⁴ Taussig, Walter Benjamin's Grave.

²⁹⁵ Walsh, 'Digging Deep.'

crumbling.²⁹⁶ As the surrounding town recovered from the genocide, bones and other remains from surrounding marshes and rivers were placed in the church. But in recent years the impetus for proper memorialization has been strengthened, and financial resources were devoted to this. For example, at Ntarama, the British government donated a roof covering to be placed over the church as a form of preservation. The church was also cleaned up and a display created, and a guide is paid to give tours of the site. But the bullet holes and grenade blast scars remain.

The church is fairly small, and at the back are metal shelves that display bones. They have sorted the bones by type, including skulls, longer bones, and several bones clearly belonging to children due to size. These small skulls stand out the most. They are almost haphazardly displayed, without much rhyme or reason except for bone type. It is almost as if the smallest skulls disrupt the neatness of the homogenous rows of skulls. There is clothing hanging from the walls and ceiling, with empty pews and benches, a departure from the pews covered in clothing that is so expressive at Nyamata. Ntarama is oddly different from Nyamata. There are no mass graves at Ntarama, just skulls and bones at the back of the church. The clothes are on the wall rather than laid out over the pews, and so the empty pews send a message of emptiness and lack. At the front of the church are several coffins draped in white and purple cloth. When people from the area find victims killed outside the church, they bring the remains to the church to be buried in these coffins which sit at the front. In the first half of 2011,

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

there have been six new coffins placed here. What is striking about this is the differentiation from the newly discovered remains and the ones that have been in the church all along. It seems as though it is deemed only acceptable and dignified to inter the remains found now in coffins, but why, then, display the others on shelves? Why not simply add the newly found remains to the display that is already there, especially as there is not much space in the church for these newly added coffins? The individualization of the bodies at the front of the church almost seems at odds with the crowded shelving at the back of the church, two competing narratives of memorialization and dignified burial or display.

Also at the front of the church is a very small exhibit of items, mostly materials people brought with them when they sought refuge in the church, including mattresses, dishes, and pens. There are also several weapons including machetes and a wooden club with nails stuck in it. Especially at the front of the church, grenade holes are evident in the windows and walls. The church windows are broken stained glass, and blood is still evident on the walls that are torn up by grenade blasts. Behind the church are two small buildings where torture and killings took place. One was burned with people inside. Charred clothing is still evident on the ground.

The other was primarily used for killing babies and torturing women. The guide shows us a large blood stain still evident on one of the walls, which he says is where all of the babies were killed by throwing them against the wall. So many babies were killed this way at this spot that the stain has remained. This stain represents the logic of corporeality that underpins genocide memorialization in Rwanda. The stain of the body is itself considered the ultimate evidence and therefore, the ultimate memorial. The human being itself memorializes the loss of humanity that occurred during the genocide, both in terms of the immense loss of lives and the dehumanization associated both with the lead-up to the genocide and with the actions of the perpetrators. The victims were no longer human beings; they had been dehumanized by the logic of the genocide which constructed them as less-than-human. The perpetrators were no longer human beings; they had been dehumanized in the instant they picked up a machete against their own neighbor, in the process of killing itself. In the face of the disappearance of the human, it remains fitting that the representation and memorialization of the genocide is simply bare life itself: not even the human body but the stain of a body on a brick wall.

He also points out a large stick which has been carved to a point on one end which was used for raping and mutilating women before killing them. It was mostly women and children that were killed at Ntarama, because many of the men in the area had left to join the RPF resistance. The tour guide at the site is knowledgeable about the site, and I ask him why he chose to become a guide here. The primary reason, he says, is his past. He is a genocide survivor from this very area. He also needs a job, and it may as well be this one. He tells me that not many survivors can have the courage to give tours like this. It is telling that the first words he says in response are 'my past.' Ghosts linger at the site, and he seems almost in communion with them here.

It is worth unpacking here the notion of bones on display, since I have discussed them in the context of Kigali Memorial Centre, Nyamata, and Ntarama. What does it mean to display skulls and bones? The word display itself can mean to unfold or spread out or reveal, but originates from the Latin 'displicare', meaning to scatter apart. In this case, the term display is particularly apt. The body is itself *unfolded*, put into its pieces, spread out so that we can see its inner parts and workings, in this case, literally so because the bones are displayed by type, the skulls all together and the other bones sorted by type. The body is itself spread out. The very nature of genocide is *revealed* by the display, and the bodies of the dead are shown to us in some sort of ultimate revelation. The manner of death is also revealed by the cuts on display. In this way, the killers in the background are also revealed, as is perhaps the nature of humanity that made such an event permissible. The bodies are *scattered apart*, piece by piece, not distinguishable from one another, where the bones form one human mass that is then superficially sorted by bone type, recalling the logic of genocide which scatters not only bodies but also families, spaces, and society itself.²⁹⁷

An interesting site is one at which there are no displays, not yet, but we can see the preparation for this display. When I visited Ibuka, the umbrella survivor's group, located on Nyanza Hill in Kigali, in mid-2011, I noticed a brand new building on the property, which I was told will ultimately become a museum.

²⁹⁷ Indeed, display of bodies is particularly significant in the context of a society where there is no tradition of displaying bodies or corpses. Thus tradition cannot explain the display of bodies. Neither can financial considerations, as Kigali Memorial Centre is supported by a large amount of foreign donations, yet still chooses to display bones in particular contexts.

A large warehouse holds many artifacts from the genocide, including photographs, testimonies, and physical objects including weapons, clothing, and other materials. At first glimpse, it looks like a site under construction with large equipment such as backhoes and diggers behind the building. I assumed they were simply doing some construction. This is until I saw that the tractors were in fact unearthing mass graves. A large pile of overturned dirt sat on the site, next to a large open hole in the ground. Stacks of clothing littered the site, and there were ten or fifteen people clustered around the edges of the deep hole washing clothes and sorting bones and skulls on tarps.²⁹⁸ It looked like an excavation.

Then I am told the story of Nyanza Hill. In 1994, the UN was stationed at the ETO, a school a short distance away where thousands of Tutsis sought refuge after the start of the genocide in early April. Approximately 5,000 Tutsis were massacred when the UN pulled out on April 11. The bodies were taken to nearby Nyanza Hill, which had been a landfill, where they were simply left in the rubbish area as bodies decomposing on a hill. There are only 80 known survivors of this massacre. Then, thousands of white crosses were placed on the hill as a memorial. In 2008, the decision was made to dig up the hill and rebury these victims. They are unburying the mass graves in order to properly rebury them. In between, the bodies are in the great hall in the building on the property. A Rwandan friend tells me that this decision is not a good one. They shouldn't change the site where people were killed, because it destroys the proof. He is a

²⁹⁸ This observation matters, because it means that bones are not necessarily already disaggregated in the mass graves. Bodies are held together, then displayed apart purposefully. The same is true of clothing, which is purposefully disaggregated from bodies, even washed so as to be displayed.

bit angry that they have built the house on the hill where the Ibuka offices now sit. They should instead, he says, leave the clothes on the hill, because it shows more impact than large white mass graves. Perhaps they should bury the remains in a coffin at the place where they were killed in order to truly give them dignity. But this unburial and reburial is not dignity.

Nyanza Hill thus represents the inherent contestation surrounding memorialization in Rwanda. The executive director of Ibuka notes that this area carries the shame of the international community because they left people to die, a complex memory in and of itself. Then we also see disagreement among survivors as to what should be done with the bodies. Meanwhile, the graves have been dug up and the bodies are kept in the building and then will be reburied later on. While their new mass grave is being constructed, the bodies are simply stored in a warehouse. This example really speaks to the importance of bodies and burial in Rwandan genocide memorialization. It is as if the burial of these bones represents the taking back of these bodies from the ideology of genocide. But does unearthing their rest simply to repurpose their clothes for a museum and rebury them again in a whiter, cleaner, mass grave really do this? It does speak to the importance placed on dignified burial in Rwanda.

This is also true of Murambi, where mass graves were unearthed and some of the bodies were reburied, while others are on display. Murambi was a school in the process of being built in 1994. The head of the province encouraged Tutsi who were hiding in churches in the area to gather at Murambi. They were told that it would be safe, but instead it was used as a way to gather them together in

156

one place to kill them more easily. On April 9, 1994, Tutsi started arriving at the site from throughout the region. Approximately 55,000 people gathered there. First, soldiers cut off the water and electricity at the site. On April 18, soldiers attacked and were repelled by Tutsi with stones. The soldiers returned on April 21 and started to kill. There are only 14 known survivors of the massacres at Murambi. It was relatively easy to kill because they were all gathered in one place on an isolated hill, weak from hunger, and highly demoralized. Additionally, many were from rural areas and had never encountered guns or grenades before so they had no idea what was happening.

On the site, there are mass graves like most memorial sites in Rwanda. But what makes Murambi unique is the 848 bodies that are preserved in lime displayed at the site. In 1995, some survivors of the area came to Murambi and found some fresh bodies. Because so many people had been buried in one grave, they were so tightly packed together that some bodies had not yet decomposed. So the National Museum in Rwanda decided to preserve the bodies in lime. Our guide at the site, Emmanuel Murangira, is himself a genocide survivor. He has stood watch over the mass graves since the genocide, even before there were plans for a memorial in this area. Indeed the memorial didn't open officially until May 2011. Murangira stood watch there to ensure that the remains did not disappear as evidence of the genocide. As the memorial construction at that site began, he stated, 'now I can do something else'. As Rory Carroll remarks in relation to this comment, 'these centres offer a chance to end their vigil and rebuild their lives.²⁹⁹ The burden of memory is lifted from the shoulders of Murangira and instantiated in the monument site. James Smith, one of the planners of the Kigali Memorial Centre describes that upon its opening, survivors told him 'we don't need the bones now.³⁰⁰ But Kigali Memorial Centre still has the bones, and Emmanuel Murangira is still at Murambi.

As he takes tour groups around the site, he first stops at the mass graves to talk about the seriousness of the site. He states that a "memorial is a special area that is different from other areas," emphasizing the importance of representing memorial space as singular and different from ordinary space, both because of what happened there (a tragedy), and what is there now (bodies and memories). This reinforces the construction of memorial space as sacred space, an idea to which we will return later. The idea he suggests, though, is that the presence of the bodies at the site has literally reconfigured the space we inhabit at that moment. He suggests a moment of silence to pay respect at the mass graves to prepare for what is ahead.

Murangira refers to the bodies as 'sleeping' in the rooms. This reference to the activity of a live individual interestingly blurs the lines between life and death, between the community of the dead and the living. It is, as Derrida says, neither life nor death, but the haunting of one by the other.³⁰¹ It makes it hard to grieve for those who are just sleeping, but this euphemism is perhaps intended to

²⁹⁹ Carroll, 'In Memory of Murder.'

³⁰⁰ Wrong, 'It was sobering- but in a good way', 12.

³⁰¹ Jacques Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001, 41.

soften the blow of visiting the bodies. They do not look like they are sleeping, contorted into odd positions, holding their hands up to shield themselves for the machete strike that has already happened, yet seems to be perpetually about to happen because they are forever frozen in that position, forever in the moment where they are about to die, yet also already dead. In this sense, they disrupt all sense of temporality, because their death has already happened, yet we see them before their death has happened, but they are anticipating their own deaths. They are thus frozen in an impossible moment, as Nicki Hitchcott characterizes: 'forever trapped in the horror of experiencing their own deaths.'³⁰²

Because they are experiencing it, they are in fact fully alive even as they are dying and then dead. 'The human subject has to be fully alive at the very moment of dying, to be aware of his or her death, to live with the impression of actually dying. Death itself must become awareness of the self at the very time that it does away with the conscious being.'³⁰³ The bodies at Murambi are thus frozen in this instance of ultimate self-awareness. The imminence of death presents itself, but at the same time, as Derrida says of death, 'it is always at the point—in presenting itself—of presenting itself no longer.'³⁰⁴ The bodies at Murambi are thus both dead and not dead, both about to die and already dead, both imbued with the knowledge of death and in the silence of death itself. In this way they represent the proper characteristic of specters discussed in Chapter 2,

³⁰² Nicki Hitchcott, 'Writing on Bones: Commemorating Genocide in Boubacar Boris Diop's Murambi.' *Research in African Literatures*, vol. 40, no. 3 (2009): 48-61, 49.

³⁰³ Mbembe, 'Necropolitics,' 38.

³⁰⁴ Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*, 66.

neither living nor properly dead,³⁰⁵ blurring the ontological line between life and death through haunting.

The bodies are truly horrific. There are two babies on a desk. Mummified jean shorts on a child are still visible. Other clothes are evident, as are bits of hair on the heads of some of the bodies. On some of the bodies, a gash in their heel is evident. I know from reading testimonies that striking the heel was standard practice during the Rwandan genocide. It was done at the end of a long day of killing when the killers were tired, too tired to keep killing. They would strike the heel with a machete, rendering the person unable to walk, and therefore unable to get away. The killers would then rest and return to finish off the person later or the next day. There is room after room of these preserved bodies laid out on wooden slats. The rooms smell chokingly of lime, like breathing in poison.³⁰⁶ This is not a traditional memorial composed of a triumphal arch or granite obelisk. At Murambi, the bodies preserved in lime are not sanitized by white clean stone structures, but appear in the midst of the tragedy, preserved in the moment of the genocide itself, where the past will always haunt the present with its traces that exist too starkly to be ignored.

Visiting the rooms makes me nauseous. Other visitors cry or simply leave, unable to look any more. Interestingly, only some of the rooms are open for public viewing. I wonder why some bodies have been disinterred as evidence

³⁰⁵ Mary-Jane Rubenstein, 'Of Ghosts and Angels: Derrida, Kushner, and the Impossibility of Forgiveness,' *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1 (2008): 79-95, 86.

³⁰⁶ Literally so in fact. One of the critiques of Murambi by many museum professionals is that the lime is toxic both to visitors and the site's employees.

of genocide if they are not intended for viewing. The bodies are ordered in a certain way, Murangira says. There is one room for adults. One for babies. The 'true image of genocide' is found in these bodies, he says. But what does this mean? Image in relation to the genocide seems to be exceedingly important.³⁰⁷ One of the survivors I interviewed says that 'when you commemorate, you get an image to try to build your present.' The term image derives from the Latin and refers to a copy or picture, also referring to one's reflection in a mirror. The notion that one can arrest the reflection of the genocide, while at the same time that this representation can only ever be a copy of something that does not exist without its reflections and representation, fits closely with the logic of haunting described in Chapter 2. The 'true image' of the genocide, as Murangira refers to Murambi, is exceedingly complex. While he is referring to the display of the preserved bodies as this image, what is important to keep in mind that is these bodies, like the mirror function discussed previously, disrupt the lines between life and death, between identifiable life and identifiable death.

One of the visitors to Murambi I interviewed tells me that she believes that the display of bodies at Murambi simply replicates the logic of genocide that desubjectified these individuals; now they and their corpses are further desubjectified. 'I am opposed to that way of displaying people's dead bodies,' she says. 'It's just they don't respect these people in those rooms, just keeping their

³⁰⁷ Interestingly, Marilyn Ivy refers to the importance of the image in memorialization in the sense that 'memorializing the dead is a way of replacing the memory of the dead person by substituting a marker (or memorial) for the image of the dead.' See Marilyn Ivy, *Discourses of the Vanishing: Modernity, Phantasm, Japan.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995, 151. In this way, the image itself becomes obstructed by the memorial imaginary.

body dry, and maybe their intention is to show the cruelty of the genocide, but to me this way of displaying people just makes the people's lives less valuable. So I felt like as if the characteristic of the genocide itself, that they don't see the people's lives as human lives, and it looks like completely similar.³⁰⁸ Indeed the display of bodies at Murambi is extremely controversial, both within the survivor community and the larger global community. But others are concerned that without this kind of display, visitors are not really feeling what happened. Indeed one of the genocide survivors I interviewed said simply burying the bodies and having mass graves as memorial doesn't provide clear evidence of the genocide.

One survivor tells me that the message of any genocide memorial to foreigners is very clear: to demonstrate that there are clear events. Genocide happened in Rwanda, and foreigners should go back to their own countries and prevent genocide and counteract deniers that foreigners might find in their own countries. 'I saw the tombs where people are buried,' he says is the key message for foreigners to bring home. This fact that seeing the gravesite represents the ultimate firsthand experience of the facts of the genocide is striking. The body and the burial site here is the medium for understanding the events of the genocide. Another survivor I spoke with emphasized the importance of bodies in memorialization. She said that if she could design a genocide memorial, it would be multiple rooms for the bodies, separated by the way they had been killed. One

³⁰⁸ Indeed, Achille Mbembe refers to the production of skeletons in the Rwandan case: 'lifeless bodies are quickly reduced to the status of simple skeletons. Their morphology henceforth inscribes them in the register of undifferentiated generality: simple relics of an unburied pain, empty, meaningless corporealities, strange deposits plunged into cruel stupor.' See Mbembe, 'Necropolitics,' 35.

room would be people killed by machetes, with the instruments themselves also displayed as evidence. This emphasizes the seemingly natural link between bodies and memorialization in the Rwandan genocide imaginary, and explains the impetus for displaying bodies at memorial sites like Murambi.

A 2003 report on Murambi argues that memorialization here should be a priority because it represents one of the largest on-site slaughters in Rwanda. It is the only site 'where entire victims are preserved', yet it is precisely this 'entire' preservation that has engendered so much controversy. The report also mentions how important it is in memorialization at Murambi, that survivors should be able to visit freely the places where their families lie. The unfortunate and sad part about this is that there were very few survivors of the massacres. Additionally, one eerie fact about Murambi is that because of the large number of people who were killed there, Tutsis who survived from the area were traumatized and didn't want to return to their home villages, and Kigali offered more development and services, so they moved there. Very few returned to their home areas. The effect of this is that in many of the areas where there are these large memorial sites, there are very few Tutsis living there. What must also be conceptualized is that many of the residents around these sites were likely collaborators or perpetrators.

The report acknowledges the controversy surrounding the display of bodies at Murambi: 'there are differing opinions about what should happen to the preserved corpses. Some want to finally bury them. Others insist that they should remain as a testimony to what happened. A compromise is offered in this exhibition. It is planned that a small number of the preserved corpses and bones will be kept for display, but will be done so in a very dignified manner, as if in a burial chamber. Visitors will be able to see a glimpse into the burial chamber, but no more.' The designed burial chamber is built in the exhibit at the museum portion of Murambi, but it currently sits empty. This 2003 report represents just the beginning of the controversy surrounding establishment of a memorial at Murambi.

The memorial, sponsored by the Aegis Trust, who also sponsored the Kigali Memorial Centre, was intended to be opened in 2004. By 2006, the memorial still had not opened as a result of criticisms of the project by Rwandans that the memorial was simply not culturally sensitive. A report submitted to the trust by leading Rwandans labeled the design for the memorial 'monotonous' and felt that the choice of photographs to be displayed at the site were not relevant to what had happened at the site. The report states, 'the writing and photos do not represent a logic which coincides with the objective assigned to this site, namely the policy of memory, an education in the history of the genocide and in its prevention'.³⁰⁹ This statement gets at the heart of the debate over memory. This group of Rwandans felt that as a national and international monument, the Murambi site needed to be and do certain things.

James Smith, the head of Aegis Trust, remained sensitive to the perspectives of the Rwandans, stating to the London Guardian that 'the history of African nations has been written by foreigners for far too long; that is why we

³⁰⁹ Sandra Laville, 'Two years late and mired in controversy: the British memorial to Rwanda's past: UK Charity's plans for massacre site criticised: Centre is "monotonous," say prominent Rwandans,' *The Guardian*, November 13, 2006, p. 3.

have been sensitive to take on board criticism.³¹⁰ Smith also wrote a response to the article published in *The Guardian* which detailed the Rwandan critique of the Murambi memorial plans entitled 'Two Years Late and Mired in Controversy.' Smith writes that all memorialization processes involve contestation, and that this does not mean they are mired in controversy. He states that 'representing genocide is complicated, and debate around the memorial at Murambi is expected and necessary.' He labels the Murambi memorialization project particularly complex: 'Myriad questions surround this place, and our task is to bring dignity to the victims and facilitate consensus among divergent opinions in Rwanda. For example, what do you do with 800 corpses that lie in the former school when they are the only way desperate survivors can convey the tragedy?³¹¹ Smith's question is one which gestures to the questions of corporeality at the heart of Rwandan genocide memorialization. The bodies themselves have become the medium for the message of genocide, politically inscribed with the meaning that cannot be expressed through language of what happened.

On the grounds of Murambi, after walking through the rooms of preserved bodies, the visitor walks past a large hole in the ground, which is where the bodies were dug up from. It is on the site as a memorial, as an example of what mass graves looked like that held so many bodies. I am so struck by this large hole that I want to write all of my thoughts down before I forget them. As I write, the

³¹⁰ Ibid., 3.

³¹¹ Smith, 'Our Memorial to 50,000 dead is no empty historic exercise.'

security guard comes over to me. He speaks very little English, but I can tell that he wants to tell me something. He says in broken English that this is the site where the bodies were buried, the bodies that lie in those rooms, the bodies that I have just seen. I am struck by the need he feels to tell me this, that somehow this site is sacred because it once contained those bodies. It is not simply an open hole in the ground, but is significant because of its very emptiness. Its emptiness, right nearby the rooms that seem so full, overwhelmingly so, of bodies, is haunting.

Also on the site at Murambi is a resounding critique of the French, specifically Operation Turquoise. On June 23, 1994, the French soldiers arrived at Murambi as part of this operation to create a 'safe-zone' in Southern Rwanda, which ended up being more of a safe-passage-zone for many genocide perpetrators. Some Tutsi who were still alive and hiding in the bush saw the French soldiers and came to Murambi to be protected. But the French allowed the interahamwe militias in to kill them. There is a small plaque showing where the flag of the French Operation Turquoise flew. There is also a small plaque in the midst of grass and brush which shows where French soldiers played volleyball. It is right next to the mass graves where people were buried at that point. These were not the sanitized mass graves that one finds now all over Rwanda, but simply holes that had been dug in the ground to haphazardly bury all of the bodies. The French soldiers, upon coming to Murambi, found the bodies, buried them in mass graves, and built their volleyball court on top.

The site also contains a room of clothes, evidently a recurrent theme at Rwandan memorials. But, at Murambi, there are simply wooden bookshelves

along the walls of what looks like a large warehouse. The clothes are simply placed on the shelves, and it has less of an impact than the clothing at Nyamata because it almost looks like old rags on a shelf in someone's garage. One of the visitors I interviewed says that they should take more care with the clothing, because clothing can offer an even greater impact than bones. This idea, that clothing is itself able to reflect humanity and life better than the remains of that life itself, emphasizes the importance of the contextualization of identity clothing can offer.

At Murambi is also a museum exhibit, which sends the message that speaking about the past can help with reconciliation in the present and the future. One of the most interesting features of the museum is that on the way out, there is a place to leave post-it notes with comments, participating in the construction of the memorial itself, akin to the performativity at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington DC, with objects often left. At the Vietnam memorial, meaning is constantly changed and being shaped by its visitors. Objects including notes, flowers, medals, photographs, flags, dog tags, wedding rings, embroidery, Bibles, key chains, baseball gloves, and tennis balls are left at the wall. Some are traditional national objects, others deeply personal remnants. These mementos are relics of memory which make the memorial a monument able to be constantly rewritten and constructed by all those participating in the memory. Each day the items are removed by the National Park Service and stored in a warehouse, and then cycled in a display in the Smithsonian Museum of American History. Thus the monument contributes to other facets of memorialization in American

consciousness and identity. But the most important part of this is that each day the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is new and different; it is rewritten every day by those who visit it and thus participate in the construction of the memory of the event. This is true of the post-it notes at Murambi as well. The ability to leave comments is like writing memorialization itself. One comment I saw says 'I want to come back, I want to help heal.' The ability for the memorial to change allows for the performativity of memorialization.

At all of these sites, the body comes to serve as the representation of the memory of the genocide. It can act both as an emotional representation to family members, and as evidence for what happened. I asked all of the genocide survivors I talked to if they had visited any of the memorial sites and they all looked at me as if it was a stupid question. Of course they had, and all of them had visited the mass graves in the locality where they were from in addition to the main memorial at Kigali Memorial Centre. The body itself matters. The executive director of Ibuka tells me of a woman from the area near Murambi genocide memorial site. The woman asked Ibuka to please give her a body from Murambi. She said, 'I will bury it as my family member, since I don't know what happened to them.' He expands: people who do not know where their family members are buried often become traumatized, but this is less so for those who do know where their loved one is buried. They can then visit the gravesite where their loved one is buried, place a flower there, even if that site also contains the remains of thousands of others. So memorialization can help with the trauma by giving a defined site where memorialization practices can and are supposed to

occur. By laying out a particular space suitable for memorialization, and in this case, associating that space with the dead body itself, memorialization becomes possible. This notion that the body must itself be connected to or interred within a specific space that is known and defined as such represents the intersection between corporeality and spatiality in terms of Rwandan genocide memorialization. The body is itself inextricable from the politicized space which defines its resting place, and space is inextricably linked to what and who is laid to rest on that ground that becomes defined as hallowed or sacred.

This is true of the sentiments of many survivors. When James Smith, founder of Aegis Trust, visited Kigali Memorial Centre to help set it up, it was full of bones, a building floor to ceiling with bones. There was contestation over whether or not bones should be displayed there. Many survivors felt that the bodies were necessary as evidence. The compromise that was reached was to have a room of bones inside the memorial museum. Outside the bone room, a plaque reminds visitors that 'the human remains interred in this sanctuary were exhumed from the many mass graves around Kigali. Please respect the sanctity of their final resting place.' As the visitor walks into the room of bones, the audio guide says that the bone room is to remember the victims with dignity. The bones are displayed in large glass cases, divided by bone type. Four cases contain skulls, and two contain longer bones. A voice reads out the names of victims as the visitor sits in the room surrounded by bones under glass. The skulls look so small, and many have machete gashes. One has what looks like a bullet hole. One is shattered to the point that it is nearly unrecognizable as a human skull. In

some ways it draws its identification as such from the large number of other skulls it is displayed with, almost redeeming our ability to identify it as such due to the large-scale nature of the killings and thus the skull display.

Bodies are also representative of what has happened in Rwanda, which has itself become a site for thanato-tourism, tourism of death sites and memorials, in this case related to the genocide. Upon looking at tripadvisor, a travel website where people can leave reviews of hotels and tourist sites, there are pages for Kigali Memorial Centre, Murambi, Nyamata, and Ntarama. Many of these reviews include photos that the reviewer can post. One review from Murambi contains someone's personal photo of the preserved bodies on display, even though taking photographs of them is expressly forbidden. Another review of Nyamata contains a photograph of the clothing displayed on the pews, even though this is, again, forbidden. Why have these individuals shared their illicit photos, in one case, specifically of bodies? Why would this person have thought to take a photo of the bodies in the first place, much less share it with the tripadvisor community? There is a certain attraction to the site, a desire associated with the viewing of bodies. They draw us in. Being so close to death is revolting, yet it is hard to take one's eyes off of the bodies on display, and indeed they are intended to be seen. But it almost seems as though they are being commodified through such a display and through their re-presentation on the tripadvisor site. Like photographs of someone's beach vacation, these bodies are being instrumentalized as a representation of a tourist's visit to Rwanda.

But displaying bodies leaves us with perhaps more questions than answers. The politics of displaying bodies goes beyond simply the debate over dignified burial. It gets at the crux of what it means to be a politically qualified human being, one rendered visible by the logic of memorialization. Bones are interesting as the medium of display because any body can make bones.³¹² If any body can make bones, then what is the process of politicization of bones which renders them the appropriate medium for representing not only the individual but also the larger logic of genocide? Statecraft itself operates at a multiplicity of levels, sustained by a myriad of social and political practices. It is the contention of this analysis that one of these practices is the display of bones, which speak to the way in which we conceive of the line between life and death, followed then by what it means to conceive of politically qualified life.

On Naming: Walls of Names and Identifying Skulls

Naming has historically been considered important in considering the dead, especially in the case of mass atrocity, and especially in the Rwandan context, where precolonial funeral rites focused not on the corpse itself but on the name.³¹³ As WJ Booth writes, 'if the victims of mass crime are left faceless and nameless, if the hour, manner, and place of their last moments are unknown, then they are outside the light of the truth, lost to forgetting. The world is left

³¹² Sara Guyer, 'Rwanda's Bones,' *Boundary*, vol. 2, no. 36 (2009):155-175, 159.

³¹³ Guyer, 'Rwanda's Bones,' 159.

incomplete; its integrity broken; its reality undermined.³¹⁴ But, in the case of Rwanda, there is precisely this problem with naming the victims, in that the majority of the bodies of victims of the genocide remain unidentified. They are without names. This disrupts the traditional purpose of burial at a cemetery, which, in Michael Taussig's view, exists to ensure at least the appearance of a direct bond between name and body, the same magical link which language rests upon to tie words to their meanings. This link between name and body is ruptured by genocide. An interesting discussion of this idea comes in Avishai Margalit's assessment of David Edgar's play Pentecost, which tells the story of children on their way to a concentration camp. In the cattle truck, they become so hungry that they eat the cardboard nametags tied to their necks. It is clear, says Margalit, that no trace of the children and no trace of their names will be left after their deaths. What is terrifying to the viewer about the play is not that the children are about to die, but that they are going to be murdered twice, both in body and in name. This image of the double-murder is at the core of our attitudes towards memory and towards 'names as referring to the essence of human beings in a way nothing else does.³¹⁵ Just as the name is harshly separated from the body in the case of

³¹⁴ WJ Booth, 'The Unforgotten: Memories of Justice,' *American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, issue 4 (2001): 777-791, 781.

³¹⁵ Interestingly, Margalit goes on to discuss the emphasis on naming present in the Bible as well, specifically Deuteronomy, in which we can see this double murder: 'and the Lord shall blot out his name from under the heaven' (Deuteronomy 29:20), which implies both the destruction of the man and of his memory. Additionally in the Bible, remembrance is often done by passing one's name down to one's son. See Avishai Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002, 20-21.

genocide, so do many comment after genocide that it seems as though there is no language to speak about what has happened that can truly convey its meaning.³¹⁶

This is attempted to be remedied by construction of walls of names at many of the memorial sites. Several scholars have written about the problematic nature of Rwandan genocide memorialization in that the display of bones or bodies often remains anonymous. Sara Guyer, for example, argues that Rwandan genocide memorials problematically refuse to return names to the victims. She states, 'a pile of unrelated bones or a shelf with rows of carefully arranged skulls does not commemorate a person.'³¹⁷ But she fails to recognize the logistical problem of systematically naming one million people, whose bodies were mingled and fragmented by the nature of their killing, often thousands at a time in one small church. She argues that the memorials are not to the individual dead, but to the collective, to the absence of the individual.³¹⁸ She fails to offer up a

³¹⁶ Agamben discusses the way in which the term Holocaust arises out of an unconscious demand to justify a death that is without reason, to give meaning to what seemed incomprehensible. See Agamben, Remnants of Auschwitz, 28. Agamben goes on to characterize the Shoah as an event without witnesses in the sense that it is impossible to bear witness from the inside, since no one can bear witness from the inside of death, and from the outside, since the outsider is by definition excluded from the event. What we are left with is the survivor, who bears witness to missing testimony. In this context of memorialization, Robert Eaglestone similarly discusses the impossibility of identification with the Holocaust survivor. He argues that this impossibility marks the genre of Holocaust testimony, that it upsets our assumed notions of narrative as based out of comprehension through identification. It disrupts our ability to identify, and in doing so disrupts our ability to have an identity. Epistemologically, we cannot identify with the survivor because we can never have gone through what they did. Ethically, we should not identify with the survivor because doing so normalizes their experiences, assimilates them, excludes the otherness of the experiences of the survivor in an attempt to own them for ourselves through naming them, through knowing them in terms we can understand. These gesture to the difficulties of expressing an event such as genocide in terms of traditional language. See Robert Eaglestone, The Holocaust and the Postmodern. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

³¹⁷ Guyer, 'Rwanda's Bones,' 163.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 165.

solution to the problem of naming and memorializing individuals in instances of genocide, and indeed ignores the fact that an effort to individualize the victims has taken place through photographic exhibitions like the one at Kigali Memorial Centre, or naming efforts such as multiple walls of names. Indeed, she views the mass-ness as a problem, rather than as an inherent feature of memorialization of genocide. Exploring both the individualization and the mass-ness allows us to view genocide memorialization as something different from the memorialization of death. Genocide is not simply death. Death can be memorialized with a solitary tombstone with one name on it. But the very fact that genocide cannot be memorialized in this way speaks to its terrible qualities.

At Kigali Memorial Centre, a large wall of names is under construction, but there is a lot of blank wall left. There are around 1800 names listed on the wall, not anywhere near the number of people that are buried in the mass graves that are directly behind you as you gaze at the wall of names. As I stand looking at the wall of names, trying to focus in on one at a time, in some way to restore the humanity of that person, a father, a mother, a brother, a husband, a wife, a daughter, I become even more acutely aware of the large concrete slabs behind me. I look at a name and wonder, is that person, someone's loved one, buried in the slab behind me? I almost hear eerie ghostly voices. And when I looked at the blank slab of wall in front of me with no names, awaiting names, or maybe will never get names, I hear ghostly voices too. The graves beckon to me, and their eerie placement with the wall of names feeds back and forth in a chorus of voices. Names have particularly important features in the case of the Kigali Memorial Centre because there are no bodies and bones visible in the mass graves, and as Thomas Laqueur writes, 'names are the traces of bones.'³¹⁹ This comment is particularly interesting because bones are themselves traces of the body that was once composed of them, or, to many, the soul that once inhabited them. Thus names are traces of traces.

A memorial at the National University of Rwanda in Butare also is focused on individual identification. 2,500 people were killed in the immediate area, and 500 are buried at a memorial on campus. There are photos displayed with information about the individual. Most are students; some are teachers of the university. Ntarama Memorial also has a wall of names. Some of the names are circled in red chalk to mark their individuality. But if all of the names were similarly marked, then they would no longer stand out. What draws us in about walls of names in general is that even as they are individualizing, they also testify to the 'mass'-ness of the phenomenon, which must be large enough to necessitate a wall in the first place. As James Tatum says of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington DC: 'visitors who come looking for one name are made witnesses to the sum total of all of the deaths recorded there.'³²⁰

At Murambi, the process of identification was also envisioned as part of the memorial design back in 2003. A Report on the Murambi Genocide Memorial Centre in 2003 envisioned sandblasting the names of all of the victims onto a tinted window at the site. The report does acknowledge the difficulty of gathering

³¹⁹ Laqueur, 'Memory and Naming in the Great War,' 162.

³²⁰ James Tatum, *The Mourner's Song: War and Remembrance from the Iliad to Vietnam*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003, 5.

the names, which might take years, but would be possible and would represent the opportunity to include the wider society into the project. Some might say that the project is not simply difficult, but impossible. But what does it mean when naming is ontologically an impossibility?

What is interesting about the wall of names here and elsewhere is that it is so hard to identify bodies in the Rwandan context. Bodies are literally broken apart, scattered, and mingled together. The problem of naming bodies did not begin with Rwanda. Historically, tombs of unknown soldiers came to matter. They were seen as sacrificing all in the service of their country, even their name.³²¹ But the impossibility of naming every single individual in the Rwandan context lingers as an obstacle to proper memorialization, which remains centered around the name, and has not erased the drive to identify that is perhaps a feature of human nature.

At Nyamata Memorial, inside the church and down a set of stairs is a display of skulls on shelves, a very small display as compared to the large mass graves behind the church. On one of the skulls is written Patrice in what looks like pencil. It is unusual that this one skull has been identified. But what is more interesting about this phenomenon is the fact that Patrice was named. His loved ones could have marked the skull so that they would be able to find it again on their next visit to the church, so that they wouldn't have to remember which row or column of skulls he was in. But naming the skull is also a declaration to all who visit, a performance of the identity of this individual.

³²¹ Laqueur, 'Memory and Naming in the Great War.'

This declaration of the name is an interesting feature of Rwandan memorialization, given both the general lack of ability to identify bodies and the loss of the name upon death. Derrida discusses in relation to the death of Roland Barthes the fact that 'Roland Barthes' is now the name of someone who can 'no longer hear or bear it.³²² But if his name is no longer his, then was it ever uniquely his in the first place? This notion becomes interesting if we think about nominalization in the case of Rwandan memorialization. At Kigali Memorial Centre, there is the bone room previously mentioned, where names are read aloud. But is that done for the dead, who cannot hear it, or for the living? In the case of a wall of names, is it for the dead to identify themselves to themselves, or rather to reinforce to the living the importance of the proper name and the ability to hear/say/possess a proper name as that which differentiates the living from the dead? Thus naming at a wall of names makes the dead seem more alive simply by marking them with a proper name, as a gravestone might. As Derrida says of Barthes, 'when I say Roland Barthes it is certainly him whom I name, him beyond his name. But since he himself is now inaccessible to this appellation...it is him in me that I name, toward him in me, in you, in us that I pass through his name. What happens around him and is said about him remains between us. Mourning began at this point.'323

Despite the desire to name, lack of names can also evoke a strong emotional response. At Kigali Memorial Centre, there is a room which only

³²² Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*, 45.

³²³ Ibid., 46.

contains photographs. One of the visitors I interviewed said that this photo room was one of the most impactful things at any memorial site in Rwanda. The photos, because they are obviously contemporary, as evident from the fact that they are not black-and-white, and many are clear and crisp, as well as the fact that the picture individuals with clothing that we can identify as relatively recent, allows us to identify with the individuals pictured, he says. The photos were donated by families in memoriam. Some are most certainly identity card photos, perhaps a replication of the very thing that may have gotten this individual killed. Others are photos with family, wedding photos, normal, everyday photos. Most striking and sad are the photos with an entire family in them, and upon looking one knows that everyone in the photo was killed. There is space for adding more photos, yet the gaps themselves between the photos are oddly grief-stricken, indicating a lack of knowledge about what really happened, evoking the anonymous gravesites and bodies buried right outside. Perhaps an entire family was killed, and simply disappeared, no one left to donate or hang a photograph. Yet these empty spaces are evocative of this exact fact, of remembering those who are not there.

This use of the photograph is an interesting one. The photograph may be considered to be one of the most accurate depictions of reality, as it attests that the object captured has been real, and this induces a belief that the object is alive, at least through its memory. In this case it is particularly significant in evoking the vitality of the person pictured, even as the viewer knows that the person's picture is displayed precisely because they are no longer alive. This testifies to the fact that the photograph, as much as it is a depiction of reality, lacks contextualization, lacks meaning without the memory of the event to place it in its context, to provide a way to process the reality viewed. As Michael Taussig says, the photograph is both of the past and about the past.³²⁴ As such, it represents a certain site of transference between the past and the present. On one of the photographs in the photo room at Kigali Memorial Centre, someone has inscribed a message, 'les innocents ne meurent pas, ils se reposent.' This translates as 'the innocents do not die, they rest.' This is evocative of the line between life and death that is olten blurred in traumatic situations, and indeed the line between life and death that is blurred by the photograph. The photograph presents to us a reality that no longer exists: the alive, smiling individual in the photograph is no longer alive. Yet they also remain forever preserved in that moment of vitality. The photograph documents the past, before that individual was killed in the genocide, but in presenting us with the image, also blurs this temporality.

In this discussion of naming, it is important to also address the naming of sites, not simply the naming and identifying of bodies. The Kigali Memorial Centre has recently been renamed the Kigali Genocide Memorial, in 2011. Some survivors felt that the memorial was not overtly enough about genocide, and this needed to be something present in the name of the site, though many residents of Kigali simply refer to the memorial as the memorial at Gisozi, the name of the hill which it is on. The importance placed on the inclusion of the term 'genocide', a word which was not even in the vocabulary of Rwandans until 1994, emphasizes

³²⁴ Taussig, Walter Benjamin's Grave.

the importance naming a phenomenon can give to those remembering it. In 2004, when the memorial opened, everything was about genocide, so it didn't need to be included in the name itself. But, as time has passed, and society has started to move on, it needs to be specified as such: genocide needs to be specified. Freddy Mutanguha, the Director of the Kigali Genocide Memorial says that the main reason for the name change is that 'it's not a war memorial.' You can have a memorial for anything that happened. The key word is genocide.³²⁵

Naming it orders it for our comprehension and understanding, and allows 'everyone' to agree upon what it is and what it means, and perhaps then how it should be memorialized both in the Rwandan context and in the larger global context of genocide and genocide memorialization. This is particularly apt in referring to the Kigali Memorial Centre because it is modeled after the UK Holocaust Centre yet with a Rwandan spin in consultation with Kigali officials and survivors. What is interesting about the name change is that most of the political officials and survivors I talked to mentioned the way in which, especially during the April commemoration ceremonies, mentions of genocide are everywhere and one cannot escape this. This seems in contrast with the stated reason for the name change, which is to emphasize that the memory is of a genocide, in the face of possible forgetting as the society around the memorial changes. This only reinforces the idea that the name change is not simply semantic or even related to practically identifying the function of the memorial,

³²⁵ This also interestingly recalls the semantic debate about whether to call Rwanda a 'genocide', thereby mandating intervention from the international community.

but rather also a way of constructing the meaning of the memorial itself in relation to society as a whole and in relation to the event, but also in the process of constructing the event itself by virtue of declaring its meaning through naming it according to a socially agreed-upon global definition: 'genocide.' The emphatic importance of this term must not be forgotten in terms of what it declares and what it invokes, specifically in terms of action, response, levels of victimization, and transition.

Scarred Bodies, Scarred Spaces, Scarred Buildings

Here it bears examination why certain spaces become the focus for memorialization. Why are some spaces considered key to memorializing, while others resume functional purposes? Why some spaces and not others? Throughout Rwanda, churches formed a key site for massacres. This is largely because in the early 1990s, smaller-scale massacres took place and people who sought refuge in churches were spared. Thus, in 1994, people felt that they would be safe in churches again. So they flocked to churches en masse. But they were not spared, and there are numerous instances all over Rwanda of entire churches full of people, from hundreds to thousands, being massacred. What is interesting is that some of these churches have become memorial sites, most notably Nyamata and Ntarama. But there are others that were simply cleaned up and now function as churches again. Why? One such church is in Kabgayi. 5,000 Tutsis were killed at this cathedral after they sought refuge when the priest closed them into the church and told the militias where they were hiding. The bodies were

moved elsewhere to be buried, and the site still functions as a church today. An international organization official in Rwanda told me about a visit to genocide sites he made in 2002. He saw various churches where you could see the indelible stain on the floor where a body has lain. The blood and body stain on the floor could not be cleaned away.³²⁶ The churches excavated the floors and replaced them, and many still function as churches today, like Kabgayi. One visitor to Rwanda said in our interview in regards to these kinds of sites, 'how can you sit there and pray after so many people have been killed in there?' This question speaks to the inability to understand why and perhaps how some sites become constructed as appropriate sites of memorialization and others not. It is easy for us to forget that in the drive to memorialize, there is work to be done, the work of construction, and not simply the physical construction of memorials, but the construction of space itself as sacred, or in other instances, as normalized space. The space becomes reconceptualized and reconfigured from genocidespace to sacred-space or normal-space.

It also bears examining why some buildings have been left scarred by genocide, while others have been repaired. Here I examine four main buildings: first is Nyamata genocide memorial, the church previously discussed. Here I will explore further why Nyamata has been left as it was, with bullet holes in the ceilings, with only some minor changes. Additionally I will explore Ntarama, a similar case. I will also explore the Belgian Peacekeeper's Memorial in Kigali,

³²⁶ The mark of the body is not one which can be erased, either physically or ontologically.

where gunshot holes and grenade blasts are evident on the building, and the Parliament, which also bears the scars of gun fighting.

Nyamata has already been discussed in the context of corporeality, the role of bodies and mass graves. Now it bears exploring spatiality at Nyamata, or why space is configured in a particular way there, specifically, why the scars of the genocide remain as a memorial. At the door to the church, grenade blasts are evident on the ground that have blasted away at the concrete floor. The ceiling of the church looks like stars at night because of the numerous bullet holes that let light shine in to the otherwise dark and shady church. The large vessel intended to hold holy water is also pockmarked with bullet holes. While the bodies have been removed from the church, and the clothing has been laid out on display, the bullet holes are also on display, both as evidence and as experience. They provide evidence for the way in which the door was blasted open and the way people were shot. But they also provide an experience to those visiting the memorial, both of a night sky and a metaphor of light shining through over the horrors of the genocide.

Leaving the scars serves a purpose, as Brent Steele elaborates in a different context. 'By revealing violence against the body of human beings...or even the physical destruction of an environment that is part of our daily existence, we are creating the most extreme juxtaposition one can create, between the romance of the violent Idealist and the reality of human destruction. Such a meeting...can provide a particular community an opportunity for pause, for reflection, and create a space within which further reflection is possible³²⁷ In this way, the physical destruction of a daily community site such as the church at Nyamata, can act in this manner. Space, because it has been violated and subject to destruction, is able to repurposed away from a church towards a different kind of sacred site, sacred precisely because it is scarred and thus enables a specific kind of reflection.

Ntarama is another site which has been reconfigured as a memorial site, while at the same time preserving scarred space. The primary feature of Ntarama that recalls this idea are the large holes in the walls and windows created by grenades which were thrown through the windows when the church was attacked. Interestingly, many of the planned changes at Ntarama have not happened yet or according to plan. LB Landscape Architecture, a London-based company, was hired to make a variety of changes at the site, and drew up a proposed plan in April 2004. Many of the changes still had not been made when I visited the site most recently in July 2011. The design plan lists key recommendations derived from meetings with government officials and representatives from Ibuka. This emphasized preserving the buildings and their character and the need to not dramatically alter the existing character of the site, while emphasizing care and respect of existing graves. Interestingly, the design also mentions the provision of a small chapel on the site, a place of prayer and contemplation. The fact that a chapel was deemed necessary reinforces the notion that this space is no longer a

³²⁷ Brent Steele, 'Alternative Accountability After the "Naughts," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 37, no. 5 (2011): 2603-2625, 2625.

church as it once was, is no longer a site solely intended for prayer, but now is a gravesite, a memorial, a provider of genocide evidence. The question becomes, at what point does the site cease to be a church and become alternately sacralized as a site of memory? Unlike Kabgayi, which continued to be constructed as a church and function as such, Ntarama stopped being a church and was reconfigured as a site of memory to the extent that a proposed other building was to be added to act as a church which could be a site for prayer and contemplation.

The Camp Kigali Genocide Memorial memorializes Belgian UN peacekeepers killed in the first days of the genocide who sought to protect the moderate Hutu Prime Minister. Prime Minister Agathe was a moderate Hutu who was targeted by extremists at the beginning of the genocide. 11 Belgian peacekeepers were assigned to protect her, but they were not able to and she was killed. They were captured and taken to Camp Kigali, where the Rwandan military was stationed. In a small building, they were held and ultimately all shot. Most were shot in the building, but one young soldier named Yannick tried to run out of the building, and the spray from the gunfire which greeted him and ultimately killed him is evident on the outside of the building. This has resulted in a building scarred on both the inside and outside by gunfire. There is now a memorial at the site built by the Belgian government, which includes one stone column for each soldier, with lines etched in matching the age they were when they were killed. Inside the building where they were killed is a very small exhibit about historical genocides around the world. What is interesting about this site is that the scarred building has been left together with the newly

constructed, more traditional memorial composed of stone columns. It is significant that the scars were kept as part of the memorial, testifying to what happened there, to the absent body which stood in front of the building as both the body and the building became scarred by the gunfire.

The Parliament is an interesting example of a building at which there is no formal genocide memorial, yet the scarred building functions as an informal memorial. Prior to the genocide, there were peace talks held between the government, led by President Habyarimana, and the RPF. As a token of good faith, several RPF members were staying in the Parliament building in Kigali. They were there when Habyarimana's plane was shot down and the genocide began. The building was shelled with grenades and gunfire, and these are the scars that remain. It acts as a particularly significant memorial precisely because it does not function as a memorial site. It is almost an invisible memorial. Most tourists do not visit the site as they do other memorials in Rwanda, and government employees go to work in the building every day. In this example, the reconfiguration is less overt, because the space is itself still used for the same purpose as it was before the genocide. But the physical reconfiguration of space remains and plays with levels of visibility. The Parliament is a very tall and large building, and the scars on the building can be seen from many different parts of the city because Kigali is spread over so many hills. In this sense, they are visible, highly so in fact, yet their visibility is masked by the governmental purpose the building serves. They are both visible and not.

186

Leaving the bullet and grenade scars in these two buildings: the Parliament and the Belgian Peacekeepers' Memorial, one still functional in the same way as a government building, the other a site devoted solely to memory, testifies to the importance raw scars can have. As Brent Steele remarks, 'the scar reminds us...of the fragility of bodies—humans, buildings—and the beauty they provide us.'³²⁸ In this sense, there is also beauty in the scar, not beauty in the traditional sense, but beauty in the poignant sense, as it recalls not only the structures in place that engendered such violence, but also the individuals who were shooting and being shot at.

Scarred buildings, like scarred bodies, draw on a framework of corporeality for the purposes of memorialization. They offer up a particularly interesting memorial in the Rwandan context because of the tremendous amount of development that has occurred since the genocide, particularly in new building construction. The juxtaposition of these new buildings with the old testify to the hauntings present. It is not simply that old scarred buildings haunt Rwanda. Rather, they disrupt our ability to firmly place the genocide in the past by shattering the past/present and old/new and developed/underdeveloped dichotomies, the final and ultimate feature of haunting.

Memorialization and Reconciliation: Haunting and Statecraft

I have traced the way in which memorialization in Rwanda becomes associated with practices of spatialization and of corporealization, but it bears

³²⁸ Steele, 'Alternative Accountability,' 2625.

further exploration as to the specific practices of haunting and its relationship with statecraft. For this, I examine state memorialization and reconciliation practices to explore how the state seeks to re-order society post-trauma through memory by using haunting: the literal crafting of the Rwandan state out of the ashes of genocide.

'Bodies-seen and hidden, lost and found, alive and dead, actual and virtual—bear the marks of power and the many local and global processes through which it produces subjects.³²⁹ But these local and national and global processes also often bear the ghostly marks and traces of these bodies, and this is just as essential. We do see political inscription on dead bodies in the case of Rwanda, and we see the exercise of power and contestation in these bodies and the sites in which they lie. Just as important, we see that processes and mechanisms of power and sovereignty are also marked by these bodies. The best way to trace this is by looking at reconciliation in Rwanda. Reconciliation is one of the key missions of the government and numerous government and nongovernmental agencies as part of the crafting of the Rwandan state after the genocide. But how has state power been impacted by these bodies, and are there traces of dead bodies and ghosts in these reconciliation mechanisms? This section seeks to explore this idea through an analysis of government policies of reconciliation.

Reconciliation is a sticky subject. Should it involve forgiveness? Memorialization? Forgetting? One student member of AERG tried to describe

³²⁹ Casper and Moore, *Missing Bodies*, 180.

the process of reconciliation: 'we have forgotten but we did not forget.' This paradox aptly fits the ambiguity of reconciliation in Rwanda. It is beyond the scope of this project to put forth a complete analysis of reconciliation, even if limited to the Rwandan case, and indeed there is much work done on the topic. The purpose of exploring reconciliation here is to view the impact of memorialization and the explicit role of the state in memorialization practices as they relate to reconciliation. In this sense, it is perhaps an analysis of how haunting relates to state practices of reconciliation and their effectiveness. Rather than examining the myriad processes of reconciliation at play, an effort will be made to look at the effectiveness of reconciliation and the remaining obstacles to reconciliation and to link these with the uses of haunting by the state.

The relationship between memorialization and reconciliation is a complex one, evidenced by the response of one of my interviewees. When I asked her if she thought memorialization helps with reconciliation or makes it more difficult, she first said that reconciliation can help bring hope to people's lives again, but then changed her answer and said that while unity and reconciliation are important, they cannot make you forget your husband, your kids, or the people you lost. Another interviewee says that memorialization helps with reconciliation, because when people visit the memorial sites, they are reminded of what happened and that they never want it to happen again, which spurs them towards reconciliation.

The visibility of names and bodies and spaces speaks to the underlying logic of haunting which permeates memorialization everywhere and specifically

in Rwanda. Some bodies are visible and others hidden, some grievable and others rendered ungrievable in the name of reconciliation. It bears exploring this notion of ungrievable lives further. It is not that certain individuals or lives are rendered permanently ungrievable, or always constructed as such. Rather, they are situated in a logic of reconciliation which dictates when the appropriate time is to grieve and when is an incorrect time.

Grieving in Rwanda is often situated within discourses of medicalization, portraying it as a medical problem or condition rather than as a natural or acceptable response to what has happened. Trauma permeates society and has only within the last five or ten years really been focused on by domestic and foreign psychologists. Every year the cases of trauma increase, and many say that even over 15 years after the genocide, Rwanda still has not healed, and psychologists say that many have not yet faced their trauma and might not for decades to come. Many during commemoration periods experience signs of trauma such as headaches or other physical malady and believe that it couldn't be associated with the genocide because they believe they have accepted the genocide, accepted the past, and are living with it. When they seek help for their pain, they often meet with counselors and realize that in fact their pain is a symptom of trauma from the genocide which they have not faced.³³⁰ Some believe the increase in trauma cases is because there are many Rwandans who only now have found ways to meet their basic survival needs and so are able to

³³⁰ Gina Moore, 'Rwanda's Genocide—15 Years Later,' *GlobalPost*, April 6, 2009, Available at http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/africa/090405/rwandas-genocide-%E2%80%94-15-years-later

confront the issues held at bay while they sought these basic needs. One survivor states in regard to trauma that 'trauma will be with us until we die - it is a part of who we are.'³³¹ This discourse demonstrates that for the survivors, the trauma and the experience of the genocide itself has become an integral part of their identity, of their very sense of self.

Yet, this trauma and its expression has been situated within a medical logic which implies that it needs to be 'cured' or 'treated.' On the 10th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide, President Paul Kagame gave a memorial speech at a stadium in Kigali. A news source reports that 'at the ceremonies in the stadium people broke into tears, others screamed hysterically and were carried off into white tents set up by the Red Cross.'³³² The women who wail and the men who faint on the anniversary of the genocide get taken away to a special room for those who 'get trauma'.³³³ These people who experienced traumatic memory were placed outside of the discourse of normality, and relegated to a medical tent as those who represent the diseased of society, as if they needed to be healed or cured from their memory rather than allowed to live it or live with it. One survivor describes this sentiment in general: 'I think that everyone would like the survivors to relinquish the genocide, in a way...as if we were from now on somewhat superfluous.'³³⁴

³³¹ Uwazaninka-Smith, 'Trauma is part of who we are,' 23.

³³² Ngowi, 'Western Leaders Absent as Rwanda Mourns', 24.

³³³ Moore, 'Rwanda's Genocide—15 Years Later.'

³³⁴ Hatzfeld, *Life Laid Bare*, 111.

Those who grieve are viewed as ill, as sick with trauma and thus they must be quarantined so that the memory and the associated trauma does not spread. This discourse of sickness permeates trauma in Rwanda. Wilberforce Murengezi's entire family was killed: his wife and 5 children, his brother, sister, brother-in-law, and six nieces and nephews. He ended up seeking medical help in Kenya where his doctor told him it was okay to cry.³³⁵ His trauma could not be dealt with in his own country because in Rwanda, it is not okay to cry. Those who cry are hidden away in exceptional medicalized spaces in the same way memory in general is hidden away in exceptional memorial spaces. One survivor explains that survivors have not spoken out or given testimony for so long after the genocide because they had 'found themselves "shouldered aside," as if they were now "in the way".'³³⁶ Because grieving is discursively abnormalized, the lives being grieved are rendered ungrievable.

Reconciliation is itself a project of statecraft: a project intended to craft a specific vision of the state. It relies on a specific relationship with the memorial sites in Rwanda, just as the living experience a particular relationship with the dead. The relationship between the living and the dead offer alternative ways of viewing that can challenge the way the state uses haunting to normalize particular political agendas. As Sara Guyer delineates in relation to Murambi, memorials serve the function of showing us the difference between living and dead, between the frozen white forms and those who remember them. She states, 'in leading us

³³⁵ Walsh, 'Digging Deep.'

³³⁶ Hatzfeld, *Life Laid Bare*, 5.

to see the dead as the perpetrators of the genocide saw the living, the memorials also lead us to just see the dead: the bones and cadavers of which every one of us is composed and will become, and which signal the event of death without rendering it intelligible.³³⁷ The memorials, then, speak to the hauntological: that which is prior to the distinction between politically qualified life and politically qualified death. They speak to the 'dead': the bones at the heart of our very biological life, the ghosts that are perhaps, then, ungovernable, unable to be rendered intelligible. If the memorials memorialize the unintelligible (genocide itself), then perhaps this is one of the ways in which they can resist the coopting of genocide for the crafting of the state itself.

The Rwanda Project: Conclusions by way of Aesthetic Representations

By way of conclusion, I'd like to explore two artists' representations of the Rwandan genocide. First, Bruce Clarke's 'Jardin de la Memoire', and second, Alfredo Jaar's Rwanda Project. Both draw on many of the themes discussed here and enable a provocative summary of the ideas presented in this chapter. Rwandan artistic practices after the genocide struggled with issues of representation, and ultimately focus on 'performative practice of visibility.'³³⁸ This performative practice of visibility gets at the politics of visibility and display in bodies that have been the focus of this chapter.

³³⁷ Guyer, 'Rwanda's Bones,' 174.

³³⁸ Nicholas Mirzoeff, 'Invisible Again: Rwanda and Representation after Genocide,' *African Arts*, vol. 38, no. 3 (2005): 36-39, 86-91, 36.

Bruce Clarke is an artist who works with the twin themes of art and memory. His project, Jardin de la Memoire (Garden of Memory) is a sculptural project inaugurated in 2000 which involves the placement of 1 million individually marked stones to memorialize the 1 million victims of the genocide. The stones will be laid out in circles starting at a central point so that as the stones get laid down, more and more people will be able to participate in the construction of the memorial. The stones are intended to replicate the terraced hills of Rwanda as the installation develops. Stones can be laid by groups or individuals, visitors or locals, family members or not, in the active process of remembering. Each of the stones will be marked by a participant with a name or a distinctive sign identifying a victim and then he/she will place the stone next to the stone previously placed in an ordered manner. Clarke, according to his website, views the stone itself as anonymous by definition, yet the process of associating a distinctive sign with it that is intended to represent one specific victim, and the process of placing it, individualizes the stone. Thus, he says, 'each stone will have an individual identity, and yet will be an integral part of the overall memorial representing the totality of the victims.³³⁹ So the individual act of memory, of placing the stone, is multiplied by a million stones to create a mass individualized act.

Interestingly, the sign marked on the stone can be anything, and need not be a name. The name need not be the final representation of the individual. The

³³⁹ Bruce Clarke, 'Bruce Clarke, Visual Artist,' Retrieved January 3, 2012 from http://www.bruce-clarke.com

sign can be a name, symbol, or even a photo, and can be permanent or ephemeral. In this instance, it speaks to the way in which identities are themselves fluid and often temporary, and memorialization is itself only one performance which intercedes onto a particular landscape, but that this intercession may only ever be a temporary one. It aptly represents the genocide and its victims by marking both the individuality and the mass-ness of the event, and the difficulty with identifying and individualizing in the face of such an event. Clarke refers to the memorial as 'defiant in the face of those who try to forget the genocide.'³⁴⁰ Clarke acknowledges that genocide cannot be depicted in a normal artistic sense. Because depiction is limited to that which can be depicted, it would only normalize the genocide itself. By involving the visitors and family members in the placing of the stones, Clarke believes the performative aspect can evoke a sense of community that heals the distance created by the unrepresentability of genocide.

Clarke attempts to synthesize the artistic role in preservation of memory. He views his project as contributing to the reconstruction of a traumatized population. He states, 'with this project, we had to make the reality of the genocide tangible. What was left after the genocide, what we could see, wasn't human anymore. It was a sort of abstraction: bones, mummified bodies. But these people had really existed; they had been people like you and me, who had a life behind them, a life now completely annihilated.'³⁴¹ His aim was thus to give

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

³⁴¹ Ibid.

individuality back by allowing each individual to occupy a certain prescribed space through the ordered and organized spaces for the stones. His project thus attempts to represent both this individuality and the mass-ness of the genocide.

He uses stones purposefully, because they represent a blank slate for signs to be inscribed on. He also deliberately avoids the use of human remains. He states, 'as a foreign artist, I didn't feel that I had the right to work with such sensitive material as human remains.'³⁴² Stone is this almost a substitute for human remains in an interesting way. But, by removing the human remain component, he allows the garden to be just a garden, not a cemetery, which would be composed of both stones and bones. The decision to avoid working with bodies is itself a political decision, particularly in a context where bodies form such an integral memorial component.

Alfredo Jaar is an artist who visited Rwanda immediately after the genocide in 1994, and struggled with representing the genocide through art. He bought up postcards depicting wildlife scenes and tourist slogans and other typical Rwandan scenes, and mailed them to friends in the US and Europe with a note saying that a particular survivor was still alive: 'Caritas Namazuru is still alive!', 'Josefine Mukayiranga is still alive!' His postcards emphasize a series of connected clichés about Africa in that the pictorial narrative of the postcards were animals familiar to Westerners who still had no knowledge about Rwanda, and the written narrative on the other side of the postcards was a refutation of the notion that the entire country should be written off. By naming the individual

³⁴² Ibid.

person, he attempted to counter the anonymous images of suffering that represent Rwanda. In doing so, Jaar forces Westerners to confront their own stereotypes and the way they tend to write off the genocide.³⁴³

Nicholas Mirzoeff details Jaar's journey: upon returning from Rwanda, Jaar was initially unable to look at the photographs he had taken, struggling with the issue of the representation of what he had seen. He created an installation piece entitled 'Real Pictures' in which he selected sixty of the photographs he had taken whle in Rwanda, and then 'buried' them individually in black linen boxes, which he laid on the floor. On top of the boxes, captions described the image within and contextualized it. Jaar created this 'cemetery of images' because he felt that 'the tragedy was unrepresentable.'344 Mirzoeff comments on this installation by exploring the politics of display and visibility at play. Jaar's installation is a commentary on the way in which the genocide is beyond visual representation; to attempt to represent it in this way would be to do an injustice to it. So in order to 'see' the genocide, Jaar constructed a new mode of display of photographs which involved their textual display rather than their imaginary display. In one of his photographs specifically, Mirzoeff details, Jaar has photographed Benjamin Musisi standing among the bodies in Ntarama church. The caption details that Musisi had asked Jaar to take his photograph there, to act as evidence to others that the genocide had actually happened. But, since Jaar has translated the image as text rather than displaying the image itself, he is actually

³⁴³ Mirzoeff, 'Invisible Again,' 87.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 87.

at odds with Musisi, who demanded visual evidence of the genocide and indeed demanded the very photograph which is not shown. Mirzoeff argues that this is an indication of politics of display and the ways in which the field of visual space is at the outset structured not to accommodate the subaltern point of view (in this case Benjamin Musisi's).

Another part of Jaar's Rwanda Project focuses on the eyes of survivor Guetete Emerita. One room contains a table piled with slides of her eyes. Alan Moore describes the pile: 'it is a snake-like heap some feet high and several feet long, which could conceal a few bodies,' estimated to contain over a million slides. Moore comments on the piece: 'This grave political event of incomprehensible dimensions has been humanized by Jaar, whose work insists upon it as one million instances of the kind of personal grief he encountered. He does this by combining quantity and sameness in a single miniaturized image. One million deaths, one million absences, one million survivors' memories'.³⁴⁵ Interestingly, the pile of slides are themselves evocative of a pile of a million bodies. They also resemble ashes, remnants of life. The project is a commentary on the (im)possibility of representing the genocide, both to ourselves and in general. 'The post-traumatic gaze of loss, like the buried images of Real Pictures, is here again sculpted into a mass grave or funerary heap, laid bare within a blinding field, in a gesture which attempts both to revive and bury at the same time. The powerful and haunting nature of The Eyes of Guetete Emerita lies in the

³⁴⁵ Alan Moore, 'Alfredo Jaar's Rwanda Project,' *Artnet Magazine*, May 21, 1998, available at http://www.artnet.com/magazine_pre2000/reviews/moore/moore5-21-98.asp

shaming gaze of this missed encounter, which is not only a missed encounter between Jaar and his subject, but a missed encounter between the West and Rwanda.³⁴⁶

Jaar's most interesting contribution is perhaps not simply in reckoning with the unrepresentable, but in playing with the line of representation. It allows us to move beyond consideration of monuments as representations and look at the memory-work they perform, and more closely explore these performances. As Jaar states, 'it was my most difficult project. That's why *The Rwanda Project* lasted six years. I ended up doing twenty-one pieces in those six years. Each one was an exercise of representation. And—how can I say this—they all failed'.³⁴⁷

What do these artistic representations tell us? Perhaps it is more appropriate to ask after the way in which these aesthetic presentations offer up something different than a representation, in order to reckon with the unrepresentable. Ultimately perhaps what the Rwandan context demonstrates is that statecraft operates at a multiplicity of levels and sites, including sites of memory, and that the questions and contestations raised by displaying bones and bodies and the constructions of particular spaces are not simply questions of memory or of representation. They are questions of how we understand the line between life and death itself, how we understand the identities of the living, and the remembrance of the dead, all in the service of a particular understanding of how to craft a state after genocide. What hauntology offers us is a way of

³⁴⁶ Olivier Chow, 'Alfredo Jaar and the Post-Traumatic Gaze,' *Tate Papers*, Spring 2008.

³⁴⁷ 'Alfredo Jaar: The Rwanda Project', *Art 21*, available at http://www.art21.org/texts/alfredo-jaar/interview-alfredo-jaar-the-rwanda-project

viewing Rwandan genocide memorialization beyond simply which memorials work, and rather to explore the work memorials do in the construction of subjectivities: dead, alive, traumatized, normalized, reconciled, forgotten, remembered, and political.

VANISHING MOMUMENTS: ABSENCE, THE LOGIC OF VANISHING, AND 9/11 MEMORIALIZATION

The question of absence originated in ancient times as ruins decayed and the question of whether to preserve them or let them fall apart emerged. But in relation to trauma and memory, the question was perhaps first posed in relation to the Holocaust, where a new aesthetic of absence was invoked. Alison Landsberg describes the way that piles of belongings in museums evoke this aesthetic because they evoke the absence of the people to whom they belonged. In the case of genocide, this absence is inextricably intertwined with the violence of their deaths. She describes the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and its famous exhibit with a pile of shoes found at a concentration camp: 'each shoe bears the trace of the absent body that lived and marked it.'³⁴⁸

These piles of belongings stimulate our mimetic faculty in the sense that we feel connected to the objects even while remaining aware of the differences that exist. At the same time that we experience the shoes as their shoes, which could very well be our shoes, we feel our own shoes on our feet. The divestment that the objects represent is traumatic precisely because we are ourselves with our own shoes and there is no one to which the shoes we see belong. The shoes also act as synecdoche in the sense that the part comes to stand in for the whole, but with a slight twist. The part in this case comes to stand in for the lack of the

³⁴⁸ Alison Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Memory in the Age of Mass Culture.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2004, 133-134.

whole, for the non-existence of the whole. The absence of the shoes' owners speaks louder than any presence might. However, the absence is also somewhat macabre in that we understand the victims only through the artifacts that remain; in the case of the Holocaust, James Young theorizes that in fact we are recalling the victims as their killers have remembered them to us in the collected rubble of a destroyed group. 'Armless sleeves, eyeless lenses, headless caps, footless shoes: victims are known only by their absence, by the moment of their destruction.'³⁴⁹

The Holocaust begins to gesture at questions of memorialization through absence, and this is the same mechanism by which we might understand the 9/11 memorial, which seeks to memorialize absence. However, this chapter tries to move beyond simply an analysis of the trauma of 9/11 or the way in which it has become imbued in political narratives legitimizing the war-on-terror. Rather, it seeks to explore absence in the context of the 9/11 memorial imaginary in order to explore not how international politics has changed as a result of 9/11, but rather how we conceive of international politics, specifically international security, has changed. I will first address here a potential framework derived from Holocaust memorialization that allows for conceptualization of monuments which commemorate absence. Absence is integral to conceptualizing statecraft because statecraft relies on the emphasis of presence and the *making absent* of something else. Statecraft relies on the logic of haunting, in this case the idea that we are

³⁴⁹ James Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994, 132.

and must be haunted by the deaths of 9/11 and the specter of terrorism which spells our perpetual insecurity, but statecraft is also haunted by the logic of vanishing associated with 9/11 and its memorialization.

The missing bodies of the victims, along with the emphasis on absence that is the center of 9/11 memorial design, disrupt traditional ways of memorializing tragedy, at both the personal and national levels, through reliance on a physical gravesite memorializing an individual person. We can see this both in traditional graveyards and at national sites such as Arlington National Cemetery. Both represent the individualized logic of burial. But what happens when there are no bodied to bury, no individual remains, but rather intermingled remains, pieces, or simply absences? What is the logic of vanishing that enables statecraft after 9/11, statecraft at the site of Ground Zero itself, specifically the construction of some (haunted) presence out of an absence?

This chapter takes up these questions of statecraft and haunting through the lens of the logic of vanishing in 9/11 memorialization. I first detail the 'presence' of absence in memorialization through the Holocaust memorial counter-monument movement and the role of absence in artistic representation. I then explore controversy surrounding the designs for the 9/11 memorial, arguing that the memorial design seeks to memorialize absence, but it is absence of the towers, not of the people who died. This is not simply a facet of the memorial design, but something which characterizes 9/11 memorialization more broadly. The politics of visibility that gesture to the presence/absence of bodies in 9/11 memorialization, as well as discourses which label certain lives heroic and renders

203

others invisible, speaks to the way in which grievable lives can be conceptualized, and alters the traditional mechanisms of national grieving. I argue that unlike the schema of the missing soldier in war or the unknown soldier memorialized in multiple countries, the missing bodies of 9/11 are situated within a different logic, and specifically the logic of haunting.

I then delve more deeply into the concept of absence, arguing that memorializing absence in this instance in fact simply reifies the presence/absence dichotomy, privileging a present spatiality even as it relies on the memorialization of absence. The 9/11 memorial relies on notions of spatiality and the performance of the site as a sacred space. It is in this latter argument that the connection of memorialization to statecraft becomes fleshed out. Here I argue that reification of the presence/absence dichotomy and the privileging of spatiality are necessary to the productive, orienting, and limiting mechanisms of statecraft itself. I explore how state narratives of the war-on-terror rely on a construction of 9/11 historical memory, the logic of which is replicated by 9/11 memorialization efforts, whether or not they are directly connected with the state itself. I conclude with an analysis of other absences, other absent monuments, and other vanishings, including the removal and redesign or re-placement of Holocaust memorials in Germany in the 1980s, the destruction of the iconic Saddam Hussein statue in Iraq, and the question of absences as they relate to ruins and decay more broadly.

Historical Absences: The Counter-Memory Movement in Germany

Monuments to absence are not a new development to the post-9/11 era. To establish some historical background to the discussion of the issues surrounding the 9/11 memorial, I want to briefly describe the Harburg monument against fascism, which can be seen as exemplary of this genre of monuments, utilizing Holocaust memorials more generally as a frameworks for understanding monuments to absence from which we can begin to explore 9/11 memorialization.

To explore the Harburg Monument against Fascism in Harburg, Germany, I rely on James Young's discussion of this monument in his book, The Texture of *Memory.* Designed by artists Jochen Gerz and Esther Shalev-Gerz, the monument is a lead column 12 meters high where people can inscribe their names with a special writing implement. As the sections at hand get covered with writing, the column will be gradually lowered into the ground completely. The plaque near the monument tells visitors that as they sign their names on the monument, as a kind of pledge against fascism, it will be lowered into the ground, and one day the site will be empty. Visitors are encouraged to write on the column, and it has been graffitied extensively, including with emblems such as swastikas and racial epithets, rather than the original intention of writing names on the monument. This troubled many members of the surrounding community. Young describes it as doubly troubling both because it recalls what happened in the past and because it is a social mirror reflecting to the community their own complex responses to the past. The monument thus reflects back to the community their own memorial projections and preoccupations.

Aside from being controversial due to the graffiti, the monument was controversial for other reasons. First, the artists chose to build it in a gritty, working-class area of Harburg, rather than in a more traditional park setting. Additionally, anti-fascist groups found it problematic that the monument did not memorialize the victims of fascism. They felt that the memorial was overly aesthetic and not a practical memorialization of the individuals who were victimized by the Nazis. The monument is constantly being written, both literally and in the sense that the meaning of monumentalizing against fascism is constantly shifting and being performed. As the monument is written on, it constructs itself as a new memorial. The inscription on the memorial describes how the monument will continue to be lowered into the ground and ultimately disappear completely, and encourages visitors to think through their own roles in memorializing. It reads: 'In the end it is only we ourselves who can rise up against injustice.' The monument thus keeps us from placing our memory burden solely on the shoulders of the monument. The vanishing monument will have returned the burden of memory to the visitors, and to all of us. Young finds this apropos, asking 'how better to remember a vanished people than by the perpetually unfinished, ever-vanishing monument?³⁵⁰ The best monument, he concludes, might be no monument at all, but rather the memory of an absent monument, a monument to absence itself. 'All that remains is the memory of the monument, an afterimage projected onto the landscape by the rememberer.³⁵¹

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 31.

³⁵¹ Ibid., 32.

Young refers to this phenomenon as a counter-monument, not because it negates memory, but because it negates the illusion of permanence traditionally expressed by monumentalization. Another example of a counter-monument regularly cited is the 'negative form' monument designed by artist Horst Hoheisel in Kassel, Germany. A historic pyramid-shaped fountain known as Aschrott's Fountain built in 1908 was demolished under the Nazis because it had been designed by a Jewish company. In 1987, Hoheisel conceived of a monument to commemorate Aschrott's Fountain, but instead of rebuilding the fountain, he wanted to also memorialize the destruction put in place by the Nazis. So he took the pyramid shape of the original fountain and inverted it. The shape sinks into the ground and the surface appears to be flat at first glance. But when one looks closer, one can see the shape in the ground. In this way, Hoheisel builds what is considered a negative monument, or a counter-monument, one which does not conform to traditional forms of monumentalization, but which instead not only inverts the monument, but also inverts the gaze. Rather than the visitor looking at the monument, the visitor looks into him/herself. The monument is itself empty space, so the visitor becomes the monument. It is this notion of absence in Holocaust counter-monuments that frames the exploration of vanishing monuments in this paper, but rather than focusing in on the existence of countermonuments, I focus specifically on the appeal to absence in the memorialization process, and in a significant way pose a critique of counter-monuments, arguing that they in fact problematically reify the presence/absence dichotomy.

My title is perhaps a misnomer in the sense that, unlike the Harburg monument against Fascism, which lowers into the ground, physically vanishing, the 9/11 memorial is not a vanishing monument. However, the point I seek to make here is not that the monument itself is vanishing, but that it relies on the structure of vanishing, the historical narrative that tells a story of the vanishing of something. Indeed it also invokes the notion that the way to commemorate a vanishing is through a monument to vanishing itself, through a monument which memorializes a lack. Additionally, I focus on vanishing as it relates to the lack of corporeality related to 9/11 memorialization. Because there are no bodies to become sites of mourning, the vanishing body itself becomes monumentalized.

'After 9/11': Designing Monuments:

Immediately after the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States, a clamor for memorialization emerged unlike anything seen after any other traumatic event.³⁵² 9/11 was traumatic for multiple reasons: that it was an attack on American soil by a foreign entity, the sheer number of people killed at one time, and the shocking nature of how the attack played out. Susannah Radstone also points to the fact that 9/11 punctured a fantasy of American invulnerability and impregnability that had previously sustained our sense of national identity.³⁵³ Numerous accounts point to this same production of trauma in the US due to 9/11

³⁵² Rick Hampson, 'Americans Rush to Build Memorials to 9/11,' USA Today, May 5, 2003, 1A.

³⁵³ Susannah Radstone, 'The War of the Fathers: Trauma, Fantasy, and September 11,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 467-469.

through a sense of violation of the territorial body.³⁵⁴ It is argued by some that the reason 9/11 has remained so fresh as a trauma is because trauma takes root when 'it is connected to ongoing violences and systemic structures of oppression'.³⁵⁵ This reference to the wars that followed 9/11 indicate that they have become part of the narrative of 9/11 itself, the continuation of the story which was intended to point towards some resolution or end to the attack. The freshness of the trauma even after so much time has passed points to a phenomenon Marita Sturken elucidates: that 9/11 has become itself a marker of change, the day when our society was divided into a before and after.³⁵⁶

The debate about 9/11 memorialization has largely centered on whether there should be something or nothing.³⁵⁷ Once it was concluded that there should be something, the journey interestingly came back around to a design of something, yet commemorating the absence of something. Before getting into a discussion of the role of monuments to absence in the 9/11 context, it is important to briefly discuss the evolution of the 9/11 memorial designs. This is by no means a comprehensive assessment of all 9/11 memorialization, and I will continue to raise particular designs and issues throughout the ensuing discussion. The idea

³⁵⁴ Jenny Edkins, 'The Rush to Memory and the Rhetoric of War,' *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, vol. 31, no. 2 (2003): 231-250. See also Hannah Naveh, 'Nine Eleven: An Ethics of Proximity,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 457-459.

³⁵⁵ Ann Cvetkovich, '9-1-1 Every Day,' Signs 28, 1 (2002) 491-492, 492.

³⁵⁶ Marita Sturken, 'Masculinity, Courage, and Sacrifice,' Signs, vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 449-450.

³⁵⁷ For an excellent detailing of all of the ideas and the entire process of memorializing at Ground Zero, see Philip Goldberger, *Up From Zero: Politics, Architecture, and the Rebuilding of New York*, New York, NY: Random House, 2004. See also Philip Nobel, *Sixteen Acres: Architecture and the Outrageous Struggle for the Future of Ground Zero*, New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, 2005.

here, then, is not to tell the story of 9/11 memorialization as the debates ensued, but rather to explore what discursive work the debates and ideas did. That is, what assumptions about memorialization were engendered, and what perspectives on absence came to be taken for granted through a series of discursive performances in these practices of memory.

In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, there was strong sentiment among many about the importance of rebuilding the twin towers. On September 11, 2001, even as the towers had barely fallen, Rudy Giuliani, mayor of New York proclaimed, 'we will rebuild. We're going to come out of this stronger than before, politically stronger, economically stronger. The skyline will be made whole again'.³⁵⁸ Governor George Pataki also promised to rebuild. President George W. Bush announced to Congress shortly after the attacks that 'as a symbol of America's resolve, my administration will work with Congress, and these two leaders, to show the world that we will rebuild New York City'.³⁵⁹

A selection of architects was asked by the New York Times in late September, 2001, about whether or not the towers should be rebuilt, and the majority said yes. Robert Stern referred to the towers as 'a symbol of our achievement as New Yorkers and as Americans and to put them back says that we cannot be defeated.' Peter Eisenman similarly stated that he didn't want the US to be deterred from rebuilding, and that to not rebuild would be to retreat.

³⁵⁸ Tess Taylor, 'Rebuilding in New York,' *Architecture Week*, September 26, 2001. Available at http://www.architectureweek.com/2001/0926/today.html

³⁵⁹ George W. Bush, 'Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People,' The White House. September 20, 2001. Available at http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html.

Bernard Tschumi, dean of the architecture school at Columbia, stated that we should rebuild bigger and better, look towards the future, not the past. Terrence Riley similarly argued that rebuilding should be used as an opportunity for innovative architecture in building a new form of skyscraper.³⁶⁰

The World Trade Center Restoration movement also sought to rebuild the towers: 'not replaced by something new and supposedly better. Rebuilt, hewing as closely as possible to the design of the buildings that were lost on Sept. 11.'³⁶¹ These groups have said that if the towers are not rebuilt, the terrorists will have won. World Trade Center leaseholder Larry Silverstein stated, 'it would be the tragedy of tragedies not to rebuild this part of New York. It would give the terrorists the victory they seek.'³⁶² To leave the skyline bereft of its towers would be an expression of weakness and defeat to many.³⁶³ Yet this is not without controversy. One member of the restoration movement says he has been attacked by victims' families for his point of view. Joe Wright says, 'Some people really think that the towers killed their loved ones. So for supporting the rebuilding of the towers, I was called a murderer.'³⁶⁴

³⁶⁰ 'To Rebuild or Not: Architects Respond,' New York Times, September 23, 2001.

³⁶¹ Hugo Lindgren, 'Keep Your New Towers. They Want The Towers,' *New York Times*, August 31, 2003, p. 23.

³⁶² Steven Litt, 'In place of the Trade Center; Ideas range from building new towers to playground,' *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, September 17, 2001.

³⁶³ Marita Sturken, 'Memorializing Absence,' Social Science Research Council, After 9/11, 2002, available at http://essays.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sturken.htm.

³⁶⁴ As cited in Lindgren, 'Keep Your New Towers.'

The group is motivated by the sentiment that formal memorials are easily forgotten as time passes. The Oklahoma City bombing memorial was very popular for the first few years, then experienced a sharp drop in visitation. Grant's Tomb is also cited as the quintessential forgotten memorial, even to the old joke that no one remembers who is buried in it. The restoration movement believes that people forget things when you build for the dead and not for the living.³⁶⁵ But the WTC restoration movement does not believe they will prevail. They foresaw, in 2003, that a monument would be built rather than rebuilding the twin towers, what they call a concession to the victims groups who are determined to let their personal grief speak for all. But they also predict that the memorial will be a huge failure and will ultimately be torn down and the towers rebuilt; perhaps as the families' grief subsides with time, people will examine what remembering 9/11 'really means'.

Multiple groups have spoken up about the role of 9/11 memorialization, and as Herbert Muschamp details, 'memorialization is vulnerable to public pressure. What and how we remember are not neutral, self-evident propositions.'³⁶⁶ This explains not only the polarization of perspectives in memorialization but also the sheer number of design ideas and memorials themselves. Nearly every fire station and police precinct in the New York area has their own memorial. There are numerous smaller memorials all around the United States, each reflecting different meanings. Some are related to the attacks,

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

³⁶⁶ Herbert Muschamp, 'Balancing Reason and Emotion in Twin Towers Void,' *The New York Times*, February 6, 2003, E1.

such as the air traffic control center in Ohio that had the last contact with United flight 93 before it crashed in Pennsylvania, and others have simply sprung up at sites unrelated to the attacks themselves, but often utilizing pieces of the destroyed towers.³⁶⁷ The first 9/11 memorial outside of the US was built in Jerusalem in 2009.³⁶⁸ But it seems that everyone wants a say in what might be considered the central or national 9/11 memorial, at Ground Zero itself. Firefighters have called for a memorial stressing heroism.³⁶⁹ Victims' families stress the importance of focus on the individuals lost. Architects and designers view this as an opportunity to express an aesthetic point of view. Some city planners believe that the best memorial is a functional building which would provide a lot of office space.

Memorialization has been extremely controversial. A plan to honor firefighters with a bronze statue outside of Fire Department headquarters in Brooklyn depicting firefighters raising an American flag following on the iconic photograph taken at Ground Zero was scrapped due to debates about the proposed design. Firefighters complained because the original photograph showed three

³⁶⁷ Hampson, 'Americans Rush to Build Memorials.'

³⁶⁸ The Jerusalem memorial is a bronze sculpture depicting an American flag turning into a flame, and lists the names of all killed in the attacks. Parts of the memorial are original pieces from the towers. Russell Robinson, head of the Jewish national Fund, which provided the funding for the memorial, stated, 'The whole monument really tells the story of 9/11. The plaza itself doesn't quite look like a pentagon, but the idea of the base of it is the Pentagon. It's a little bit indented into the earth, to depict the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania. And it has the sculpture in the middle that depicts an American flag in flames, which [represents] the Twin Towers'. See Raphael Ahren, 'Jerusalem to dedicate first 9/11 memorial with names outside US,' *Haaretz*, November 6, 2009. Notice here the overwhelming design attention paid to the sites themselves.

³⁶⁹ Michael Kimmelman, 'Ground Zero's Only Hope: Elitism,' *New York Times*, December 7, 2003, Section 2, 1.

white firefighters, while the proposed memorial design depicted one black, one white, and one Hispanic firefighter. The firefighters said that the designers had 'sacrificed historical verisimilitude for political correctness'.³⁷⁰ The controversy surrounding adequate memorialization has been even more extensive when it comes to the Ground Zero site because it is considered a proprietary site by an even wider variety of groups. Controversy was between victims' families who wanted a proper memorial for their loved ones, residents of the area who didn't want a 'giant cemetery' in the middle of their neighborhood, citizens who wanted a symbol if national defiance against terrorist attack, urban planners who wanted functional city space, and architects who wanted a sophisticated design.³⁷¹ Among the majority of the designs proposed throughout the entire process of memorialization was one shared feature: that ground zero should be treated as sacred, and that even if commercial structures were to be built on the site, they should not be ordinary or conventional.³⁷²

There have been literally thousands of ideas posed for a 9/11 memorial. *The New Yorker* asked a selection of artists to envision what to do with the 'void downtown.' They ideas they came up with ranged from a dairy farm with grazing cows to a 100-story tower built underground rather than above ground, to a forest

³⁷⁰ Kevin Flynn, 'Ground Zero: A Memorial; Firefighters Block a Plan for Statue in Brooklyn,' *New York Times*, January 18, 2002, p. A21.

³⁷¹ Michiko Kakutani, 'After a Day of Terror, a Long Architectural Tug of War', *The New York Times*, January 18, 2005.

³⁷² Goldberger, 'Up From Zero', 210.

of 110 one-story towers, to numerous designs using light and word projection.³⁷³ Once the memorial competition was established, the designs got even more varied, from a large red question mark to a 'geodesic steel egg, a glowing apple spiked on a tapering spire, two ghostly white airliners with the victims' names inscribed on the seats or a steel column tilted open like a Pez dispenser to reveal a jumble of mangled artifacts'.³⁷⁴ Many advocated keeping the void because a bare ground was the best medium for meditation and healing.³⁷⁵ Architects Elizabeth Diller and Ricardo Scofidio also viewed the void as more poignant than anything that could be rebuilt. They say, 'let's not build something that would mend the skyline, it is more powerful to leave it void. We believe it would be tragic to erase the erasure'.³⁷⁶ This perspective was ultimately reflected in the design chosen in a competition by a jury of artists and victims' family members.

The Reflecting Absence design, which opened to visitors in 2011, sketches out two reflecting pools of water matching the tower footprints with waterfalls going down the sides of the voids. These voids are intended of course to recall the towers themselves. Designer Michael Arad's original idea was for two square voids in the Hudson River, close to the ground zero site but forever inaccessible,

³⁷³ Calvin Tompkins, 'After the Towers: 9 Artists Imagine a Memorial,' *The New Yorker*, July 15, 2002, p. 59.

³⁷⁴ David Dunlap, '5201 Ideas for 9/11 Memorial, from the Sublime to the Less So,' *New York Times*, February 20, 2004, A1.

³⁷⁵ Sarah Boxer, 'Debating Ground Zero Architecture and the Value of the Void,' *New York Times*, September 30, 2002, p. B1.

³⁷⁶ 'To Rebuild or Not.'

expressing inconsolable loss.³⁷⁷ But they were instead built on the site of Ground Zero. Arad wanted to express a specific feeling on the descent into the footprint level. He states, 'slowly, the sights and sounds of the city disappear and you enter into darkness, and you see a reflecting pool, two hundred feet by two hundred feet, surrounded by ribbons of names, and then, eighty feet below, at bedrock, you see a deep fissure.³⁷⁸ Aside from the two reflecting pools, the design also encompasses a memorial center museum, which will include artifacts such as twisted steel columns and fire trucks.³⁷⁹ The other main part of the site is the Freedom Tower, a compromise between rebuilding and not. In 2006, construction began at ground zero. The site opened to visitors on September 11, 2011, on the 10th anniversary of 9/11. The memorial museum is expected to be completed in 2012, with continuing construction in the area beyond this date. Despite the memorial architecture at the site, it is still intended to fit into the commercial and economic functioning of the city. More square footage at ground zero will go to retail shopping than to the memorial.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁷ Glenn Collins and David Dunlap, 'Unveiling of the Trade Center Memorials Reveals an Abundance of New Details,' *New York Times*, January 15, 2004, A26.

³⁷⁸ As cited in Goldberger, Up From Zero, 234.

³⁷⁹ David Dunlap and Eric Lipton, 'Revised Ground Zero Memorial Will Include an Artifact Center,' *The New York Times*, January 14, 2004, A19.

³⁸⁰ Michael Kimmelman, 'Ground Zero Finally Grows Up,' *New York Times*, February 1, 2004, Section 2, 1.

On Rubble: Memorializing (the lack of) Bodies

Monuments to absence are unique. Because they memorialize a nothing, they are often abstract in the aesthetic sense and do not include figural representations. I now set out to explore the role of the dead body in imaginings of monuments to absence, specifically the 9/11 memorial. It might be more appropriate to say that I set out to explore the absence of the dead body itself in these memorializations. In these instances, I argue that the monuments are sanitized of corporeality by memorializing the building or lack of a building instead. In the narratives surrounding memorial design at Ground Zero, it becomes evident the importance of the buildings. Much of the debate centered on whether or not to rebuild at the site. The building itself comes to stand in for the event itself. And the lack of a building comes to represent the lack created by the loss of loved ones. But why are we memorializing architecture instead of people? This is not a critique of the designs chosen, but rather of how the memorialization of 9/11 was and is framed: as something that must be done with a particular site, a physical, geographical, territorial, tangible site. Memorialization discourses surrounding 9/11 focus on how to memorialize Ground Zero based on what happened there rather than on how to memorialize those who died on September 11, 2001.

Though 9/11 has clearly become embedded in our cultural narratives as something related to everyday life, or as Ann Cvetkovich describes, 'beyond the immediacy of dead bodies and the spectacular sensation of falling buildings'³⁸¹,

³⁸¹ Cvetkovich, '9-1-1 Every Day,' 492.

both of these images have become key ways that the event is represented. These twin images of bodies and buildings are the logical indicators of the trauma of 9/11 since the former represents those loved ones who died, and the latter the national aspect of the attack. The interesting question is, then, why the dead body seems to have disappeared from 9/11 imaginings.³⁸²

One could argue that the dead body does not appear in memorialization discourses precisely because the dead body was not among the rubble of 9/11. Without a body to memorialize, people are left to find other loci as repositories of memory. However, this is not the case of other instances when there is no body. Crime victims for whom there are no bodily remains are typically still given a headstone in a cemetery at which mourners can congregate. This is true also of large-scale natural disasters in which bodies are often never recovered. The individual is still mourned primarily at a gravesite, even when the bodies are not recovered. Michael Taussig refers to this idea in discussing the iconic gravesite of Walter Benjamin. Benjamin was buried in a grave with a different name, but the keepers of the cemetery have established a fake grave site with no body for his admirers to visit. A gravesite serves as the end of the story of the life, and at times the cult surrounding the grave becomes more significant than the life itself. Cemeteries exist to preserve the existence of a link between name and body.³⁸³ The grave remains the locus of mourning in our society, regardless of whether

³⁸² I should note here that the dead body is as present as ever in the individual-level mourning and remembrance of victims' family members. It is in the national imagination that the bodies seem to have disappeared.

³⁸³ Michael Taussig, Walter Benjamin's Grave, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

there is a body or not, as it comes to represent the body symbolically. It is important to keep in mind that as time passed, victims' families did construct individual gravesites for their loved ones, especially as remains were identified. However, in most other cases of national-level events where large numbers were killed, as we are told 9/11 was, there are specific burial sites for the victims. This is true of Arlington National Cemetery, where war casualties are buried.

So if the lack of bodily remains doesn't explain why 9/11 mourning has left out the body, then what does? Why has ground zero become a quasigravesite, yet one without reference to corporeality, a grave in name only? This shift has occurred in the service of a statecraft which must tell the story of a national attack rather than individual deaths to legitimate specific foreign policy objectives. In 9/11 imaginings, the rubble has come to displace the (dead) body. What becomes interesting about the rubble is that it exists in an interstitial space: it is neither body nor strict rubbish material. It is remnants of both building and body, and yet is neither. The rubble itself is almost spectral: prior to the lines between life and death, between building and body, it recalls the inextricable nature of human and building, and the incomprehensible nature of the arbitrary line between life and death, between life and disappearance, between disappearance and death. The way in which the rubble is situated within this logic perhaps explains the uncanny status ascribed to it. This plays into the logic traditionally associated with ruins: when we frame something as a ruin, we elevate its status beyond simply a destroyed structure. Ruins evoke simultaneously an absence and a presence, past and future, an intersection of the

visible and invisible.³⁸⁴ As such, they play with our pre-conceived notions of temporality, visibility and intelligibility because they are only intelligible insofar as they are framed as ruins. The framing comes to mean more than the site itself.

The rubble has therefore become the site of mourning, and remembrance has transferred from the traditional individual gravesite to the site of Ground Zero as the burial site, even after it has been cleaned away of rubble. The rubble itself also comes to take on the presence of victimhood. This is exemplary of one avenue of memorialization which focuses on incorporating ruins into a memorial, utilizing pieces of a building to commemorate. This is the case with what has come to be known as the 'slurry wall' at ground zero, a piece of the towers' substructure which was left standing after the attacks. Many believed this should stand as the ultimate memorial. In the rush to memorialize after 9/11, many believed the most poignant memorial already existed, in the twisted steel of the twin towers.³⁸⁵

There was a strong notion from the beginning that even if the site was cleared, the ruins should not be treated as junk. As some city authorities wanted to clear the site quickly, firefighters and victims' families emphasized the importance of the rubble at the site. One widow said, 'last week my husband is memorialized as a hero, this week he's thought of as a landfill?'³⁸⁶ gesturing to

³⁸⁴ Michael Roth, Claire Lyons, and Charles Merewether, *Irresistible Decay: Ruins Reclaimed*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

³⁸⁵ Herbert Muschamp, 'The Commemorative Beauty of Tragic Wreckage,' *New York Times*, November 11, 2001, 37.

³⁸⁶ As cited in Jenny Edkins, 'Ground Zero: Reflections on Trauma, In/distinction and Response, *Journal for Cultural Research*, vol. 8, no. 3 (2004): 247-270, 265.

the complexity surrounding ground zero rubble. The rubble of the 9/11 attacks has acquired somewhat of a sacred significance. With much pomp and ritual, 4,000 urns were filled with powered debris from Ground Zero and given to victims' families and several memorial sites around New York in October of 2001. The preparation of the rubble for the urns was very detailed, performed by police officers specifically instructed in a ritual which was intended to maximize dignity.³⁸⁷ Of rubble. But this rubble has come to mean more than just rubble itself. As Jenny Edkins writes, in the rubble at Ground Zero, 'what was revealed was the impossibility of a sustained distinction between body and building, flesh and object, protected and protector, vulnerable and invulnerable, animate and inanimate.³⁸⁸ In the months after 9/11 as the ground zero site was cleared, there was a scuffle between police and firefighters over what to do with the rubble. Many firefighters felt strongly that the wreckage should not just be carted away and disposed of, that it should be treated with dignity and all efforts should be made to identify human remains.³⁸⁹ By the end of October 2001, more than 200,000 tons of rubble from the World Trade Center had been combed through for signs of human remains or identifying information.³⁹⁰

Ruins themselves hold strong significance for our society. Ruins seem to possess some kind of magic, and we are fascinated with their uncanny ability to

³⁸⁷ Amy Waldman, 'A Nation Challenged: Mementos; With Solemn Detail, Dust of Ground Zero is Put in Urns,' *New York Times*, October 15, 2001, B11.

³⁸⁸ Edkins, 'Ground Zero'.

³⁸⁹ Muschamp, 'Commemorative Beauty.'

³⁹⁰ Dan Barry and Amy Waldman, 'Sifting Mountains of Debris for Slivers of Solace,' *New York Times*, October 21, 2001, A1, B11.

portray the aura of past events, 'as if the molecules of the site still vibrated with the memory of their history.'³⁹¹ Young theorizes that modern memory is archival, reliant on the trace, and this explains the significance ruins have come to have in society today.³⁹² Additionally, ruins come to be significant specifically because they are all that remains, as they gesture towards what is no longer there. 'Loss is inseparable from what remains, for what is lost is known only by what remains of it, by how these remains are produced, read, and sustained.'³⁹³ Ruins, though, are not about what remains visible, but about what is missing, what has been lost, and the will to recognize this absence.³⁹⁴

Rubble is particularly interesting in this context, because it is as if even the smallest pieces of debris are somehow infused with the past itself. Patricia Yaeger explores the role of rubble as archive, arguing that we must question our responses to trauma when the only thing left is 'stuff.' She argues that the inability to distinguish body or flesh from rubble has marked American responses to 9/11. Rubble is frightening to us because we cannot tell if a piece of debris is really debris or if it is a body part. The rubble, as a result, comes to take on the sacred qualities of the body itself.³⁹⁵

³⁹¹ Young, Texture of Memory, 119.

³⁹² Ibid. 127.

³⁹³ David Eng and David Kazanjian, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003, 2.

³⁹⁴ Roth, Lyons, and Merewether, *Irresistible Decay*, 33-37.

³⁹⁵ Patricia Yaeger, 'Rubble as Archive, or 9/11 as Dust, Debris, and Bodily Vanishing,' In Judith Greenberg, ed, *Trauma at Home: After 9/11*, Winnipeg: Bison Books, 2003, 187-194.

Rubble, that which we previously consider to be worthless, polluting, invisible, comes to acquire the ultimate visibility in the way it is discursively sacralized by taking the place of human remains, which are traditionally considered to be sacred. As Yaeger writes, 'the rubble becomes a site where bodily trauma passes through.³⁹⁶ Because the trauma of death existed at that site. because the body existed at that site, that site becomes significant for mourning. The site is often referred to as a graveyard and as sacred ground. The role of debris is evident in the way debris is sacralized in the filling of the urns, and additionally in the famous story that Governor Pataki of New York refused to clean off the gluey substance that clung to his shoes after visiting Ground Zero. The wife of one of the men killed on 9/11 refers to this substance on Pataki's shoes as the 'ashes of the dead.'³⁹⁷ The use of the term 'ashes' seems to personalize the rubble, make it seem corporeal in some way.³⁹⁸ People's trauma of 9/11 seemed to be gauged in terms of their proximity to dust, and the dust was substituted for the body to mediate the absence of a loved one.³⁹⁹

Additionally, we can view the role of debris in the story of the Chelsea Jeans window display. Chelsea Jeans was a store one block from the World Trade Center. The window was smashed in the attacks, and the store owner had to get rid of almost everything in the store. However, he kept the front window

³⁹⁶ Ibid., 190.

³⁹⁷ Christy Ferer, 'Unforgotten Soldiers,' New York Times, October 25, 2001, A21.

³⁹⁸ Marita Sturken, 'The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,' *American Ethnologist*, vol. 31, no. 3 (2004): 311-325.

³⁹⁹ Ibid.

and sealed it as it was after the attack, with designer shirts and jeans all covered with the dust from the twin towers behind the glass. Reporter Michael Kimmelman describes the display by saying that the clothes look like lined-up headstones. The debris is almost ugly to us, a reminder of the ugliness of that day itself.⁴⁰⁰ In the economic downturn, Chelsea Jeans went out of business in 2006, but the window display was preserved and exhibited at the New York historical society. The toxicity of the dust is emphasized in the exhibit, and the exhibit has to be in a carefully controlled environment, not to protect the objects, as is standard in a historical exhibit, but to protect the visitors. The viewer is thus protected, insulated from the death, from the dead, and the dead/rubble has become exhibited, displayed.⁴⁰¹ The viewer must be insulated to remind us that death is 'there', and though it may be always at the door, always ominously threatening and thus legitimating of particular securing policies, it is also not present in 'our world.' The curator of the exhibit, Amy Weinstein, describes the exhibit by saying, 'ordinary ash and dust have become extraordinary'.⁴⁰² Her statement speaks to the sacralization of rubble, where even toxic dust can become something sacred, worth preserving. It also speaks to the way in which death has become perceived as extraordinary by virtue of the mixing of body with rubble.

⁴⁰⁰ Michael Kimmelman, 'Art in Ashes, Drama in Dust,' New York Times, August 19, 2002, B1.

⁴⁰¹ This display is interestingly different from the exhibition of bodies and bones in the Rwandan context. In this instance, the display of the dead is not figural. It is not at first clear that the rubble being displayed is the dead body itself, or at least contains traces of bodies. The corporeality is masked by the rubble, yet at the same time, the rubble is displayed precisely because it contains traces of the dead body, and therefore the display of the body is almost enhanced by the nature of the display.

⁴⁰² Glenn Collins, 'A 9/11 Shrine, With the Tragic, Toxic Dust,' *New York Times*, August 25, 2006.

Yet, even as the body becomes part and parcel of rubble, the building aspect of the rubble comes to take precedence. To paraphrase Patricia Yaeger, after 9/11, the bodies that form the traditional centers of mourning have vanished, or merged with the toxic air, or have turned into construction debris.⁴⁰³ Jenny Edkins similarly refers to the lack of bodies in 9/11 memorialization by detailing the images of ruins of Ground Zero that proliferated after Ground Zero, but what was missing was the missing, the dead.⁴⁰⁴

Towers of Light: From (lack of) Bodies to (lack of) Buildings

Dennis Smith points to the lack of a body in 9/11 memorialization by describing the memorial design plans: 'They have to do with light, hanging light, falling light, diluted light, drowning light. And also with stones that are crying, sky-reflecting water pools, floating gardens, bridges placed like bandages, cut fields, and an apple orchard. The universal elements—air, water, earth, and light—are celebrated. Nature is celebrated. Nowhere is there a representation of a human being'.⁴⁰⁵ Yet one thing that is present in many memorial designs is steel from the World Trade Center buildings. 'Rusty structural steel is becoming the tangible symbol of service and sacrifice'.⁴⁰⁶ The steel is referred to as

⁴⁰³ Yaeger, *Rubble as Archive*, 189.

⁴⁰⁴ Edkins, 'Ground Zero', 251.

⁴⁰⁵ Dennis Smith, 'Memorials Without a Memory,' New York Times, November 26, 2003, A29.

⁴⁰⁶ Hampson, 'Americans Rush to Build Memorials.'

'sacred' and is treated with reverence, often transported on trucks with a police escort.⁴⁰⁷

Philippe de Montebello refers to the ruins of the ground zero site shortly after the attacks as iconic. He suggested preserving the ruin already at the site, the jagged 'skeletal' steel fragment, 'inexplicably durable, still pointing to the heavens.'⁴⁰⁸ There is significance to the imagery associated with this fragment. The steel fragment is referred to as skeletal, which brings to mind both the underlying structural foundation of the towers themselves and the human skeleton, human remains. The ruin of the towers, then, comes to stand in for the body. The power of the image of the towers whole also comes to haunt our 9/11 memorial imaginary.

Jenny Edkins refers to the way in which the victims were disappeared, yet many New Yorkers seems to be mourning the buildings themselves: visitors to Ground Zero were like 'loving family members of the buildings who needed to see the actual body of the buildings to accept their loss.'⁴⁰⁹ Paraphrasing Marita Sturken, 'the preoccupation with memorializing the twin towers has displaced the profound loss of life that took place there.'⁴¹⁰ One such memorial project is the

⁴⁰⁷ Interestingly, after the shooting rampage in Tucson in 2010 that injured Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords and killed many others, including a young girl who had been born on 9/11/01, a memorial to those killed was constructed that included a piece of the structural steel from the World Trade Center. This can be likened to the way in which pieces of the Berlin Wall were sold as souvenirs.

⁴⁰⁸ Philippe De Montebello, 'The Iconic Power of an Artifact,' *New York Times*, September 25, 2001, A29.

⁴⁰⁹ Jenny Edkins, *Missing: Persons and Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011, 118.

⁴¹⁰ Sturken, 'Memorializing Absence.'

'Towers of Light' design, which seeks to create phantom towers of light at the site of the twin towers. It traces the shadow of the memory of the towers, evoking both their presence and their absence. This project is interesting because it does not seek to replace or rebuild the towers, but only to evoke them and to evoke life before 9/11.⁴¹¹ The Towers of Light project was ultimately renamed 'Tribute of Light' because victims' families felt the original name implied memorialization of the towers and not the victims.⁴¹² However, the project itself is designed to broadcast lights in the shape and place of the twin towers, so regardless of the name the project itself, the design does end up memorializing the buildings rather than the victims.

It initially ran in March 2002 as a temporary design exhibit to commemorate the 6 month anniversary of the attacks, but now will run every September through 2011, the tenth anniversary of the attacks. The lights only project for the night of the anniversary of the attacks. The tribute costs around 350,000 dollars to run for one night.⁴¹³ David Dunlap remarks that the beams are appealing because they are so open in meaning. They could symbolize nothing and just be an interesting light show. Or they can symbolize memorialization in multiple ways. This sense of anonymity and 'near-mystery' allows the viewer to

⁴¹¹ Ibid.

⁴¹² 'Tribute in light to New York victims,' *BBC News*, March 6, 2002. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1857699.stm

⁴¹³ 'Will Tribute in Light go Dark after '08?' New York Times, September 11, 2007.

create his/her own memorial out of what is there.⁴¹⁴ Additionally the temporary nature of the memorial is poignant. It reminds viewers of the ephemeral nature of life in general by the short amount of time the lights are displayed for (one night only).

One online commenter on a *New York Times* story on the Tribute of Light project sums up the appeal of the design: 'Tonight I was crossing the Manhattan Bridge and since the clouds were hanging heavy and low they blocked the "Tribute in Light" from reaching, as it does in clear weather, deep into the night sky. They cut the beams to about the height of the towers as they were, and the bottom of the clouds were lit, and trailed like the smoke from the towers while they smoked. It was like seeing a ghost. The "Tribute in Light" is something that is never the same; it is as reflexive as the city itself, and I would hate to have seen it for the last time. No two times were ever the same.⁴¹⁵ By comparing seeing the beams of light to seeing a ghost, not only is a discourse of hauntology invoked, conjuring up quasi-material images of the past, but the beams of light, and therefore the specters of the buildings themselves, are personified. The building comes to stand in for the lives. The building somehow takes on the lives of those who died on 9/11.

Another commenter, Susan, writes in response to the idea that the Tribute in Light project may not continue, 'The Tribute In Light is one of the most

⁴¹⁴ David Dunlap, 'Tribute in Light Will Keep Shining, This Year and the Next,' *New York Times*, September 10, 2010.

⁴¹⁵ Luerk, Weblog Comment, September 12, 2007, 1:37 am, Available at http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/09/11/will-the-tribute-in-light-go-dark-after-08/

beautiful memorials I've ever seen displayed. It would really be such a shame if they took that away. The lights truly signify the souls in the sky. Please do not take them away.⁴¹⁶ Her comment demonstrates the way that the towers have come to stand in for the bodies themselves. The fact that two beams of light intended to recall the towers could come to signify the souls of those lost indicates the way those lost have become inextricably linked with the image of the towers themselves. The body is itself obscured. The towers, or lack thereof, come to stand in for the body, or lack of body.

This is replicated in the narratives of victims' families in terms of how they view the towers themselves. The curator of the Chelsea Jeans rubble exhibit at the New York historical society describes the respect the artifacts are treated with, because so many victims' relatives believe their loved ones are now present in all ground zero residue.⁴¹⁷ The brother of a man who died at the World Trade Center found comfort in 20 pounds of rubble that someone managed to get for him from ground zero. He stated, 'he became part of the building when it came down. I choose to believe that there may be one speck of Ed in that rubble.⁴¹⁸ The building here comes to stand in for the body. Having remnants of the building makes up for the fact that there is no body. Corporeality transfers from the human body itself to the towers. Architecture takes the place of the body, and

⁴¹⁶ Susan, Weblog Comment, September 11, 2008, 10:11 am, Available at http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/09/11/will-the-tribute-in-light-go-dark-after-08/

⁴¹⁷ Collins, 'A 9/11 Shrine'.

⁴¹⁸ Dean Murphy, 'Slowly, Families Accept the Ruins as Burial Ground,' *New York Times*, September 29, 2001, B1, B10.

this is why memorialization itself was largely focused on the towers, because they were themselves vested with corporeality. Though the remains of their loved ones could never be attained or rebuilt, because they were disappeared, for many loved ones of someone lost on 9/11, the towers represented something that could be reclaimed, a sort of reclamation of the corporeality of their loved one through memorialization.

Even the way the reputed 9/11 falling bodies have been elided from national imaginings demonstrates the taboo associated with memorializing bodies that seems to exist related to 9/11 trauma. The photographs of the 'jumpers,' as they were called, ran once in newspapers and the images were shown on television, but they were then never shown again in the US due to criticism that their deaths were being exploited. Two different memorials drawing on these images resulted in criticism and controversy. 'Tumbling Woman', a bronze sculpture at Rockefeller Center, which depicted a figure hitting the ground to commemorate 9/11, was removed shortly after its installation due to the controversy. Similar controversy surrounded an installation by artist Sharon Paz at an art center in Queens in 2002, which took images of the falling bodies from the World Trade Center and made them into silhouettes that were spread across the windows of the building.⁴¹⁹

⁴¹⁹ Donald Bertrand, 'New Furor Sparked by Falling-Bodies Art', *New York Daily News*, September 21, 2002.

It seemed inappropriate to many to focus on the body itself. These were the only images from 9/11 that acquired this taboo status.⁴²⁰ Some estimates are that one out of every six people who died in the North Tower jumped out of the building to their deaths.⁴²¹ Given this number, one might think that the drive to identification of remains might extend to the photographs of falling bodies, but looking at these photographs or trying to determine a count has been described as perverse, and the images are now invisible and taboo.⁴²² Yet, bodies are the main site for memorialization in our everyday lives: the grave is the site of remembering. But in this context, it is the shrines to 9/11 that have acquired the corporeality we typically associated with bodily remains.⁴²³ This shift from corporeality to spatiality has been exceedingly important in how the narrative of the tragedy has emerged. Rather than focusing on individuals lost, it focuses on what brought those individuals together: the buildings that formed a national symbol of American primacy and vitality. Now lost, the buildings become a legitimating inspiration for specific foreign policies. This necessitates the shift from individuals and individual level memorialization to a spatialized national memorialization.

⁴²⁰ Tom Junod, 'The Falling Man,' *Esquire*, September 8, 2009, available at http://www.esquire.com/features/ESQ0903-SEP_FALLINGMAN

⁴²¹ Ibid.

⁴²² See Dennis Cauchon and Martha Moore, 'Desperation Forced a Horrific Decision,' *USA Today*, September 2, 2002, and Kevin Flynn and Jim Dwyer, 'Falling Bodies, A 9/11 Image Etched in Pain,' *New York Times*, September 10, 2004.

⁴²³ Yaeger, 'Rubble as Archive,' 191.

Naming and Identifying the Dead of 9/11:

9/11 brings up some of the same concerns as the Rwandan genocide in terms of naming. In both cases, bodies are missing, disaggregated, and rendered unidentifiable. However, one key difference is that the struggle for naming in the context of 9/11 is not as futile as in Rwanda, largely due to the funding for DNA technology for identifying all of the victims. Lists of the missing, lists of employees of a number of businesses in the world trade center, and the much smaller number of victims has also made the process of identification easier. This section will explore the role of the name in the 9/11 imaginary, especially given the tremendous drive to name that characterizes American memorialization of violence in general. I contrast this drive to name with the logic that surrounds the entombment of unknown soldiers to further explore the significance of 9/11 naming, especially since the memorial center at Ground Zero will hold unidentified remains. The drive to identify and name is something which can be fully realized in the American context in a way that would be impossible, for reasons of money and scale, in numerous other contexts. Nevertheless, simply because naming is financially possible and manageable, does not mean it is inevitable, and the drive to name and identify is a significant one.

Identification has always been privileged in the context of war and violent conflict. The 1949 Geneva Convention specifies that warring parties must establish the identity of the dead. Even recently, in the context of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, bodies are brought home with fanfare and emphasis on individual identification, with press attendance. But, when a group of special forces were killed in 2011, and the individual bodies were not yet identified upon their return to American soil, the press was not allowed to attend. The status of un-identification was deemed a hindrance to proper memorialization, to the proper assignment of honor and dignity to the dead heroes. Similarly, in the context of 9/11, where remains were fragmented, there has been a drive to identify as a means of assigning dignity and assuring proper memorialization. Identification of the body itself as the guarantor of an individual's identity is connected with memorialization. In this case, the essence of the person itself is considered to be imbued within each individual bodily fragment.

Identification was originally an important problem at Ground Zero due to the fragmentary nature of remains and the difficulty given the number of victims and chaos surrounding the evacuation of the towers. On the first anniversary, a list of names of the dead was read out as part of the commemoration ceremony at Ground Zero. One woman listening actually heard her own name read out, testifying to the confusion surrounding identification. Fifty missing cases were still under investigation, yet the names were read out anyway.⁴²⁴ But the New York Medical Examiner promised to identify the remains from Ground Zero. Jenny Edkins refers to the way the very possibility of identifying bone fragments and remains led to the public's expectation that they be identified. The fact that the technology existed made a nameless and anonymous and unidentified death an affront. She argues that forensic identification was a way to reassert the

⁴²⁴ Edkins, 'Ground Zero'.

personhood of the victims and reclaim, if not the lives, then at least the deaths of those who died on 9/11.425 It is a way to conquer death, to say, 'this dust will have a name again.⁴²⁶ Edkins advocates for an understanding of the politics of the person as missing to explore the politics of visibility and accountability surrounding who gets recognized as a victim. She argues that missing persons occupy a zone of indistinction between life and death.⁴²⁷ Her argument makes it possible to conceive of naming in the context of 9/11 as an attempt to reimpose the distinctions between life and death, reclaim death itself within a context of intelligibility, distinguish the bodies from the rubble, thereby reclaiming personhood. But this naming can elide the way in which this zone of indistinction opens up important political questions about who counts, who goes missing in conceptualization of a politics which relies on identification of the rational and intelligible as the politically qualified life. Thus finding the missing, so to speak, in this context, may in fact hide the way in which sovereignty can be productive of bare life. Rather than regarding 'missing' as a problem, Edkins explores the questions it can open up for a conventional politics in which all of the dead are missing because there is no place for them except as they are co-opted into specific political projects.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁵ Edkins, Missing.

⁴²⁶ Ibid., 120.

⁴²⁷ Ibid., 14.

⁴²⁸ Ibid., 35.

When family members after 9/11 got the first phone call that the remains of their loved ones had been found, many proceeded to bury the fragments that had been found. But over the next years, they received periodic phone calls identifying other parts of remains. This makes sense considering that there are some 22,000 remnants of remains, while 2,747 people died in the World Trade Center. Some are as small as bone particles. In extreme cases, more than 300 pieces have been linked to a single victim. Over 1,000 victims have still not been linked to any remains. Some families chose to re-open the casket and bury the other remains with the original ones. Others kept the newly found remains until they could collect all of them to bury them together.⁴²⁹ This recalls the bones in a brown bag in the Rwandan case which gesture to the need for whole remains, but also the idea that there needs to be a specific physical site at which to collect remains, whether they be of one person or of many. The idea that the grave, the site of the dead body, is the ultimate memorial to the individual becomes particularly interesting in the context of large-scale violence where there is also often a memorial to the event itself. This emphasis on individuality becomes particularly interesting as it relates to naming in the memorial at Ground Zero.

At Ground Zero, in the memorial center, will be a stone container that will hold the unidentified remains of victims.⁴³⁰ This inevitably brings up a point of comparison with tombs of unknown soldiers. The precise characteristic of the

⁴²⁹ Jo Craven McGinty, 'As 9/11 Remains Are Identified, Grief is Renewed,' *New York Times*, November 12, 2011.

⁴³⁰ Dunlap and Lipton, 'Revised Ground Zero Memorial.'

unknown soldier which makes him a representation of unidentification in general, is considered problematic in the case of 9/11, where the New York medical examiner has promised to identify every single fragment. The tombs of unknown soldiers in Arlington National Cemetery in the US are intended to evoke the hopelessness of loss in war, even to the extent of loss of identity, which is considered perhaps more tragic than simply loss of life. Even in death, at least the identified retain their identity, their name. Yet the unidentified soldier has lost both his life and his name. War has rendered identification itself problematic.

The dead soldier, over time and through the unknown soldier memorialization, became rendered a political person, deserving of individual identification, and when not available, deserving of political recognition even as an unknown and unidentified.⁴³¹ Yet, in the context of 9/11 we are not dealing with soldiers who have been killed in action. Rather, the case is of private individuals that have now been subjected to a national attack and thereby a national narrative which renders their lives and death political. They have become political persons, thereby deserving of *national* identification, or at least national unidentification, as in the case of the unidentified remains which will be housed at the memorial at ground zero.

There has been, however, an effort to incorporate names in the memorial, even if the names cannot be strictly associated with individual bodies. The design

⁴³¹ Ken Inglis, 'Entombing Unknown Soldiers: From London and Paris to Baghdad,' *History and Memory*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1993): 7-31.

for the memorial, Reflecting Absence, incorporates the names of the victims of 9/11 in a way that differs from simply a wall of names. The names encircle the reflecting pools that represent the footprints of the twin towers. The names are stencil-cut around the edges of the pools, allowing the visitor to look at the water through the names, and the names are cut such that visitors can take rubbings of the names in a way similar to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington DC.⁴³² The names are ordered around the reflecting pool purposefully, according to a set pattern. The 2,983 names are arranged to reflect the complexity of interpersonal relationships. First, they are broadly arranged by the location of the individuals on 9/11, including sections for each of the flights, towers, the Pentagon, and the earlier 1993 World Trade Center bombings. Within each of these the names are arranged by personal relationships. Emergency personnel are arranged together, as are individuals who worked at the same company. If two individuals had a particularly close relationship as coworkers at the company, their names are next to one another. Individuals from different companies who became close only at the end as the towers crumbled are also placed next to one another. Family members who worked for different companies are placed next to each other, as is one firefighter brother who is placed next to a police officer brother. Designer Michael Arad describes the design: 'it allows us to place the

⁴³² 'Names on the Memorial,' National September 11 Memorial and Museum website, accessed January 23, 2012.

names of those who died that day next to each other in a meaningful way, marking the names of family and friends together as they had lived and died.'⁴³³

One of the interesting features of the name arrangement is that the ties that bring the names together, such as company affiliation, are not labeled. Rather, the layout almost appears random since the names are not arranged in alphabetical order. However, it is anything but. Family members were in fact asked about any specific relationships their loved one had, and every effort was made to accommodate these connections in creating a complex algorithm to determine name placement. As John Matson remarks on the order, the complexity of meaning of the arrangement of the names 'freezes into place the events of that day a decade ago. In its overarching structure, the arrangement of names preserves the order behind the victims' lives—their work, their friends, their families...At the same time, the seeming disorder in the arrangement of the victims' names preserves the chaos and randomness behind their deaths.⁴³⁴ In this way, the way the names are arranged plays with our conceptions of ordering. It stops everything at the moment of death, where individuals' relationships with one another become defining, where many encountered new individuals who they died with.⁴³⁵ The way the names are arranged thus marks the event by stopping

⁴³³ 'Names Arrangement,' National September 11 Memorial and Museum website, accessed January 23, 2012.

⁴³⁴ John Matson, 'Commemorative Calculus: How an Algorithm Helped Arrange the Names on the 9/11 Memorial', *Scientific American*, September 7, 2011.

⁴³⁵ One of the most well-known stories is of Victor Wald and Harry Ramos, who met while trying to escape from the North Tower in a stairwell. Wald, who found it difficult to go on, was helped

time at the event itself, freezing the interpersonal and professional relationships people had in the exact moment that they died.

The names of those in law enforcement, firefighters, or emergency medical personnel, will have shields or emblems next to them to indicate that these individuals who died did so by willingly going into the towers to provide help, but while still avoiding creating some kind of hierarchy of the dead. Though, this caused controversy from both the families of non-emergency personnel, who felt that it rendered their loved ones deaths less meaningful, and from emergency personnel and the families of emergency personnel who had died, who felt they needed their own memorial.⁴³⁶

The new 9/11 memorial can be considered a palimpsest. Avery Gordon defines this as a 'document that has been inscribed several times, where the remnants of earlier, imperfectly erased scripting is still detectable'.⁴³⁷ Thinking of the memorial in these terms helps us conceptualize how memorialization at Ground Zero represents a form of inscription. Though the site is not a document in strict terms, it is repeatedly and perpetually inscribed and reinscribed by the performances which constitute it as the memorial that it is. In 1993, after the World Trade Center was bombed, a memorial was established which had the

by Ramos. Ultimately, Ramos stayed behind to help Wald, and both died together when the tower collapsed. Their names are listed together on the memorial. See Ibid.

⁴³⁶ Goldberger, Up From Zero, 232.

⁴³⁷ Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, 146.

names of those killed. In this way, the memorial to 9/11, which also contains the names of those killed, also invokes the names of those killed in the earlier bombings, and it lists these 6 names along with those killed in 2001. It is built on the ground of the same prior memorial. It is like a memorial over a memorial, yet also encompasses the earlier memorial. The earlier scripting of the bombing which was also orchestrated by Osama bin Laden, is evident, which laid the groundwork for 9/11, and in this sense 9/11 was a reinscription of a discourse that was already there, that already existed. Memorialization operates the same way; it shifts and takes on new forms; old memories are forgotten in favor of new ones deemed more significant.

Statecraft: The Construction and Governing of Sacred Space

In this section, I explore the importance of spatiality in memorialization, arguing that governing space is the mechanism by which statecraft intercedes in memorialization. To explore this, I evaluate the importance of space in the 9/11 memorial, including the construction of ground zero as a 'sacred space' while the Pentagon site remains a functional one, as well as the importance placed on the spaces we consider to be the 'footprints' of the twin towers. I argue that monumentalization plans at Ground Zero spatialize; they construct space both by situating memory at a particular site which is swathed in narratives of sacralization, and also by rewriting the memory of 9/11 as a New York event, of which Ground Zero becomes exemplary.

Though there are numerous memorial sites all around the US where smaller memorials have sprung up, I argue that 9/11 has been spatialized: the exemplary site of monumentalization has become Ground Zero. It is through the performance of this site as sacred ground that space is constructed. The picture of the event at Ground Zero is clear, while the further one moves away from the physical site, the murkier the picture becomes.⁴³⁸ This fits with the original use of the term 'ground zero,' to refer to the heart of a nuclear explosion, which sustains the most damage, while concentric rings of destruction move outward. Yifat Gutman theorizes the same mechanism at Ground Zero in New York. The site is the 'heart of meaning production, a hallowed burial ground, and an open wound'.⁴³⁹ Marita Sturken theorizes that use of the term 'ground zero' to describe the site implies obliteration and also the idea of a tabula rasa, an empty starting point from which memorialization can derive.⁴⁴⁰ Monumentalization efforts have focused on ground zero as the symbolic center of what we now term '9/11,' overshadowing the other 9/11 sites of the Pentagon and the airplane crash site in Pennsylvania.⁴⁴¹ 9/11 now means New York.

⁴³⁸ Janice Haaken, 'Cultural Amnesia: Memory, Trauma, and War,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 465-466.

⁴³⁹ Yifat Gutman, 'Where do we go from here: The pasts, presents and futures of Ground Zero', *Memory Studies* vol. 2, no. 1 (2009): 55-70, 60. She also, however, points to the problem with viewing destruction in this manner, as site-located rather than as a continuum. Gutman theorizes that even if destruction diminishes as one moves further away from a particular site, this doesn't bring any sense of closure to the site.

⁴⁴⁰ Sturken, 'The Aesthetics of Absence.'

⁴⁴¹ Sturken, 'Memorializing Absence.'

In 9/11 memorialization, space becomes key. Memory is centered at the physical site of Ground Zero. As one family member of a victim says, 'what I have left of my husband are his love, my memories and the place where his life ended.⁴⁴² She refers to Ground Zero as sacred territory due to its status as a burial ground: 'Where they rest is now hallowed ground.'⁴⁴³ Yet ground zero does not take on any of the traditional characteristics of a burial ground, such as grave markers or grassy areas. It resides in an interstitial area between an urban site and a burial site. Practical and economic activities take place there, yet there remains this sense that it is sacred ground. But this is a notion that is performed; ground zero is constructed as sacred ground through mechanisms of memorialization. Death itself has also been spatialized by national narratives; even as ground zero becomes sacred ground, it is not a burial ground. Death has been relegated to the various cemeteries around the country where family members have decided to bury their loved ones. This is the traditional way in which death is spatially isolated from our everyday lives.⁴⁴⁴ In this way, ground zero is sacralized but not because it is the locus of death. Rather, it is because it is the locus of national identity-making.

Ground Zero became sacralized through a variety of individual and political measures. Individual performances of memory at the site and the

⁴⁴² Ferer, 'Unforgotten Soldiers.'

⁴⁴³ Ibid. This is also true of many other family members of victims, who refer to it as 'sacred' or 'hallowed' ground. See Goldberger, *Up From Zero*.

⁴⁴⁴ James Mayo, *War Memorials as Political Landscape: The American Experience and Beyond*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 1988.

perspectives of victims' families on the site constructed a discourse of the sacred. But there were also concerted efforts to perform a sacred identity at the site, including Giuliani's decision after 9/11 to ban amateur photographers from documenting the ruins of the World Trade Center. This action marked the distinguishing of 'disaster' space or 'sacred' space from the rest of the city. This had the effect of ensuring that experience of 9/11 would come from the view of the empty skyline rather than any experience, physical or imagined, of the site of destruction itself.⁴⁴⁵ Interestingly, despite the sacralization of ruins, as discussed earlier, in this instance the site became so sacred as to not invite any normal traffic. People did not walk through the site, even after it was cleared. And visitors to the site after its clearing saw an empty concrete hole in the ground. As this didn't mesh with their imagined view of the site, their vision of the standing towers (and their absence) as representations of the attack was reinforced.⁴⁴⁶ And in 2006, the narrative exhibit that took visitors around the ground zero site was an official narration of the past, a performance of memory and a construction of a memorial imaginary that was perhaps oddly disconnected with the space that looked like a construction site.⁴⁴⁷ This seemed to make the narrative almost more powerful, and emphasized not only the specter of the towers and their absence, but also gestured towards a memorial presence. As Paul Goldberger says, the

⁴⁴⁵ Gutman, 'Where do we go from here', 57.

⁴⁴⁶ As Jenny Edkins says, 'the reality on the ground was both incomparable worse than and not as bad as people had imagined.' See Edkins, 'Ground Zero', 260.

⁴⁴⁷ Gutman, 'Where do we go from here'.

paradox that all monuments must address is a solid to make us feel the void.⁴⁴⁸ In this sense, the dichotomy between presence and absence often privileged in memorialization discourse is often troubled by the performances and processes surrounding the actual design and construction of monuments.

The importance associated with the footprints of the twin towers also speaks to the construction of space. As Michael Kimmelman notes, the key memorial concern in envisioning a 9/11 memorial was how to respect the tower footprints and keep them unencumbered.⁴⁴⁹ Paul Goldberger similarly references the political necessity of keeping the footprints clear, referring to the way in which they were conceived of as the twin towers in a 'spiritual sense.'⁴⁵⁰ The chosen design for the 9/11 memorial at Ground Zero, Reflecting Absence, does just this. The leader of the jury which chose the design stated that the reflecting pools have made 'the voids left by the destruction the primary symbol of our loss'.⁴⁵¹ The emphasis here is placed on the voids as the ultimate representation of the absent towers, which is considered the ultimate memorial to the event. The use of the term footprints to refer to these voids also represents the personification of the towers themselves.

But the memorial which is intended to commemorate these voids is not actually going to end up memorializing the footprints of the towers. The voids in

⁴⁴⁸ Goldberger, Up From Zero, 209.

⁴⁴⁹ Kimmelman, 'Ground Zero's Only Hope'.

⁴⁵⁰ Goldberger, Up From Zero, 212.

⁴⁵¹ Collins and Dunlap, 'Unveiling of the Trade Center Memorials'.

the Reflecting Absence design will be smaller than the tower footprints they are supposed to represent. The underground infrastructure of the memorial center is getting in the way. Designer Michael Arad said that he viewed the footprints at the significant artifact of the site, and would make every effort to preserve the symbolic tracing of the footprints, if not their literal tracing. This mismatch has angered some family members of victims. Jack Lynch, whose son, a firefighter, died on 9/11, said 'it's very important to me that the dimensions of the towers be properly delineated. To do any less, I think, would not be telling the story. People who come years from now will have no idea what the original dimensions were.⁴⁵² His reasoning is interesting here, because it begs the question of whether or not the ten square foot differential will speak a different narrative to the future memorial visitors. It is hard to believe that anyone will even notice the difference, as another relative of a victim points out. James Young also pointed out that the idea of the memorial should not be to elevate the status of the destroyed twin towers over the lives lost, but as Paul Goldberger says, 'this was Ground Zero, where reason did not always prevail'.⁴⁵³ He goes on to delineate the position of the family members of the victims: that the footprints were not a flexible symbol, but a tangible and firm reality. This demonstrates the way in which the buildings have themselves taken on the corporeality normally associated with the body of the victim. In this case, because the towers represented the body, victims' families felt that they needed to be true to form.

⁴⁵² David Dunlap, 'At 9/11 Memorial, Actual Sizes May Vary,' *New York Times*, February 12, 2004, A31.

⁴⁵³ Goldberger, 'Up From Zero,' 235.

It bears further exploration why it is important that the footprints themselves be preserved in situ. I argue that this can be explained by the dichotomy between presence and absence. The reason the footprints come to assume such significance is because they do not represent absence, but in fact appeal to construction of presence through the mechanisms of memorialization. Marita Sturken theorizes that the fetishization of the footprints of the towers demonstrates a desire to situate the site within a larger recognizable memorial tradition. 'The idea that a destroyed structure leaves a footprint evokes a sitespecific concept of memory and the concrete materiality of ruins.'⁴⁵⁴ Our desire to physicalize footprints of the towers is an attempt to reassert them into the sky, she argues. Ultimately the memorialization of the towers' absence then, is simply a reassertion of their dominant presence, and this can be subsumed into sovereign narratives which seek to piece back together and reconstruct linear narratives of space and time.

Statecraft relies on construction of the dichotomy between presence and absence, privileging presence over absence, yet invoking absence as that which threatens presence as a fixed and formed whole. This is what makes it so interesting when there are memorials to absence. But I argue that rather than privileging absence itself, these monuments in fact act to construct and perform the presence/absence dichotomy which the state relies on. In the face of ruptured representation and identification that is so extreme, representation cannot be put back together in the traditional manner. Rather it must be put back together in a

⁴⁵⁴ Sturken, 'The Aesthetics of Absence', 318.

way that acknowledges the rupture, yet still reconstructs the dichotomy and privileges the notion of presence. The 9/11 memorial is poignant because it reminds us of what was lost, of what isn't there anymore. But it also appeals to a notion of what is left, what is still here, albeit perhaps in ruins. It appeals to an image of a ruin in addition to simply the appeal to absence. By doing so, it performs the task of post-trauma reconciliation to help us move on from the event. In this sense, structure comes to matter more precisely because the body, the traditional locus of grief, is missing or absent. While the grave can be empty, the tombstone matters, and in this sense the footprints of the twin towers become the tombstone. The construction of ground zero as sacred space and the inscription of a patriotic and heroic narrative become integral to statecraft precisely because the normal subjects of statecraft, bodies, are no longer present.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the 'language of lack—lack of good information, lack of security, and lack of medical readiness in the face of biological terrorism—flooded the public sphere. Lacks cry out for redress, and holes, and everyone knows, need to be filled'.⁴⁵⁵ Marita Sturken similarly argues that the twin towers never signified more than in their absence. Their absence is more significant than their presence ever was. She points to the shock experienced when looking at the New York skyline and seeing the absence of the towers. She points to the propensity to create a presence of some kind in the face of absence.⁴⁵⁶ Why, then, did the lack of buildings end up not being filled, but rather

⁴⁵⁵ Diana Taylor, 'Ground Zero,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 453-455, 453.

⁴⁵⁶ Sturken, 'Memorializing Absence.'

emphasized? The presence constructed out of the lack in this case was concretized by the drive to memorialize. Absence is itself then, no longer absence, and memorials to absence become more about fetishization, the desire for a presence, than a real contemplation or appreciation of the essential void itself.

In this sense, my argument posits a critique of the counter-monument phenomenon exemplified by the Harburg monument against Fascism. For the counter-monument, absence comes to be the focus. Akin to a hat trick, the focus of the monument comes to be its disappearing rather than the memorialization itself. The Harburg monument, once it was completely lowered into the ground, did not in fact leave the site empty, just as the voids left by the footprints of the twin towers are not empty either. Rather, there is now a plaque at the Harburg site which describes the project, with photographs of each stage of the monument as it was lowered into the ground, and part of the column is visible through a window in the ground. The site itself has become more of an attraction than the memory holds. We visit the site because it is unique and interesting, not to think about fascism or how to prevent fascism. Thus, the counter-monument is simply an unfulfilled promise, and ends up being just another monument, albeit in different aesthetic form.

Like the Harburg monument, which seems to privilege absence while ultimately resorting to presence, the 9/11 monuments to absence also end up privileging presence. Monuments to absence stand out to us precisely because they memorialize the subjugated half of the dichotomy. They memorialize that which we deem to be inferior, absence. In doing so they remind us that the presence of the object was superior, therefore we should never forget it. It is this injunction to privilege the presence of the object through remembrance that ends up being performed through memorialization of absence. This differs from the memorialization that occurs through the construction of a standard monument to memorialize an event such as war or genocide, which does not appeal to the absence of something in order to memorialize it. I am not arguing here that traditional monuments are better suited to memorialize trauma than nontraditional monuments. Rather, I think it is essential for us to keep in mind that despite the shock and awe factor associated with monuments to absence, and no matter how poignant of memorials they may be, they too are in the service of presence, and reinforce the idea that something is still better than nothing. They do so by constructing space around the theme of absence, but they construct space nevertheless.

In this specific instance, the construction of space has powerful foreign policy implications. The construction of a memorial presence has constructed also a narrative understanding of the event, and as Maja Zehfuss⁴⁵⁷ and Jenny Edkins⁴⁵⁸ have demonstrated, this narrative has served to legitimate securitization.⁴⁵⁹ Zehfuss demonstrates the dismantling of civil liberties in the

⁴⁵⁷ Maja Zehfuss, 'Forget September 11,' Third World Quarterly, vol. 24, no. 3 (2003): 513-528.

⁴⁵⁸ Edkins, 'The Rush to Memory'. See also Edkins, 'Ground Zero', specifically her connection between George Bush's statements at Ground Zero on September 11, 2002, and his statements at the UN about intentions to go into Iraq on September 12, 2002.

⁴⁵⁹ An interesting example of the way this has permeated popular culture and everyday practice in 9/11 remembrance is Toby Keith's 2003 song 'Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue', a country

name of 9/11, with the victims reinscribed as heroes in a larger war story. It retroactively constructs an us vs. them dynamic which constructs 9/11 as something exceptional and blurs the lines between war and terrorism. We begin to see 9/11 as the origin, demonstrated by the way we mark time by the event itself, but this results in an ahistorical understanding of 9/11 and an inability for anyone to question the historical conditions that led to the attacks. This renders objections to official policy difficult if not impossible.⁴⁶⁰ Edkins similarly points to the links between the rush to memorialize and the rhetoric of war, arguing that narratives of grief were transformed into demands for revenge by the national memorialization apparatus. After 9/11, she says, the government called for remembrance as a means of legitimating particular policies, rendering them taken for granted and therefore beyond debate.⁴⁶¹ She argues that after 9/11, the US government attempted to reclaim its sovereign power through acts of commemoration, but these acts 'did not wait until it was known who had died but

song which declares American strength in the face of the 9/11 attacks. 9/11 is drawn on to legitimize the perpetration of violence in a way that seems natural to our sensibilities and along with a catchy tune. Lyrics such as 'it'll feel like the whole wide world is raining down on you', 'justice will be served and the battle will rage' (linking justice to war), and 'you'll be sorry that you messed with the U S of A, cause we'll put a boot in your ass, it's the American way', exemplify the connection between justice and aggressive violence, with the latter as quintessentially American. Indeed, Toby Keith's song lyrics have been used as a battle cry by the US military in Iraq, bombs were branded with it, as was one of the first American tanks that went into Baghdad. See Rebecca Leung, 'Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue,' *CBS News*, February 11, 2009. The spread exemplifies the way in which memorialization can be sustained at the level of popular culture and everyday practices.

⁴⁶⁰ Zehfuss offers in response to this idea a provocative injunction that we should forget September 11, rather than allow memory to serve as a tool for official policy and for the construction of the state as the provider of security. See Zehfuss, 'Forget September 11.'

⁴⁶¹ Edkins, 'Ground Zero', 262.

reduced those missing to nothing but numbers of lives lost'.⁴⁶² The construction of space and the missing corporeality within memorialization discourses surrounding September 11, then, all comes back to the state itself.

Jenny Edkins aptly gestures to the role of the state in describing absence in 9/11 memorialization: 'ground zero marks...a nothing that is not a nothing, an absence, an aporia, a stumbling block. To leave it empty would be a permanent reminder of the tear at the heart of the city. This would be unacceptable. Life must, apparently, go on. Or the instrumentalization and depoliticization of life must'. Her argument, that life and death often are mobilized in the service of some political end, characterizes 9/11 memorialization in the way individuals and their bodies became discursively subsumed within the debate about memorialization and design of buildings at ground zero, replicating the way they were physically subsumed into the buildings in the midst of the event itself. In this way, the debate around memorialization took for granted precisely the fact that the debate would be about building a monument. At its start, it assumed the elision of the bodies that mingled with the buildings, in favor of a debate over the design for a memorial. In this case, statecraft cannot be reduced to a decision about what the appropriate memorial design should be. Rather, it discursively sets the agenda by laying the grounds for the debate itself; what is said and what is not said.

⁴⁶² Edkins, 'The Rush to Memory', 235.

Ten Years Later: Memorializing the Anniversary

This section explores the way 9/11 was memorialized on its 10th anniversary by exploring the discourses of popular culture and media memorialization in 2011. By exploring what is remembered and how it is remembered, certain themes become evident which enhance the discussion of statecraft. The way 9/11 is deemed to have changed American life, and indeed conceptualizations of nationalism, citizenship, and security, follow closely with the story of American statecraft after 'the event.' This section thus sets out to explore the numerous television programs which set a specific tone for memorialization. As popular culture and international politics can be considered to form an intertext,⁴⁶³ examining popular conceptualizations of 9/11 can be linked with general perceptions that bolster specific assumptions and policies discursively.

The narrative of 9/11 has been crafted over the ten years since the event. In 2011, the 10 year anniversary commemoration took over the US. Not only was it apparent in the way in which the media was consumed with memorializations, but also in the government plans for commemoration. In August, the White House issued a guide to both domestic officials and overseas embassies. Officials were instructed to memorialize those who died on 9/11, as well as to acknowledge what the government had done to prevent another attack in the US. One interesting aspect of the instructions, both to foreign and domestic officials, was

⁴⁶³ See Jutta Weldes, *To Seek Out New Worlds: Exploring Links Between Science Fiction and World Politics.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

to emphasize that the attacks on 9/11 and terrorism in general is not just about the US, and that there have been other terrorist attacks around the world by Al-Qaeda. The foreign guidelines stated that the 'chief goal of our communications is to present a positive, forward-looking narrative.'⁴⁶⁴ But remembrance was also couched in terms of securitization. The guidelines that emphasized resilience also said that 'while we must never forget those who we lost, we must do more than simply remember them—we must sustain our resilience and remain united to prevent new attacks and new victims'.⁴⁶⁵

The guidelines presented security as an extension of resilience and remembrance. Interestingly, the guidelines suggested minimal reference to Al-Qaeda, because of the death of Osama bin Laden. The guidelines tell officials to make the point that 'Al-Qaeda and its adherents have become increasingly irrelevant.'⁴⁶⁶ Thus, even as security narratives are reinforced, the US key enemy which originally initiated a retaliation is no longer relevant. The idea, then, is not security against the group that perpetrated the attack, but some sense of general security which is broad enough to legitimate any kind of military or political action to secure, which can then draw on 9/11 as legitimation.

⁴⁶⁴ Thom Shanker and Eric Schmitt, 'White House Issues Guides on Sept. 11 Observances', *The New York Times*, August 20, 2011, A12.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid.

'Too Early for Masterpieces': Artistic Memorialization of 9/11

This section explores the struggle with representation after 9/11 through a variety of artistic installations. Tom Sutcliffe details the fact that there is surprisingly little art related to the topic of 9/11, but the art that does exist is centered on the theme of absences or voids. Artists felt pressure both in terms of documentation and composition, especially because many of the materials at play after 9/11, such as twisted metal, tangled steel, and distressed surfaces, were already incorporated within art before 9/11.⁴⁶⁷ So the question of what kind of novel art could be posited after such a large shift in 'reality' troubled many artists. Though several writers took on the task, I focus specifically on visual arts here because they more closely fit the conception of monumentalization that is the focus of this analysis.⁴⁶⁸ Sutcliffe also notes that it is perhaps too early for any 9/11 art masterpieces, primarily due to the nature of anxiety that surround 9/11 and any efforts at interpretation or representation. As he notes: 'we've only just acquired sufficient distance from the event to be able to take risks with the subject and reshape it into different forms'.⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁷ Tom Sutcliffe, 'The Art of 9/11', *The Independent*, September 7, 2011.

⁴⁶⁸ Though it should be acknowledged that there is a range of written work on the topic. Some examples which directly address 9/11 include playwright Neil LaBute, who composed a play about a man who should have been in the towers, but was with his mistress at the time of their destruction instead, and Leslie Bramm, whose play Lovers Leapt focuses on a couple who jumped out of the world trade center buildings. See Sutcliffe, 'The Art of 9/11', for additional examples. See also Ulrich Baer, ed, *110 Stories: New York Writes After September 11*, New York, NY: NYU Press, 2002, which includes the efforts of 110 writers to respond to 9/11. Baer writes interestingly in his introduction to the volume that fiction writing in particular offers a unique response to 9/11 because it does not provide solace, but rather cauterizes the wound with uncomfortable questions and unflinching reflection. See Ibid, 3.

⁴⁶⁹ Sutcliffe, 'The Art of 9/11'.

Still, even if it is too early for masterpieces, the struggles at representation speak to the story told by the 9/11 memorial imaginary, however befuddled it may be. This section looks at several of these artists attempts at memorializing 9/11 through their art. First I look at artists who struggled to represent what had happened and so represented images unrelated to Ground Zero as a way of working through their responses to 9/11, including Audrey Flack's paintings of the fishing boats in Montauk. I then look at artists who have tried to represent the horror of the event more directly, including Sharon Paz's falling bodies project, Magdalena Taber's '3000 Rose Petals,' also intended to evoke the falling bodies, Janet Culbertson's 'Fleeing' and 'The Fallen' paintings, Elizabeth Fergus-Jean's sculptural installation 'Body of Evidence', and Erin Konstantinow's paintings to face her grief over her brother's death on 9/11. Additionally, I address two ways in which artists have tried to conceptualize the world after 9/11, including Chitra Ganesh and Mariam Ghani's commentary on the detention of suspected terrorists after 9/11 and Wayne Belger's Sons of Abraham project. Exploring these artists' work allows for an overview of many of the themes that have been discussed here, and allows for a concentrated view of the popular discourses, exemplified by artistic media, that emerges out of 9/11 and its memorialization.

Audrey Flack's paintings of fishing boats in Montauk on Long Island gesture to the immediate struggle after 9/11 for any sort of artistic representation. Flack tells her story in her statement for an exhibition of 9/11-related work in 2005. She worked in New York and was trying to get into work the morning of September 11, 2001, when the bridges were blocked to incoming traffic as a result of the attacks. She decided to then take a ferry to East Hampton where she had a studio. She recalls the inextricable nature of the shock and horror at what she saw unfolding on the television, and the 'intense cerulean blue' sky. The beautiful weather lasted as long as the shock of the event. To escape the despair, she took her watercolors out to Montauk, where the smells of dead fish and brine overwhelmed her senses. The way this reality interceded started to heal the shock of 9/11. She gestures towards the difficulty of art after 9/11: 'I don't know what's wrong with me. I should be painting images of planes hitting the World Trade Center and all I can do is paint the fishing boats at Montauk'.⁴⁷⁰ Here she speaks to the way in which memorialization need not take the form of representation. Her paintings of the boats act as physical monument to the emotions derived from the event. In this regard, it is harder for her images to be co-opted into the kind of linear political narrative that often arises after a traumatic event.

Sharon Paz, Magdalena Taber, and Janet Culbertson all deal with the issue of the falling bodies of 9/11, each in different ways, yet each recalling the attraction of the imagery of the dead body, both as artistic depiction and as medium for the message of memorialization. Sharon Paz's art depicts images of people falling/jumping from the World Trade Center. The installation appeared at a Queens art center for the one year anniversary of 9/11, and sparked divisive

⁴⁷⁰ Audrey Flack, 'Artist's Statement', The Art of 9/11 Exhibition, curated by Arthur C. Danto, September 7-October 15, 2005. Statement available at http://www.apexart.org/exhibitions/danto.htm, accessed 1/17/12.

remarks from the community. Most deemed it disgusting and offensive because it depicted people dying in a horrible way. But one passerby said, 'I think it is beautiful. It is alive. It is reality'.⁴⁷¹ The idea that it depicted reality made it seem appropriate in the eyes of those who approved of the installation, while the very depiction of such a horrific reality is precisely what made it so controversial for those opposed to the display. Paz attributes her inspiration to the videos she saw of people falling from the towers. Originally from Israel, she says that her background has led her to learn how to deal with terror as part of everyday life. Her exhibit, then, was her way of 'dealing with these images that are so disturbing instead of ignoring them'.⁴⁷²

Magdalena Taber's painting '3000 Rose Petals' is intended to evoke both the dead of 9/11 in general, as evident by the number 3,000, which approximates the number dead, and the falling bodies, also known as the jumpers. Her painting depicts a blurred cityscape in the background, which she notes is generic to allow for the focus on the figures in the painting, and almost seems covered with a layer of ash or dust. Three figures hover in the air. The figures look almost biblical in dress and style, and they appear to be floating and flying and falling through the air all at once. They are surrounded by rose petals of different colors which appear covered by the same layer of dust that covers the background. In her artist's statement, she describes the project's inspiration: 'from a distance, in the

⁴⁷¹ Bertrand, 'New Furor Sparked'.

⁴⁷² Ibid.

midst of horror and chaos, the sight of people jumping out of the windows of the towers appeared so serene, evoking a comparison to flower petals...The people soaring in the sky are fearless, in control of every moment that they have left.⁴⁷³ She also scattered 3,000 rose petals in the ocean as memorial and videotaped it as art form.⁴⁷⁴ She notes that her art seeks to focus on the value of human life, life in bloom, rather than on nationalism or patriotism. She counts each individual rose petal to draw attention to the way in which each human being matters individually.

Unlike Sharon Paz, who displays actual images of the falling bodies from 9/11, or Magdalena Taber, whose work shows falling bodies but not in the context of the twin towers, Janet Culbertson's work paints shadowy figures falling out of burning twin towers. Her painting 'Fleeing' depicts black almost stick figures falling or jumping out of a building, all in different positions, all suspended in mid-air for the moment depicted. Between the steel frames of the building are numerous more figures, reddened by the fiery buildings, all poised to make the same jump. Flames rise from the building, and dark black smoke billows. Hundreds of figures appear in partiality in the painting, intermingled with the building from which they seem ready to flee. The figures already falling seem to be in odd contorted positions, some in what appear to be classical ballet positions. Another painting by Culbertson entitled 'The Fallen' depicts what happens after

⁴⁷³ Magdalena Taber, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=1679.

⁴⁷⁴ See Ibid. for the video.

the falling bodies have landed. Yet it is not what we know has happened to the bodies: they fragmented upon impact. Rather, the bodies appear as apparitions in some kind of darkness, in the classic body positions that one might see in the movies laid out with crime scene tape. The painting makes it seem like the viewer is both looking into a deep dark puddle and into a light as in some sort of near death experience. The bodies seem to be moving from the dark into the light.⁴⁷⁵

The next two artists deal directly with the theme of the body in 9/11 memorialization. Elizabeth Fergus-Jean's sculptural installation 'Body of Evidence' is a figure lying on the ground. The figure is itself composed of newspaper, but specifically newspaper articles about 9/11. The newspaper figure is coated with a layer of wax, then covered with a fabric shroud which contains images of a skeleton.⁴⁷⁶ The figure acknowledges the disruption of our conceptualization of 9/11 as an act that took place on bodies, because, after all, there are no bodies after 9/11. Fergus-Jean in this way brings the body back in, but the body is fragmented, reduced to bones, rendered as a subject of the discursive performance of 9/11 that takes place in the newspapers. The newspaper headlines are still visible as a reminder of this: 'workers dig out the dead', 'naming the dead a daunting task'.⁴⁷⁷ The subject is thus a compilation of

⁴⁷⁵ Janet Culbertson, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=161

⁴⁷⁶ Elizabeth Fergus-Jean, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=1134

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid.

all of the discourses that make it up, that situate it, and that render its very subjectivity. 'Body of Evidence' thus reminds us that our bodies are discursively constituted, not simply material. It also calls attention to the memorialization of bare life that occurs when life is stripped down to bone. Bare life can be coopted within the very same political project that rendered it bare. Erin Konstantinow also undertakes art that relies on body imagery, but recalling the fragmentary nature of the body. Two of her paintings involve digital manipulation of photographs of bone fragments. Interestingly, she also works with digital manipulation of photographs of these images seems to promote an association between the structure of the body and the structure of the towers, the fragmented body and the fragmented towers, and at its heart, body and building itself.

Chitra Ganesh and Mariam Ghani's art 'How Do You See the Disappeared' invokes the securitization that has occurred in the US as a result of the attacks on 9/11. They investigate and comment on not the missing bodies of 9/11, but the voids of those missing because they have been rendered so by the security apparatus. They explore the other, the ungrievable lives, secured within a narrative of securing. They ask after the voids constructed out of the voids of the towers. They explore the immigrants who were detained by the Immigration and Nationalization Services. When the INS released a list of detainees to comply with a Freedom of Information Act request, Ghani noted that the list was redacted

⁴⁷⁸ Erin Konstantinow, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=127

to the extent that the list was simply blank. She states, 'there was nothing left but blank space. These people had been erased. So I felt something else needed to be created out of that.'⁴⁷⁹ What they created was a way to collect the stories of these immigrants, to make their voices heard.⁴⁸⁰ In this way they gesture towards the other absences: not the absence of towers or the absence of bodies, but the absence of voices and the absence of those individuals labeled as 'other' who have been elided from the national story about 9/11.⁴⁸¹

Wayne Belger's art attempts to respond to the divisiveness bred from 9/11, utilizing the very physicality of the twin towers to reflect an understanding of the world that offers an alternative to the nationalist rhetoric that arose out of 9/11. Belger utilizes a handmade pinhole camera to take photographs. The camera, which he calls the 'Sons of Abraham' camera, is made using a piece of structural steel from the south tower and is inlayed with parts of the Bible, Torah, and Quran. This mixture of holy books is an attempt to comment on our shared humanity rather than religious divisiveness. Belger takes photographs which are composed in a very specific way: one religious leader (priest, rabbi, or imam), holding the holy book corresponding to his religion, standing in front of a church, synagogue, or mosque. The three photographs that result share the same composition, leading us to reflect on the way in which all three are the same

⁴⁷⁹ Christine Lagorio, 'Artists Seek to Fill 9/11 Voids', CBS News, September 10, 2009.

⁴⁸⁰ 'How Do You See the Disappeared: A Warm Database'. Available online at http://www.turbulence.org/Works/seethedisappeared/, accessed 1/15/12

⁴⁸¹ Thus even as the disappearances of those lost on 9/11 are rendered excruciatingly visible in the form of heroic narratives, the disappearances of those on these lists are rendered normalized.

rather than upon religious difference. In this way, Belger's art acts as a resistance to the othering rhetoric in which 9/11 has too often been coopted in order to promote a specific nationalist narrative. As Belger says, 'the Sons of Abraham Project was created to study a fictitious "us and them" that was created after 9/11.' His photographs, then, depict, 'just a man or woman, standing to the left of a building holding a book. All the compositions of the photos will be the same, all without an "us and them".⁴⁸² Indeed, because the photographs are taken with the pinhole camera, the images are themselves blurred and as a result, the faces and clothing of the individuals is not distinguishable from one another. Belger's piece is one medium through which resistance to a totalizing narrative can be expressed by in some ways recuperating the other and presenting it for our view in the same way as he presents ourselves.

Artistic interpretations can be problematic. A design for a pair of highrise buildings in Seoul is not intended to bear any relation to the twin towers in New York, but critics and families of victims have drawn attention to the fact that the designs for the buildings evoke not only the twin towers, but their destruction. The two towers stand next to each other and each have a cloud of jumbled blocks in the center, which critics say look like the towers are exploding, and bear an uncanny resemblance to the appearance of the towers upon their explosions when the airplanes hit. A parent of someone killed on 9/11 in the towers said that the designers of the South Korean buildings 'have no respect for the people who died

⁴⁸² Wayne Belger, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=1376

that day. They're crossing a line. It looks just like the towers imploding. I think they're trying to sensationalize it. It's a cheap way to get publicity'.⁴⁸³ Surely there are cheaper ways that 9/11 memory has been commercialized and commodified. Still, the designers maintain that their buildings were not intended to resemble the World Trade Center towers and though they express regret over the controversy, do not intend to alter the plans for the building.

Artistic representations and attempts at representation gesture to the difficulty of fully and finally fixing one specific understanding of 9/11. Though some believe memorialization or monumentalization involve fixing one narrative, they often rather involve a series of iterative performances that are contextually changing and are bolstered by a myriad of social and political practices. The production of art after 9/11 is no different. It gestures at the way 9/11 narratives are sustained through artistic practice, but artistic practice can also offer a potential resistance to the totalizing narratives that imply some inherent meaning to the event.

Some Conclusions: When Ruins Fall into Ruin

By way of conclusion, I'd like to discuss three vanishings of monuments. The first is the decisions made in Germany in the 1980s that certain Holocaust memorials were not quite suitable, and should be redesigned or reconfigured or moved to other locations. The purposeful destruction of memorials based out of a

⁴⁸³ Tracy Connor, 'Korean Tower Design Evokes Exploding WTC', *New York Daily News*, December 9, 2011.

notion that they didn't memorialize correctly is a very specific type of vanishing. When one begins to speak of the destruction of Holocaust memorials, it almost seems as if one must be telling the story of an act of vandalism. The privileging of the memorial site as a sacred one has been detailed throughout this project. The site itself becomes imbued with a sacred quality by virtue of the events that took place there, and often, because of the bodies and bones buried or mixed with the earth or debris. But in the case of Germany in the 1980s, an institutional decision was made to remove monuments, and very few people noticed. There was no uproar over the defilement of sacred ground. What logic of vanishing does this invoke?

Another equally interesting type is the destruction of memorials in an attempt to recast national histories and national narratives, as in the case of the destruction of the monument to Saddam Hussein, which essentially memorialized his rule over Iraq. The fact that the monument was destroyed by the Iraqi people represents a memorialization performance: a specific and deliberate act of destroying a memory in the service of an alternative future and a different story of the past than had been told. As Katherine Verdery points out, 'a statue alters the temporality associated with the person, bringing him into the realm of the timeless or the sacred.'⁴⁸⁴ She goes on to point to the way in which tearing down a statue removes that body from the national landscape, and deprives it of the sacred quality that had been attributed to it by the construction and predominance of the

⁴⁸⁴ Katherine Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*, New York: NY: Columbia University Press, 1999, 5.

statue. Since it can be torn down, the person is no longer invulnerable. The person dissolves into an ordinary person bound by time.⁴⁸⁵ The destruction of the monument to Saddam Hussein, though it is not strictly a memorial monument, helps us conceive of how physical structures exist within a multiplicity of narratives which can also narrate their own destruction and absence.

Lastly, I want to explore the monument crumbling into ruins as a political act. How does the fading of the physical monument operate juxtaposed with new forms of technological advancement which allows for storage of all information permanently? The physical fading of monuments poses problems for remembrance, particularly when the monument is a ruin which testifies to a particular event. Many people cited this problem with leaving ground zero as is with twisted steel structures: that it would not remain permanently structurally sound. James Young raises this issue with the preservation of the concentration camp sites which are essentially ruins. How does one preserve ruins? 'Short of reconstructing the gas chambers, just how much renovation should be permitted?⁴⁸⁶ And indeed, in many Holocaust concentration camp memorials, buildings have been rebuilt, including barracks and guard towers. The question of how to memorialize must reckon with the natural tendency of things to fade. Ruins are not the exception, but the rule. So how do we memorialize ruins without memorializing the fading of the event itself from our memory as the ruins physically decay?

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁶ Young, Texture of Memory, 153.

The monument need not even physically fade to be forgotten. Many cite the downturn in visitors to the Oklahoma City bombing memorial as time has passed. One million people attended the dedication of Grant's Tomb in 1897, yet now most people have never heard of it except in a joke. One hundred years ago, a 12 story column was erected in Brooklyn to remember 11,000 American soldiers who died aboard British ships as prisoners during the Revolutionary War. Today the memorial is vandalized and few remember its meaning or those it was meant to honor.⁴⁸⁷

Even some have anticipated the fading of memory surrounding the 9/11 memorial at Ground Zero, before building has even been completed. Anita Contini was hired as the curator of the memorial aspects at Ground Zero by the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. She researched the functioning of other memorial sites and said, 'maybe they shouldn't have long-term relevance— not everything should be remembered forever. Do we want to celebrate the culture of death, instead of the culture of the living? Do we want to have so much reminding us of the terror of the tragedy, or more of a living memorial about our culture?'⁴⁸⁸

Monuments vanish. This is a feature of our modern life. But rather than viewing this as natural, perhaps it is possible to conceive of this biopolitically, as a facet related to memorialization. It is not unimaginable that the same narrativization and performance that occludes part of the story in performing the

⁴⁸⁷ Hampson, 'Americans Rush to Build Memorials.'

⁴⁸⁸ As cited in Goldberger, Up From Zero, 215-216.

sovereign view of space and time would ultimately come to render invisible the monument itself. Perhaps this most of all speaks to the constant performance necessary to sustain statecraft. Memory must not simply be situated in a monument, which takes on the burden of memory. Rather, it is something that is political; it must constantly be performed and reconstructed and re-imagined and delimited.

Most Americans believe 9/11 represents a marked shift in American consciousness. The question posited here is how 'after 9/11' represents a kind of memorialization which bears the marks of statecraft. The crafting of the state often appears more stark after a traumatic event, still statecraft itself is sustained by a multiplicity of everyday practices and assumptions exercised by the general public. American statecraft after 9/11 is not simply exercised in the policymaking surrounding the war-on-terror, but in the memorialization impetus that began before the dust had settled, in the contestation over memorial designs, and in the sacralization of Ground Zero space. Unlike the other cases presented in previous chapters, it perhaps still remains to be seen what avenues of resistance have opened up or will open up as a response to these discourses. But looking at the 9/11 memorial imaginary reinforces that more than ever, performances of statecraft rely on difference and othering, on the construction of grievable lives. The fact that the US remains haunted by 9/11 is not something apolitical, something distinct from the operations of statecraft. It is implicated in the crafting of the state. Perhaps resistances can be found in the way in which Americans can be haunted by the unfinished story of the state.

267

Chapter 6

AFTER GHOSTLY POLITICS: SOME CONCLUSIONS

One of the main goals of this project has been to demonstrate that statecraft is not simply the purview of the institutions we often recognize as the state. Rather, the state is both a theoretical and material construct, whose crafting is reliant on not only institutional practices but also a myriad of social, economic, and other identity-related practices at a multiplicity of levels and sites, including everyday practice. Statecraft is nothing less, then, than the very construction of subjectivity itself, the construction of life and death, what it means to be recognized as alive or dead by the state. It rests on schemas of visibility and intelligibility to render life and death itself politically qualified, or not. Statecraft, the crafting of the state, is the crafting of a story about who lives and who dies, a story about 'our' history and identity. Yet as much as the state draws on this story, this 'history', this memory and memorialization of a specific past in order to perform itself as fully formed, it remains haunted by the fact that statecraft is precisely that, a crafting. It is never fully and finally completed; it relies on the construction of dichotomies even down to the most basic level of life and death, and is implicated in governance of these biopolitical qualities. Paying attention to ghosts then, is not an empty exercise, but one which allows us to ask after the governance of these qualities, and the biological lives deemed unintelligible, ungrievable, unlivable, by the state. These lives, and deaths, exist at the hauntological level, reminding us that being is itself a political construction.

As Joanne Lipson Freed characterizes, 'for Derrida, the ghost or specter becomes a figure for all that disrupts, interrupts, or deconstructs, and possesses all the productive potential that such interventions promise.⁴⁸⁹ In this sense, looking for ghosts is not simply a way to explore the logic of haunting at play in contemporary forms of statecraft, but also a way of conceiving hauntological resistances to many of the closures imposed by the state in these ordering mechanisms. Resistance is not as simple as political protest of the institutional structures of the state; rather here it is conceptualized as a re-thinking of many of the categories and foundational concepts we take for granted or assume as given. By putting things out-of-joint, haunting can remind us of the discursive production of citizenship and offer productive ways of considering how these concepts function to reinforce othering mechanisms even at the biological level, such as the lack of concern for undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border. Haunting can remind us that the way the state is crafted and sustained by identity practices can serve to legitimate certain policies, as in Rwanda where the specter of genocide must exist in order for the state to invoke the continued threat of genocide ideology. The bodies as evidence of the genocide must be continually present as the ultimate monument to bare life instrumentalized by the state, even as biological life continues to be appropriated by the state to guard against the continued threat of genocide ideology that is appealed to as the basis for policymaking in Rwanda.

⁴⁸⁹ Joanne Lipson Freed, *Haunting Encounters: The Ethics of Global Reading*, dissertation, English Language and Literature, University of Michigan, 2011, 7.

Considering how statecraft functions and haunting-as-resistance brings voices to the forefront that have been silenced. I do not presume to speak for these voices here, merely to point to the perhaps Levinasian ethical imperative of listening to the 'other'. Rather than viewing the ghost as a threat subject to intervention or mediation, or simply as an otherworldly figure who cannot be understood in the confines of this world, we must open to the ghost and the way it ruptures our understanding of this world, the identities we perceive in it, the foundational concepts we assume, and the language we use to describe our world. Thus my goal is not to render the ghostly visible or intelligible, but to put into question visibility and intelligibility as preconditions for entrance into a specific bounded political community, to ask after how we might undertake an ethical effort to re-conceptualize our frameworks to listen to the ghostly voices.

The question is not whether ghosts or hauntings exist in international politics, but rather the forms they take, the structures and assumptions they sustain or resist, and most importantly, whether the ghostly will continue to be laughed off, marginalized, or ignored in an era where questions of security predominate. Will the ghost continue to be 'secured' as a threat subject to intervention which is deemed necessary to the functioning of the state, or will aesthetic and political forms of resistance open new ways of thinking about the ghostly figures that haunt at the margins of international politics, after war, in the mass graves of Rwanda, in the deserts of the southwestern US, beyond the walls which separate Israel from the Palestinian territories, and in the bone fragments from Ground Zero that have been invoked as legitimation for war and intervention.

270

In many of the instances I speak about, there is much contestation and controversy at memorial sites about the appropriateness of specific kinds of memorialization. But I have tried to avoid remarking on the legitimacy of specific forms of memorialization, rather intending to focus on the work these forms do towards supporting or resisting mechanisms of statecraft. I'm interested, then, for example, not in whether it is good or bad to display bodies in the Rwandan context, but what mechanisms are at work that result in this form of memorialization, what kind of work bodies do in sustaining narratives of statecraft as to what counts as politically qualified life, but also in positing potential resistances to the closures and silences of the state. By no means have I been able to provide a comprehensive analysis of the many forms of memorialization in these cases, much less of the range of cases that exist where there is an interesting relationship between statecraft, haunting, and sites of memory. These three cases, however, have been exceedingly useful in that they are all different, yet have allowed me to trace a similar process.

The case of memorialization of undocumented immigrants who die crossing the US-Mexico border is an interesting case precisely because bordering is not a feature unique to this case. Bordering is a mechanism of statecraft which has existed since the emergence of the territorial Westphalian state, if not much earlier. The notion of a shared identity tied to a piece of land has become problematized in an era of global mobility, but this has only strengthened the performances and practices which sustain this notion, including the idea of citizenship as being somehow importantly connected to birth and death. One is a citizen of a country who has been born on its land. Alternately, if one has not been born on that land, he is not a citizen. He may become a citizen through a complex process where he swears allegiance, essentially announcing his intentions to die on that land or die for that land, as in cases where foreigners who join the US military are often fast-tracked to citizenship, or awarded citizenship posthumously after dying for that country. The connection between birth, death, and land, ultimately all about the body itself and its biological processes, becomes interestingly ruptured not at the point the undocumented immigrant crosses the border; at this point he is simply an economic and security threat to the country subject to intervention. Rather, the rupture occurs at the moment he dies on American soil, forever frozen in the perpetual status of undocumented-ness. It is at this point that his biopolitical life, and death, can no longer be appropriated by the sovereign complex.

The case of Rwanda offered a useful way of thinking through statecraft because after the genocide, the state was in a literal re-crafting, almost from scratch. The rebuilding of the institutional state was paired with a recrafting of state narratives, even of what it meant to be Rwandan; identity and subjectivity itself were re-formed and re-constructed. There are many who say of Rwanda post-genocide that survivors are marginalized by reconciliation, by memorialization, by the government apparatus, and that political dissent and political freedom is suppressed. It is my argument, though, that though there may be some instances of marginalization of survivors, it is and can never be effective. While the state may invoke the specter of haunting to legitimize its policies by claiming to be guarding against genocide ideology, there is a significant way in which the state is haunted by the stories of survivors and by the dead. The ghostly traces leak through, even as bodies or bones may be displayed for political purposes. The best example of this is in the way the bodies and bones of genocide victims are viewed by survivors themselves. All of the survivors I interviewed felt that the evidence being presented was important, which goes along with the government's message of guarding against genocide ideology. But they also all seemed to adopt a perspective that in the face of genocide, when life is stripped bare by sovereign totalitarian power to the point of genocidal killing, the only natural thing might be to memorialize that bare life, and in doing so, memorialize the process and the logic of genocide itself. What is being memorialized in Rwandan genocide memorialization is not the individuals killed, though there are some mechanisms for reclaiming individuality and humanity. Rather, what is being memorialized is the genocide. These individuals were not simply killed, they were killed in a genocide. This difference has de-natured traditional schemas of burial and normalized alternative ways of visibility and display. And it is impossible not to be haunted when visiting genocide memorials, not by the victims individually as much as by the nature of genocide itself, which is horrific and overpowering. In this way, by memorializing genocide rather than the individual victims, Rwandan memorial sites ensure that visitors leave as haunted as Rwanda is.

The final case I addressed, 9/11 memorialization, offers up an interesting link between national narratives and practices of memorialization. Others have

demonstrated how 9/11 narratives led to specific foreign policy practices, but I have tried to explore and complicate the story by asking after the sacralization of ground zero as a memorial site which comes to serve a national role in statecraft. The 9/11 case is one in which the story is still being told. Memorialization is an active process, not the construction of static monuments. Bodies and fragments are still being identified, buildings are still being built, lives are still being grieved, and war is still being fought. But the story of 9/11 is haunted by the invisibility of many bodies, not only the missing victims of 9/11, but the lives elided from the national imagination that are being taken with the battle cry of 9/11, as Judith Butler, Jenny Edkins, and Maja Zehfuss have pointed to. This case is particularly interesting because of the question of absence, both of bodies and of buildings. The focus on absence in 9/11 memorialization reminds us that integral to the project of statecraft is the making present and making absent. 9/11 haunts, both because we are told we must be haunted by the specter of terrorism that marks our continued insecurity, and because the deaths of that day do not fully conform to this same narrative. In some way, artistic representations of 9/11 are able to demonstrate this tension between presence and absence and begin to posit a rupture by pointing to the logic of vanishing.

The three cases ultimately each address a similar yet different type of process associated with statecraft. They thus illustrate that statecraft and its performances are heavily context-dependent. The Rwandan case illustrates erasure in the elision of particular stories about the genocide. The case of undocumented immigrants illustrates exile as a strategy of statecraft in the way in

which they have been placed beyond the bounds, both territorially and metaphorically, of qualified politics. The 9/11 case illustrates excision as a means of construction of a political community in the way in which it has excised specific forms of subjectivity from the political and memorial imaginary. Ultimately each of these cases illustrate different instances of statecraft. While I have perhaps not offered a reconceptualization of statecraft itself, I have tried to offer up an exploration of how it works and the work that it does in specific contexts, in an attempt to question the assumptions underlying its practice. Statecraft is an abstract concept which ultimately eludes definition precisely because it is so heavily context-dependent in its potentialities. One may ask, then, what is not statecraft? Is anything not a purview of the construction of the state? I might argue, then, that in the contemporary era, perhaps like Agamben says, the modern state is totalitarian in that it is literally imbued in every aspect of life, including what it means to live and die.⁴⁹⁰ In this sense, nothing, not even death, is beyond the purview of statecraft.

The forms addressed here in which the connections between statecraft and haunting have been fleshed out all speak to the work bodies do in international politics and contribute to a burgeoning field of scholarship that seeks to address embodied practices in global politics. As conflict continues to take new forms that often distance the aggressor from the victim, there is a danger that the dead bodies of international politics will be perceived more as collateral damage, a necessary evil, or perhaps simply necessary, and both the humanity and the

⁴⁹⁰ Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

politics of these dead bodies will be more easily elided from the public imagination. It is important then, as I conclude the project that has been this dissertation, for me to emphasize the importance of dead bodies. They offer an alternative perspective on international politics. If ethnographic research tries to look at things from the perspective of others, incorporate alternative ways of viewing, experience the lived experience of others, then what does it mean to see things from the perspective of a dead body, to experience the lived experience of the dead? I have tried to keep this way of seeing in the back of my mind as I have moved through this project, and ultimately I think it is an important and undertheorized area of research. If the ghost is a social figure, then the dead body is a political one, a physical instantiation of the biopolitical subject of the state. Death is often portrayed as a mystical realm where the political story has ended, beyond the purview of the state. But the story of the state, the political story, does not end with death. It is made ever more significant.

Shakespeare once said, 'And nothing can we call our own but death, And that small model of the barren earth, Which serves as paste and cover to our bones.' But in many instances, dead bodies are co-opted into a variety of political projects, and there are no individual graves, or perhaps no graves at all in which the earth provides cover to bones. In some instances, bones are on display in a Rwandan genocide memorial; in others, bleached bones bake in the Arizona desert; in others, bone fragments are scattered, some in the New York Medical Examiner's office, others perhaps in a grave, some disintegrated, and perhaps some used as industrial mix-in for construction projects. We must move beyond the schema that our death is somehow our own, which ignores the way in which our biopolitical lives, and our deaths, and indeed their ontological status and meaning, are already the purview of the state. Bodies and spaces are both reconfigured by a multiplicity of international processes operating at levels ranging from the international to the local. They can no longer be written off as the collateral damage of international conflict, even while they are inscribed and re-inscribed with specific political narratives.

Rather, the ultimate aim of this project must, at the end, be an ethical imperative, not simply to recognize the role that bodies and spaces play in international politics, but to be open to the ghostly. My argument, then, is that by thinking hauntologically, we are able to ask after those deemed ontologically dead or ungrievable lives. Rather than rendering these lives visible or grievable, my aim has been to trouble the conditions by which lives are deemed visible, grievable, and indeed politically qualified, to problematize the preconditions for entrance into a political community. This project has attempted to detail the complex narratives that are crafted and performed in the context of statecraft, and the exclusions, exiles, excisions, and silences this generates. By paying attention to what is often left out of the story, the voices that have not been heard and the ghosts that have been marginalized can begin to be thought of as political.

REFERENCES

'5,100 Crosses at Mexico Border Mark Migrant Deaths', *San Diego Union Tribune*, October 30, 2009.

Adorno, Theodor, 'What Does Coming to Terms with the Past Mean?' In Geoffrey Hartman, ed, *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959/1986.

Agamben, Giorgio, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Agamben, Giorgio, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*, Zone Books, 2002.

Agamben, Giorgio, *State of Exception*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Agathangelou, Anna, 'Bodies of Desire, Terror and the War in Eurasia: Impolite Disruptions of (Neo) Liberal Internationalism, Neoconservatism and the "New: Imperium,' *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 3 (2010): 693-722.

Ahren, Raphael, 'Jerusalem to dedicate first 9/11 memorial with names outside US,' *Haaretz*, November 6, 2009.

'Alfredo Jaar: The Rwanda Project', *Art 21*, available at http://www.art21.org/texts/alfredo-jaar/interview-alfredo-jaar-the-rwanda-project

Amoore, Louise, and Alexandra Hall, 'Border Theatre: On the Arts of Security and Resistance', *Cultural Geographies*, vol. 17, no. 3 (2010): 299-319.

Andreas, Peter, *Border Games: Policing the US-Mexico Divide*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Andrieu, Kora, 'Sorry for the Genocide': How Public Apologies can help Promote National Reconciliation, *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 1 (2009): 3-23.

Antze, Paul, and Michael Lambek, eds, Tense Past, New York: Routledge, 1996.

Ashley, Richard, 'Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique,' *Millennium*, vol. 17, no. 2 (1988): 227-262.

Baer, Ulrich, ed, *110 Stories: New York Writes After September 11*, New York, NY: NYU Press, 2002.

Baines, Erin, 'Body Politics and the Rwandan Crisis', *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3 (2003): 479-493.

Barry, Dan, and Amy Waldman, 'Sifting Mountains of Debris for Slivers of Solace,' *New York Times*, October 21, 2001, A1, B11.

Belger, Wayne, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=1376

Bell, Duncan, *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Bell, Duncan, 'Memory and Violence', Millennium vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 345-360.

Benjamin, Walter, Illuminations. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Bernstein, Neil, 'Controversial-art-inspires-debate', *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 10, 2008.

Bertrand, Donald, 'New Furor Sparked by Falling-Bodies Art', *New York Daily News*, September 21, 2002.

Booth, W. James, 'The Unforgotten: Memories of Justice', *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, no. 4 (2001): 777-791.

Booth, W. James, 'Kashmir Road: Some Reflections on Memory and Violence', *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 361-377.

Borg, Stefan, 'Euro-Crafting at Border Zones: Desires for Europe at the Greco-Turkish border and the question of a European Union "beyond the state", Paper Presented at International Studies Association-Northeast Annual Conference, Providence, RI, November 4-5, 2011.

Boxer, Sarah, 'Debating Ground Zero Architecture and the Value of the Void,' *New York Times*, September 30, 2002, p. B1.

Buckley-Zistel, Suzanne, 'We are Pretending Peace: Local Memory and the Absence of Social Transformation and Reconciliation in Rwanda,' In Clark and Kaufman, eds, *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction, and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2009, 125-144.

Bush, George W., 'Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People,' The White House. September 20, 2001. Available at http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html.

Bush, George W., 'The President's News Conference With President Paul Kagame of Rwanda in Kigali,' *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* vol. 44, issue 7, February 5, 2008: 238-244.

Butler, Judith, Bodies that Matter, London: Routledge, 1993.

Butler, Judith, 'Afterword' in David Eng and David Kazanjian, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003, 467-474.

Butler, Judith, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London, UK: Verso, 2004.

Carroll, Rory, 'In Memory of Murder: Can Art help ease Rwanda's pain?' *The Guardian* March 24, 2004, p.12.

Caruth, Cathy, *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Caruth, Cathy, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History,* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Casanova, Jorge Pech, '2,501 Migrants by Alejandro Santiago Ramirez: A Brief Comment on the Significance of the Project', accessed December 4, 2011, http://www.2501migrants.com/home.html.

Casper, Monica and Lisa Jean Moore, *Missing Bodies: the Politics of Visibility*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2009.

Cauchon, Dennis and Martha Moore, 'Desperation Forced a Horrific Decision,' *USA Today*, September 2, 2002.

'Century-Old Obelisks Mark U.S-Mexico Boundary Line', last modified August 30, 2010,

http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/about/history/did_you_know/obelisk/obelisk.xml.

'Chip in for a \$50m Border Fence', Belfast Telegraph, July 20, 2011.

Chow, Olivier, 'Alfredo Jaar and the Post-Traumatic Gaze,' *Tate Papers*, Spring 2008.

Clarke, Bruce, 'Bruce Clarke, Visual Artist,' Retrieved January 3, 2012 from http://www.bruce-clarke.com.

Cobban, Helena, Amnesty After Atrocity? Healing Nations After Genocide and War Crimes. Paradigm, 2006.

Collins, Glenn, 'A 9/11 Shrine, With the Tragic, Toxic Dust,' *New York Times*, August 25, 2006.

Collins, Glenn and David Dunlap, 'Unveiling of the Trade Center Memorials Reveals an Abundance of New Details,' *New York Times*, January 15, 2004, A26.

Colloff, Pamela, 'The Desert of the Dead', Texas Monthly, November 1, 2006.

Connor, Tracy, 'Korean Tower Design Evokes Exploding WTC', *New York Daily News*, December 9, 2011.

'Court Rules Israel's Barrier Illegal', The Seattle Times, July 10, 2004, A6.

Coutin, Susan Bibler, *Legalizing Moves: Salvadoran Immigrants' Struggle for* U.S. Residency, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Cubitt, Geoffrey, *History and Memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Culbertson, Janet, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=161

Cvetkovich, Ann, '9-1-1 Every Day,' Signs 28, 1 (2002) 491-492.

Dalenberg, Alex, 'Capitol's Monuments Fall Victim to Budget Crunch,' *The Arizona Republic*, June 14, 2009.

Dauphinee, Elizabeth and Cristina Masters, 'Introduction: Living, Dying, Surviving I,' in Dauphinee and Masters eds., *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Davis, Colin, 'Etat Present: Hauntology, Spectres, and Phantoms', *French Studies* vol. 59, no. 3 (2005): 373-379.

Davis, Trista, 'El Tiradito Shrine an Ode to Local Hispanic Folklore', *El Independiente*, October 23, 2009.

De Genova, Nicholas, 'Migrant "Illegality" and Deportability in Everyday Life', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 31 (2002): 419-447.

De Montebello, Philippe, 'The Iconic Power of an Artifact,' *New York Times*, September 25, 2001, A29.

Derrida, Jacques, *The Work of Mourning*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Derrida, Jacques, Specters of Marx. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Doty, Roxanne, 'Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, '*International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37 (1993): 297-320.

Doty, Roxanne, 'The Double Writing of Statecraft: Exploring State Responses to Illegal Immigration, *Alternatives*, vol. 21, no. 2 (1996): 171-189.

Doty, Roxanne, 'Bare Life: Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, forthcoming.

Douglass, Ana, and Thomas Vogler, *Witness and Memory: The Discourse of Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Dunlap, David, 'At 9/11 Memorial, Actual Sizes May Vary,' *New York Times*, February 12, 2004, A31.

Dunlap, David, '5201 Ideas for 9/11 Memorial, from the Sublime to the Less So,' *New York Times*, February 20, 2004, A1.

Dunlap, David, 'Tribute in Light Will Keep Shining, This Year and the Next,' *New York Times*, September 10, 2010.

Dunlap, David, and Eric Lipton, 'Revised Ground Zero Memorial Will Include an Artifact Center,' *The New York Times*, January 14, 2004, A19.

Eaglestone, Robert, *The Holocaust and the Postmodern*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Edkins, Jenny, 'The Rush to Memory and the Rhetoric of War,' *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, vol. 31, no. 2 (2003): 231-250.

Edkins, Jenny, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Edkins, Jenny, 'Ground Zero: Reflections on Trauma, In/distinction and Response, *Journal for Cultural Research*, vol. 8, no. 3 (2004): 247-270.

Edkins, Jenny, *Missing: Persons and Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Elford, Ricardo, 'Discarded Migrants', *CMSM Forum*, Fall 2010, accessed 1/25/11,

http://www.archchicago.org/immigration/pdf/Immigration/Discarded_Migrants.p df.

Eng, David, and David Kazanjian, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Engle, Kathy, 'Bridge over troubled borders: Artist created "Veil of Tears" tribute in Arivaca', *Green Valley News and Sun*, February 21, 2008.

Epstein, Charlotte, 'Guilty Bodies, Productive Bodies, Destructive Bodies: Crossing the Biometric Borders,' *International Political Sociology*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2007): 149-164.

Estrin, Daniel, 'West Bank Security Barrier Draws Artists and Advertisers', *Forward*, August 25, 2010.

Ferer, Christy, 'Unforgotten Soldiers,' New York Times, October 25, 2001, A21.

Fergus-Jean, Elizabeth, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=1134

Ferraris, Maurizio, 'Documentality'. Working Paper. New York, Italian Academy, October 11, 2006, accessed January 25, 2011, http://www.italianacademy.columbia.edu/publications/working_papers/2006_200 7/paper_fa06_Ferraris.pdf

Fierke, Karin, 'Bewitched by the Past: Social Memory, Trauma, and International Relations,' in Duncan Bell, ed, *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, 116-134.

Fischer, Zane, 'Justice for All: But Especially for the Artist', *Santa Fe Reporter*, August 5, 2008.

Flack, Audrey, 'Artist's Statement', The Art of 9/11 Exhibition, curated by Arthur C. Danto, September 7-October 15, 2005. Statement available at http://www.apexart.org/exhibitions/danto.htm, accessed 1/17/12.

Flynn, Kevin, 'Ground Zero: A Memorial; Firefighters Block a Plan for Statue in Brooklyn,' *New York Times*, January 18, 2002, p. A21.

Flynn, Kevin, and Jim Dwyer, 'Falling Bodies, A 9/11 Image Etched in Pain,' *New York Times*, September 10, 2004.

Foucault, Michel, The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1, Vintage Books, 1990.

Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1975/1995.

Foucault, Michel, Society Must Be Defended. London: Picador, 1976/2003.

Foucault, Michel, Security, Territory, Population. London: Picador, 2009.

Fox, Ben, 'Unknown Immigrants Fill Pauper Cemetery', *The Spokesman-Review*, May 29, 2001, A3.

Freed, Joanne Lipson, *Haunting Encounters: The Ethics of Global Reading*, dissertation, English Language and Literature, University of Michigan, 2011.

George, Jim, Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re) Introduction to International Relations. Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1994.

Giroux, Henry, 'Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability,' *College Literature*, vol. 33, no. 3 (2006): 171-196.

Goldberger, Philip, Up From Zero: Politics, Architecture, and the Rebuilding of New York, New York, NY: Random House, 2004.

Gordon, Avery, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Greenberg, Hanan, 'Army Building New Gaza Barrier', *Israel News*, April 14, 2005.

Gutman, Yifat, 'Where do we go from here: The pasts, presents and futures of Ground Zero', *Memory Studies* vol. 2, no. 1 (2009): 55-70.

Guyer, Sara, 'Rwanda's Bones,' Boundary, vol. 2, no. 36 (2009):155-175.

Haaken, Janice, 'Cultural Amnesia: Memory, Trauma, and War,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 465-466.

Hampson, Rick, 'Americans Rush to Build Memorials to 9/11,' USA Today, May 5, 2003, 1A.

Hansen, Lene, *Security As Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Hatzfeld, Jean, *Life Laid Bare: The Survivors in Rwanda Speak*. New York: Other Press, 2000.

Herzog, Lawrence, 'Rethinking the Design of Mexican Border Cities,' in *Fluctuating Borders: Speculations about Memory and Emergence*, eds. Rosalea Monacella and SueAnne Ware. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT University Press, 1999: 41.

Hitchcott, Nicki, 'Writing on Bones: Commemorating Genocide in Boubacar Boris Diop's Murambi.' *Research in African Literatures*, vol. 40, no. 3 (2009): 48-61.

Hite, Katherine, and Catherine Collins, 'Memorial Fragments, Monumental Silences and Reawakenings in 21st-Century Chile', *Millennium* vol. 38, no. 2 (2009): 379-400.

Hoge, Warren, 'UN Seeks Ruling on Israel's Barrier', *The New York Times*, December 10, 2003, 6.

Honig, Bonnie, 'Immigrant America? How Foreignness "Solves" Democracy's Problems', *Social Text*, no. 56 (1998): 1-27.

'How Do You See the Disappeared: A Warm Database'. Available online at http://www.turbulence.org/Works/seethedisappeared/, accessed 1/15/12

Hutchison, Emma, and Roland Bleiker, 'Emotional Reconciliation: Reconstituting Identity and Community After Trauma,' *European Journal of Social Theory* vol. 11, no. 3 (2008): 385-403.

Huyssen, Andreas, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Inglis, Ken, 'Entombing Unknown Soldiers: From London and Paris to Baghdad,' *History and Memory*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1993): 7-31.

'In Pictures: Banksy Returns to Bethlehem', BBC News, December 3, 2007.

Irigaray, Luce, This Sex Which is Not One, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

'Israel Mulls Building Wall Along Part of Lebanon Border', *AFP News*, January 3, 2012.

'Israel Plans Jordan Border Fence to Stop Migrants', AFP News, January 1, 2012.

'Israel to Build Wall Along Jordanian Border: Netanyahu', *Xinhua News*, January 1, 2012.

'Israel to Construct Barrier on Lebanese Border', Xinhua News, January 3, 2012.

Ivy, Marilyn, *Discourses of the Vanishing: Modernity, Phantasm, Japan.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Jadrnak, Jackie, 'A Public Display of Dissent: Art Project Gets Some Feedback in the Form of Spray Paint', *Journal Santa Fe*, August 8, 2008.

James, Valarie, Email Interview, November 28, 2011.

Jameson, Fredric, 'Marx's Purloined Letter,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 26-67.

Johnson, Reed, 'Mexico's Alejandro Santiago Evokes the Toll of Immigration with Clay Figures', *Los Angeles Times*, April 7, 2006.

Jones, Sam, 'Spray Can Prankster Tackles Israel's Security Barrier', *The Guardian*, August 5, 2005.

Junod, Tom, 'The Falling Man,' *Esquire*, September 8, 2009, available at http://www.esquire.com/features/ESQ0903-SEP_FALLINGMAN

Kakutani, Michiko, 'After a Day of Terror, a Long Architectural Tug of War', *The New York Times*, January 18, 2005.

Karuhanga, James, 'One injured in grenade attacks on Gisozi Genocide Memorial,' *The New Times*, April 16, 2009, Available through BBC Monitoring International Reports.

Kattago, Siobhan, 'War Memorials and the Politics of Memory: The Soviet War Memorial in Tallinn', *Constellations*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2009):150-166.

Kaufman, Joe, 'The Israel-Egypt Border Fence', *National Review*, January 2, 2012.

Kimmelman, Michael, 'Art in Ashes, Drama in Dust,' *New York Times*, August 19, 2002, B1.

Kimmelman, Michael, 'Ground Zero's Only Hope: Elitism,' *New York Times*, December 7, 2003, Section 2, 1.

Kimmelman, Michael, 'Ground Zero Finally Grows Up,' *New York Times*, February 1, 2004, Section 2, 1.

Konstantinow, Erin, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=127

Kristeva, Julia, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

LaCapra, Dominick, *History and Memory After Auschwitz*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Laffey, Mark, and Jutta Weldes, 'Methodological Reflections on Discourse Analysis,' *Qualitative Methods, Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2004): 28-30.

Lagorio, Christine, 'Artists Seek to Fill 9/11 Voids', CBS News, September 10, 2009.

Lambek, Michael, 'The Past Imperfect: Remembering as Moral Practice,' In Antze and Lambek, eds, *Tense Past*, New York: Routledge, 1996.

Landsberg, Alison, *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Memory in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Langiewiesche, William, 'The Border', The Atlantic Monthly, (May 1992): 53.

Laqueur, Thomas, 'Memory and Naming in the Great War,' In John Gillis, ed, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994, 150-167.

Laville, Sandra, 'Two years late and mired in controversy: the British memorial to Rwanda's past: UK Charity's plans for massacre site criticised: Centre is "monotonous," say prominent Rwandans,' *The Guardian*, November 13, 2006, p. 3.

Leuenberger, Christine, 'The West Bank Wall as Canvas: Art and Graffiti in Palestine/Israel,' *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, and Culture*, vol. 17, no. 12 (2011).

Leung, Rebecca, 'Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue,' *CBS News*, February 11, 2009.

Levanetz, Joel, 'A Compromised Country: Redefining the U.S.-Mexico Border', *The Journal of San Diego History* 54, no. 1 (2008): 40.

Lewis, Tom, 'The Politics of "Hauntology" in Derrida's Spectres of Marx,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 134-167.

Leys, Ruth, Trauma: A Genealogy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Lindgren, Hugo, 'Keep Your New Towers. They Want The Towers,' *New York Times*, August 31, 2003, p. 23.

Litt, Steven, 'In place of the Trade Center; Ideas range from building new towers to playground,' *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, September 17, 2001.

Loven, Jennifer, 'Bush urges the world to face "evil" in Africa; At Rwandan Genocide museum, seeks end to strife in Kenya, Sudan,' *Toronto Star*, February 20, 2008, p. AA03.

Luerk, Weblog Comment, September 12, 2007, 1:37 am, Available at http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/09/11/will-the-tribute-in-light-go-dark-after-08/

Macherey, Pierre, 'Marx Dematerialized, or the Spirit of Derrida,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 17-25.

Margalit, Avishai, *The Ethics of Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Marlin-Bennett, Renee, Marieke Wilson, and Jason Walton, 'Commodified Cadavers and the Political Economy of the Spectacle,' *International Political Sociology*, vol. 2, no. 2 (2010): 159-177.

Matson, John, 'Commemorative Calculus: How an Algorithm Helped Arrange the Names on the 9/11 Memorial', *Scientific American*, September 7, 2011.

Mayo, James, War Memorials as Political Landscape: The American Experience and Beyond. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 1988.

Mbembe, Achille, 'Necropolitics', Public Culture, vol. 15, no. 1 (2003): 11-40.

McGinty, Jo Craven, 'As 9/11 Remains Are Identified, Grief is Renewed,' *New York Times*, November 12, 2011.

McGreal, Chris, 'Bush shaken by Memorial to 800,000 Rwanda dead,' *The Guardian*, February 20, 2008, p.16.

Milliken, Jennifer, 'The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods,' *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1999): 225-254.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas, 'Invisible Again: Rwanda and Representation after Genocide,' *African Arts*, vol. 38, no. 3 (2005): 36-39, 86-91.

Moore, Alan, 'Alfredo Jaar's Rwanda Project,' *Artnet Magazine*, May 21, 1998, available at http://www.artnet.com/magazine_pre2000/reviews/moore/moore5-21-98.asp.

Moore, Gina, 'Rwanda's Genocide—15 Years Later,' *GlobalPost*, April 6, 2009, Available at http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/africa/090405/rwandas-genocide-%E2%80%94-15-years-later.

Moscovitz, Talia, 'Through the wall: the West Bank wall as global canvas', *Honors Junior/Senior Projects*, Northeastern University, 2007.

Murphy, Dean, 'Slowly, Families Accept the Ruins as Burial Ground,' *New York Times*, September 29, 2001, B1, B10.

Muschamp, Herbert, 'The Commemorative Beauty of Tragic Wreckage,' *New York Times*, November 11, 2001, 37.

Muschamp, Herbert, 'Balancing Reason and Emotion in Twin Towers Void,' *The New York Times*, February 6, 2003, E1.

'Names Arrangement,' National September 11 Memorial and Museum website, accessed January 23, 2012.

'Names on the Memorial,' National September 11 Memorial and Museum website, accessed January 23, 2012.

Naveh, Hannah, 'Nine Eleven: An Ethics of Proximity,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 457-459.

Negri, Antonio, 'The Specter's Smile,' in Michael Sprinker, ed, *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Spectres of Marx*, London: Verso, 2008, 5-16.

Ngowi, Rodrique, 'Western Leaders Absent as Rwanda Mourns, 10 years after the Genocide,' *The Independent*, April 8, 2004, p. 24.

Nichanian, Marc, 'Catastrophic Mourning,' in David Eng and David Kazanjian, eds, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003: 99-124.

Nobel, Philip, *Sixteen Acres: Architecture and the Outrageous Struggle for the Future of Ground Zero*, New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, 2005.

Norris, Scott, 'Alejandro Santiago's "2501 Migrantes" in Oaxaca', Art Culture, May 5, 2009.

Novick, Peter, The Holocaust in American Life, Mariner Books, 2000.

Olick, Jeffrey, States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformation in National Retrospection. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

'Our Memory Our Future,' Video made by Aegis Students, 2005. Available at: http://www.facebook.com/video/video.php?v=503090398504&oid=2214536704 and

http://www.facebook.com/video/video.php?v=503090403494&oid=2214536704.

Owen, Clive, 'In Rwanda, it's as if genocide is still going on.' Aegis Students, April 8, 2010. Available at:http://www.aegisstudents.org/in-rwandait%E2%80%99s-as-if-genocide-is-still-going-on/.

Pachirat, Timothy, 'The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches From the Kill Floor,' in Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009, 143-162.

Pachirat, Timothy, *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Parry, Nigel, 'British Graffiti Artist, Banksy, Hacks the Wall', *Thresholds*, issue 2, October 1, 2006.

Radstone, Susannah, 'The War of the Fathers: Trauma, Fantasy, and September 11,' *Signs* vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 467-469.

Raftery, Miriam, 'Dying to Come to America—Immigrant Death Toll Soars; Water Stations Sabotaged', *East County Magazine*, September 2008.

Rajaram, Prem Kumar, 'Disruptive Writings and a Critique of Territoriality', *Review of International Studies* 30, (2004): 201-228.

Regan, Margaret, 'Tales from the Outskirts: Amado', *Tucson Weekly*, July 22, 2010.

Riggs, Ransom, 'Strange Geographies: Death at the Border', March 9, 2010, accessed July 24, 2010, www.mentalfloss.com/blogs/archives/49478.

Rock, Paul, 'Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnography,' In Paul Atkinson et al, eds, *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage, 2002, 32-37.

Rosenfeld, Gavriel, 'A looming Crash or a Soft Landing? Forecasting the Future of the Memory "Industry", *The Journal of Modern History* vol. 81 (2009): 122-158.

Rotella, Sebastian, 'El Brinco (The Leap)', in *Running Fence*, ed Geoffrey James, North Vancouver: Presentation House Gallery, 1999, 99.

Roth, Michael, Claire Lyons, and Charles Merewether, *Irresistible Decay: Ruins Reclaimed*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Rubenstein, Mary Jane, 'Of Ghosts and Angels: Derrida, Kushner, and the Impossibility of Forgiveness,' *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* vol. 9, no. 1 (2008): 79-95.

Sabol, John, *The Politics of Presence: Haunting Performances on the Gettysburg Battlefield*. Authorhouse, 2008.

Saghafi, Kas, 'Apparitions,' Forum, Autumn 2008.

Salter, Mark, 'The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Borders, Bodies, Biopolitics', *Alternatives* 31, (2006): 167-189.

Salter, Mark, 'Governmentalities of an airport: heterotopia and confession', *International Political Sociology* 1, no. 1 (2007): 49-67.

Salter, Mark, 'When the Exception becomes the Rule: borders, sovereignty, citizenship', *Citizenship Studies* 12, no. 4 (2008): 365-380.

Schaffer, Kay, 'Memory Work and Memorialization in the new South Africa,' In Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela and Chris van der Merwe (eds) *Memory, Narrative, and Forgiveness.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009, 362-381.

Sharpe, Tom, 'Artist's Monument to Migrants finds trouble in Santa Fe', *Santa Fe New Mexican*, July 21, 2008.

Schatz, Edward, 'Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics,' In Schatz, ed, *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009, 1-22.

Shanker, Thom, and Eric Schmitt, 'White House Issues Guides on Sept. 11 Observances', *The New York Times*, August 20, 2011, A12.

Sherman, Daniel, 'Art, Commerce, and the Production of Memory in France after World War I,' in John Gillis, ed, *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 186-214.

Shinko, Rosemary, 'Ethics After Liberalism: Why (Autonomous) Bodies Matter, *Millennium*, vol. 38, no. 3 (2010): 723-745.

Shinko, Rosemary, 'This is not a Mannequin: Enfashioning the Body of Resistance,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association Annual Conference 'Global Governance: Political Authority in Transition', Le Centre Sheraton Montreal Hotel, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, Mar 16, 2011, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p503054_index.html.

Smith, Dennis, 'Memorials Without a Memory,' *New York Times*, November 26, 2003, A29.

Smith, James, 'Our Memorial to 50,000 dead is no empty historic exercise: Debate around the Murambi genocide site in Rwanda is expected and necessary', *The Guardian*, November 21, 2006, p. 33.

Steele, Brent, 'Alternative Accountability After the "Naughts," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 37, no. 5 (2011): 2603-2625, 2625.

St. John, Carol, 'Transforming Tragedy Into Art', *Hispanic News*, March 22, 2007.

Sturken, Marita, 'Masculinity, Courage, and Sacrifice,' *Signs*, vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 449-450.

Sturken, Marita, 'Memorializing Absence,' Social Science Research Council, After 9/11, 2002, available at http://essays.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sturken.htm.

Sturken, Marita, 'The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,' *American Ethnologist*, vol. 31, no. 3 (2004): 311-325.

Susan, Weblog Comment, September 11, 2008, 10:11 am, Available at http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/09/11/will-the-tribute-in-light-go-dark-after-08/

Sutcliffe, Tom, 'The Art of 9/11', The Independent, September 7, 2011.

Taber, Magdalena, 'Artist Portfolio', 9/11 Memorial Museum Artist Registry, available at http://registry.national911memorial.org/view_artist.php?aid=1679.

Tatum, James, *The Mourner's Song: War and Remembrance from the Iliad to Vietnam.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Taussig, Michael, *Walter Benjamin's Grave*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Taylor, Diana, 'Ground Zero,' Signs vol. 28, no. 1 (2002): 453-455.

Taylor, Tess, 'Rebuilding in New York,' *Architecture Week*, September 26, 2001. Available at http://www.architectureweek.com/2001/0926/today.html

Tompkins, Calvin, 'After the Towers: 9 Artists Imagine a Memorial,' *The New Yorker*, July 15, 2002, p. 59.

'To Rebuild or Not: Architects Respond,' New York Times, September 23, 2001.

'Tribute in light to New York victims,' *BBC News*, March 6, 2002. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1857699.stm

Tuer, Dot, 'Imaging the Borderlands', in *Running Fence*, ed Geofrrey James, North Vancouver: Presentation House Gallery, 1999.

Uwazaninka-Smith, Beata, 'Trauma is part of who we are,' *The Independent*, March 29, 2006, p. 23.

Verdery, Katherine, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*, New York: NY: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Waldman, Amy, 'A Nation Challenged: Mementos; With Solemn Detail, Dust of Ground Zero is Put in Urns,' *New York Times*, October 15, 2001, B11.

Walsh, Declan, 'Digging Deep: The British Brothers who are Building Hope in Rwanda; Ten Years After the Genocide in Which 800,000 Died', *The Independent*, April 2, 2004, p. 14-15.

Ware, SueAnne, 'Borders, Memory and the Slippage In-Between', in *Fluctuating Borders: Speculations about Memory and Emergence*, eds. Rosalea Monacella and SueAnne Ware. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT University Press, 1999, 78-97.

'Waters Writes on West Bank Wall', BBC News, June 22, 2006.

Wedeen, Lisa, 'Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science,' *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 13 (2010): 255-272.

Weldes, Jutta, *To Seek Out New Worlds: Exploring Links Between Science Fiction and World Politics*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Wilcox, Lauren, 'Technologies of the Body: Theorizing Embodiment and Contemporary Warfare,' Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, March 28, 2008, San Francisco.

Wilcox, Lauren, 'Bodies of International Relations: Theorizing Bodies, Pain, and Resistance,' Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, 2009.

'Will Tribute in Light go Dark after '08?' New York Times, September 11, 2007.

Winter, Jay, *Remembering War: The Great War and Historical Memory in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Wrong, Michela, "It was sobering—but in a good way": Memorials for the victims of genocide in Rwanda are helping the country's reconciliation process', *Financial Times*, April 29, 2006, p. 12.

Yaeger, Patricia, 'Rubble as Archive, or 9/11 as Dust, Debris, and Bodily Vanishing,' In Judith Greenberg, ed, *Trauma at Home: After 9/11*, Winnipeg: Bison Books, 2003, 187-194.

Young, James, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Zehfuss, Maja, 'Forget September 11,' *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3 (2003): 513-528.

Zehfuss, Maja, *Wounds of Memory: The Politics of War in Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.