Theorizing haunting and the international after genocide: the cases of Rwanda and Darfur

Jessica Auchter

Department of Political Science and Public Service
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
615 McCallie Ave, Chattanooga, TN, USA
E-mail: Jessica-Auchter@utc.edu

Ethnicity Studies, 2015/2. P. 36–56 © Lithuanian Social Research Centre, 2015

ABSTRACT: This contribution seeks to explore the concept of *haunting* by examining two cases in which memorialization has proceeded very differently: Rwanda and Darfur. It makes the argument that by allowing ourselves to be haunted, new avenues of politics open up that gesture towards a shared human vulnerability rather than a politics based on competing victimhood. It specifically seeks to elucidate how an ethics of haunting offers an alternative lens with which to view memorialization after mass atrocity. Rwanda and Darfur provide two very different contexts for this process: in Rwanda, built memorials form key sites for memorialization and the display of human remains as evidence of atrocity. In Darfur, there is ongoing conflict, no physical memorial sites, and the bodies of victims mingle with desert sands, yet oral testimonies persist as key ways in which deaths are memorialized. Both of these examples posit questions about lingering identities and the relationship between identity and physical memorial sites. Exploring tensions between how deaths and narratives about deaths are managed (or attempts to manage these), as well as the competing narratives that persist at memorial sites allows me to explore more fundamental questions of identity as it relates to who and what memorialization is. Furthermore, it allows me to explore how memorialization proceeds and what it might mean to be haunted by the lives and deaths that have been silenced or coopted into particular memorial projects.

Keywords: remembering, poetry, identity, human vulnerability.

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” (Butler, 2003: 467). During and after a traumatic event, traditional schemas of identification and representation are ruptured and fractured. Identities, spaces, and times are thrown into disorder. This is widely agreed to be a key aspect of trauma, perhaps best articulated by Cathy Caruth (1995 and 1996). Newer approaches to trauma have focused on the inability to describe the traumatic event through language, and sought to move beyond the national level of memorialization. Erica Resende and Dovile Budryte, for example, have advocated challenging nation-centered accounts of memory construction, and

argued that "memory is pluralistic, multidimensional and multilayered, and to study memory means to be ready to explore various (including non-territorial) spaces of memory and to construct various memory communities" (Resende and Budryte, 2014: 9-10). It is in this same spirit that I approach this paper, as a way to interrogate questions of identity and memory in various spaces and via a variety of mechanisms, in order to ask questions not only about identity and memory themselves but about how we think about and study these concepts.

This paper travels through the politics of death, memory, and forgetting in order to explore how and why specific narratives become memorialized in physical memorials and by various mechanisms of storytelling, and how this can retrench or shift salient identities. I seek to allow several literatures to speak to one another, including work on ethnicity studies, identity politics, genocide, and memory studies. Genocide studies has tended to focus on transitional justice, and the formalized legal and policy-oriented mechanisms of reconciliation and post-conflict, leaving out questions about the importance of memorialization for identities, as I have demonstrated elsewhere (Auchter, 2014b). Meanwhile, memory studies tends to focus solely on the building of physical memorial sites, and not on the relationship these have to the way individuals and groups conceptualize their identities and the ensuing effects on political communities.

Elsewhere, I have laid out a framework of *hauntology* that offers up a new way of thinking about life and death in modern politics (Auchter, 2014a). This framework focuses on the importance of being haunted by marginalized voices and stories and bodies in global politics; that is, it views haunting as both a political and ethical commitment to rethink the problem of life and death in global politics. It argues that by thinking about how decisions about life and death and memorialization are political ones, it becomes possible to rethink the ontological foundations of modern statecraft, which is the attempt to tell one unitary story about identity and subject formation. This logic of haunting draws strongly on past theorization of bodies, visibility, and the ghostly, but refocuses these into an analysis specifically of memorialization. It views memorialization as a complex process that involves negotiations and contestations of stories and physical sites, but with particular attention to how stories are told and how lives and deaths, as well as personhood are rendered structurally impossible by particular logics. The ontologically "dead", as Anna Agathangelou (2009) refers to them, allow us to interrogate questions of identity and subject formation by being haunted by how lives and deaths are often co-opted into political projects. In this paper I use this framework to address identity politics in Rwandan genocide memorialization and in the ways in which stories of the Darfurian genocide are told by refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). I explore questions of memorialization in these two cases, interweaving a story about whose stories in Rwanda and Darfur are told, and whose are forgotten. I look for how specific stories are told at sites of memory, and the exclusions this necessitates, focusing particularly on the storytelling aspect of memorialization. I seek to expose the way memorialization relies on haunting as a means of ordering, bordering, and

limiting by declaring a particular narrative to be concretized at a memorial site. I also explore the role haunting can play in resistance, the way ghosts can play with our conceptions of visibility, thereby opening up avenues of resistance, particularly in terms of reconceiving notions of identity.

Thus, as I will demonstrate below, memory studies tends to conceptualize memorials as performing very specific, often static narratives, even while theorizing memory itself as fungible. I hope to bring literatures in conversation with one another to explore how the desire to memorialize comes to fruition in two very different contexts: Rwanda and Darfur, whose stories are being told, how this relates to identity politics in these two places, and finally what it might mean to be haunted by those both captured within and silenced by these memorial logics. I explore how identity is often not discussed in the context of genocide memorialization, despite its seemingly natural link to genocide itself, and the atrocities committed in its name, and what implications this has for memory in Rwanda and Darfur. I conclude by offering up thoughts on how, by allowing ourselves to be haunted, new avenues of politics open up and gesture towards a shared human vulnerability rather than a politics based on competing victimhood.

Theorizing memory and identity

Jeffrey Olick (2003: 15) has referred to memory as "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." This link between memory and identity is what makes memory so significant, particularly in a post-colonial and post-Cold War era, where new countries and regimes emerge, defining their identities in relation to their pasts. Political identities are not static, but constantly shifting. Wars force us to divide ourselves according to our political identities, thus the criteria for defining these become ever more important. Because decisions of life or death are decided upon questions and definitions of political identity, memory becomes the defining feature of our identities. As Geoffrey Cubitt (2007) outlines, it is in representation of the past that the markers for a present identity can be located. And as Douglas Becker (2014) has argued, this often translates into particular foreign policies at the national level via the role of memory entrepreneurs, because nations share "common memories and forge a common identity through them," later adding that "identity becomes a vehicle by which a nation can define its historical existence. It is a lens through which international interactions are viewed" (p. 58-9).

Thus memory becomes a way to perceive the world that is inherent to our identity, an integral part of who we are: Duncan Bell (2006) has referred to memory as a defining feature of the human condition. And as Robert Eaglestone (2004) suggests, "identity without memory is empty, memory without identity is meaningless" (p. 125). Memory constructs our identity, and has the power of naming, of legitimizing. The fact that the identity 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. 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. However, memory is also itself inherently contested, contingent, and provisional (Huyssen, 1994). As Duncan Bell (2009) says, "memory is the product of conflicts, power struggles and social contestation" (p. 351).

Memory, like identity, is a social construction, but based in reference to historical or contemporary events. It has no fixed meaning or content, and is always in flux (Cubitt, 2007: 8). 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, as Maja Zehfuss (2007) has demonstrated in the context of German memory in the 20th century. Similarly, W. James Booth (2009) has noted that "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" (p. 370). 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 present, because it does recall a past and at times leads us to relive a past through commemorative practices.

A key aspect of memorialization 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" (Hite and Collins, 2009). Commemoration brings up the question of what to remember and how. It ultimately privileges certain kinds of experience and excludes others (Sherman, 1996). 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" (Young, 1994: 6-7). In this sense, as Young theorizes, 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, the monument is in fact, despite its "land-anchored permanence," as James Young calls it, a performance of a multiplicity of narratives of the event being memorialized.

Memorials serve to, as James Mayo (1998) argues, create "an ongoing order and meaning." Trauma shatters linear time, and disrupts linguistic conventions and norms 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 (Nichanian, 2003). The monument then can act as 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 (Andrieu, 2009: 12). Hutchison and Bleiker (2008: 386) state that "in most instances, political elites deal with the legacy of pain and death by re-imposing order". The monument is an attempt to do so by making concrete the memory of the event. According to Hite and Collins (2009: 380), "memory discourse asserts that monuments and memorials often serve as attempts to relegate away, to erase conflict-ridden, politically traumatic pasts". To do so, they represent one conception of the event among the multiplicity of conceptions possible, but often impose this unitary narrative as the purported truth of the event. One of the things we often see regardless of the specific location of memorialization is the attempt on the part of one group to establish their narrative as the accepted history and basis of memorialization, rather than another group. This often takes the form of political rhetoric, as we have seen throughout Eastern Europe after World War II and again after the end of the Cold War, for example, where competing memory narratives led to the effort to try to impose once conception over the other as a way to exercise political power. Memorials, then, can be used as tools of political elites to tell particular stories.

Memorials are generally established for the purpose of ensuring that a memory or a person or group is never forgotten. As Booth (2001: 781) 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". Booth emphasizes here the idea that memory is linked with truth, that memory enlightens us to a reality about the world that we require to find and understand our place in the world. Without memory, we are lost, because we not only lack a sense of self but also a sense of how we relate to our past and those around us. We are without a sense of identity, which is where our truth is situated.

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. Additionally, much work, as noted above, has tended to focus on how unitary narratives of the event are performed through the memorial site, one of the critiques that is often posed of the government in Rwanda in the context of genocide commemoration.[1] Yet in most cases of atrocity, of which Rwanda may be exemplary, memorials seem not to be static, even as government policies may espouse particular narratives, as I have demonstrated elsewhere (Auchter, 2014b). This previous work argued that although many scholars have critiqued the formalized commemoration ceremonies in Rwanda as marginalizing survivor memory by imposing specific understandings of the genocide, the fact that there are a multiplicity of memorial sites indicate that

1 This often appears as the argument that Rwandan reconciliation policy marginalizes genocide survivors by using genocide as a tool, made by Straus and Aldorf (2011), Cobban (2007), Lemarchand (2009), Buckley-Zistel (2009), and Burnet (2009).

multiple narratives still exist. It also demonstrates that for many, justice is about being able to memorialize the way one wishes in a cultural and ethical sense, rather than necessarily in a national one. I traced the way government bodies acknowledged in official documents the need for multiple memorial forms. Museum style memorials do tell a story of the genocide, but other memorial forms commemorate by drawing attention to shared human vulnerability instead (Auchter, 2014a). Thus even in this case, where the memorial narrative is often depicted as unitary, there are numerous genocide memorials that have been built, and they express a variety of stories and memory narratives that go alongside official commemoration ceremonies and individual practices. Similarly, in other cases of atrocity, there may be no practical impetus to build memorials, when people have been driven off of their land and have not been able to return, as in Darfur, or when political constraints do not allow for certain memorial narratives, such as in Eastern Europe under the Soviet Union after the World War II. In these cases, perhaps the tendency of memory studies scholarship to focus on physical memorial sites doesn't allow for a bigger picture that would encompass storytelling, other memory narratives, and forms of memorialization. This has been the case, even as memory narratives have become increasingly important and common in a post-Holocaust world.

As Jay Winter (2006) traces, memory and memorialization has shifted from memory acting in the service of national identity construction, which characterized post-WWI memorials, to a more victim-centered approach that emerges from the Holocaust and new technologies that enabled the recording, both audio and video, of these stories, as well as their mass dissemination around the world, which he calls "the acts of remembrance of the witness." Siobhan Kattago (2009) elaborates on the type of memorialization that emerges after the Holocaust. 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 in Washington DC in the United States heralded a new kind of monument that completely separated individual death from ideological cause.[2] Both Kattago (2009) and Winter (2006) 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, and indeed were awarded, a semi-sacred role as truth-tellers who experienced something that no one else had. As Winter says (2006: 62), "they spoke of the dead, and for the dead, whose voices could somehow be retrieved in the telling of these terrifying stories".

---

[2] The Vietnam Veterans Memorial reconceives of the structure, style, and function of memorials by focusing not on triumphalist representations such as the arches or figural monuments that emerged out of the world wars, but rather on individual reflection and the commemoration of loss rather than triumph. As a black wall etched with the names of the dead, it was originally deemed a scar on the landscape because of the rupture it represented with traditional memorial forms. However, this rupture inaugurated a new era of memorial architecture precisely because it focused on individual loss rather than on a national narrative of triumph.

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/her name removed and thereby his/her personhood, is claiming the proper name back, for the purposes of proving that s/he has claimed back his/her 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, whose name and thereby life was stolen, whose story was written for him or her, is reclaiming his story for him or herself. Memoir is thus viewed as a tool to regain the power to represent oneself. This becomes particularly relevant in the case of Darfur, where we do not see the practical ability to build physical memorial sites, due to the fact that the regime that perpetrated the atrocities is still in power in Sudan. I now address Rwanda and Darfur as two cases to flesh out the relationships between memory and identity I have traced above.

Rwanda: the proliferation of memorial sites

2014 marked the 20th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide. The commemoration ceremonies drew attention to Rwanda's ongoing memorialization. Even as legal prosecution is wrapping up with the conclusion of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) trials, and the end of the *gacaca* court proceedings, the continuing commemoration demonstrates that for many Rwandans and members of the international community, remembrance is a lasting concern. Nowhere is this as evident as in debates about physical memorialization. This section addresses how Rwanda remains haunted by the legacy of the genocide, and raises questions about what sort of Rwandan identity is constructed at memorial sites. It is widely accepted that memorialization always performs a particular narrative, as I have demonstrated above. If this is the case, then what identities are being memorialized and how, and what identities remain at the margins of memorialization? And finally, what implications does it have for memorializing the genocide if we allow ourselves to be haunted by the lives and deaths, both those coopted into the memorial project and those left out of it?

There is a significant way in which remembrance in Rwanda is tied to political activity, because reconciliation is itself government policy, as well as individual and community practice. This mandate to memorialize has often been critiqued for performing a particularized narrative of the genocide, even to the extent that Paul Kagame, the former head of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) and now longstanding President of Rwanda, and the RPF itself have been accused of marginalizing genocide survivors in the name of the heroic

RPF liberator narrative.[3] But the situation is more complex than this, and in fact multiple narratives coexist at a variety of levels in Rwanda. This is evident at memorial sites and in the widespread agreement that physical sites are themselves necessary to memorialize the genocide. In 2011, on a research visit to Rwanda, I interviewed several survivors on their thoughts on memorialization in Rwanda.[4] 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, 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.

Memorials in Rwanda fit with official commemoration narratives and the attempt to exclude ethnic identities from conversation, yet at the same time they memorialize ethnic cleavages that led to genocide, and the commemoration is very much centered on themes of identity, as in the renaming of the genocide to highlight that it was a genocide against the Tutsis. Main memorial sites that attract foreign visitors are museum-based, as in Kigali Genocide Memorial and Murambi, both of which were partially sponsored and designed by foreign organizations, and contain museum exhibits to explain the story of the genocide to visitors. Anytime a story is told, space opens up for accusations that it is only one particular story, and opposition politicians such as Victoire Ingabire, recently imprisoned in Rwanda, have criticized memorial sites and commemoration ceremonies for not telling the stories of moderate Hutus, and failing to recognize the role of the RPF in committing atrocities in Rwanda as they took back the country after the genocide. Still, the majority of Rwandans regularly visit memorial sites that are local-level mass graves, which are often less prone to the political debates that the main memorial sites engender because they are not incorporated within national commemoration ceremonies or discussed as national representations of the genocide by national or international media. At mass graves that do not contain the museum component, commemoration of the genocide and the individual lives lost often takes the form of testimonies and storytelling. This facet of memorialization is often less addressed in Rwanda because it is a local-level practice rather than a formal memorial site. Testimonies form key parts of formal and informal commemoration ceremonies, and religious organizations and judicial institutions alike often involve the telling of one's own story of survival or loss. Yet these forms of narrating war with political and community discourses that pressure survivors and the country as a whole to reconcile and move on from the trauma.

---

3 The Rwandan Patriotic Front was the military group made up of mostly exiled Rwandans in Uganda that was fighting the Rwandan military for control of the country during the genocide, who ultimately ended the genocide by taking over the country. It now refers to the political party of Paul Kagame.

4 For further details, see Auchter (2014a, especially pages 47-50).

President Paul Kagame's 2013 speech at the genocide commemoration ceremonies is illuminating in this context: "this year we are holding commemoration in our communities so that every Rwandan has the opportunity to participate fully in activities of remembrance where they live. Remembrance of the genocide is an obligation for every Rwandan. It is also falls on us to teach and pass on that responsibility to the youth so that they, in turn, can pass it on to successive generations. Sharing our history, some of which has been tragic, will help us prevent future evil, fight genocide ideology and anything that could take the country back to the bad past we have left behind. It will also help us focus on that which will advance the collective good of Rwandans" (Kagame, 2013). Memory is also posited as a counterpoint to forgetting; remembering allows us to not forget. As Booth (2009: 370) says, "remembering is a duty rooted in filiation; and forgetting is an offense against those debts shared by a community".[5] This characterization of memory elides the fact that all memory entails some forgetting[6] and that memory is not simple by any means. It also gestures to the instrumentalization of memory in the service of political tools such as reconciliation and the future.

Commemoration narratives focus on the universality of the need to remember, and the result of this is often a unitary and universalized content to remembrance via public ceremonies and physical memorial sites. As these are often the sites most observed by outsiders, there has been the tendency for the argument to be made about exclusionary memorial practices, particularly the exclusion from the memorial narratives of moderate Hutus who died, as well as atrocities that were perpetrated by the RPF, documented by a well-publicized Human Rights Watch report. It is certainly the case that Rwanda has recently targeted opposition politicians for what is termed *genocide ideology*. These potentially exclusionary practices have led to the hardening of dividing lines, even to the extent that recent studies have traced the persistence of animosities between ethnic groups among young schoolchildren in Rwanda, even though they were born after the genocide. If memorialization and commemoration have hardened lines of identity, then is there an alternate way memorialization can proceed that focuses on shared human vulnerabilities rather than identity and differences?

This is perhaps to be found in the variety of memorial sites evident around Rwanda. Though some sites do perform specific memorial narratives, many of the

---

5 Other examples of scholars who emphasize the problems with forgetting include Adorno (1986), 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, Douglass and Vogler, who also argue that there is a tension between remembering and forgetting, labeling forgetting the dead as impious (2003: 42-3), and Cubitt (2007), who says that not forgetting is a human moral obligation.

6 As Susan Buckley-Zistel (2009) 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.

sites simply display the bones of victims, or mass gravesites.[7] They do not tell a particular story of what happened aside from its stark material reality. Because of this, they offer the opportunity for reflection based on shared human vulnerabilities. Similarly, testimonies offer us alternative ways for a multiplicity of stories to be told. However, it is potentially how remembrance is situated rather than the ways the genocide is remembered that poses the most interesting questions in the Rwandan context. Forgetting, as noted above, is thought of as a crime against the dead, and remembrance as a responsibility of every Rwandan, but at the same time, a certain amount of forgetting is required for the country to reconcile and move on. Without some forgetting, there can be no reconciliation between opposing sides and thus no ceasing of conflict. As Margalit describes (2002: 13), "communities must make decisions and establish institutions that foster forgetting as much as remembering". Douglass and Vogler describe this tension: to remember the dead is obsessive, to forget the dead is impious (2003: 42-3). Thus both remembering and forgetting are identity-building acts (Lambek, 1996: 243). Rwandan genocide memorialization is often depicted as a struggle of memorialization between competing narratives. However, I find it more useful to think of Rwandan genocide memorialization as a constant tension between remembrance and forgetting as a means of parsing out Rwandan identity. Though there are disagreements over the official commemoration narrative as noted above, larger questions emerge about how to remember in a context of political and social reconciliation, to what degree old identities and their associated divisions remain salient, and how to build identity out of a traumatic event, when it is precisely identity that led to the violent cleavages that caused the genocide as a traumatic event in the first place.

The Rwandan case also demonstrates that identity is a process that is consistently being constructed, shaped, and reinforced by processes at a variety of levels, formal and informal. Rwandan identity after the genocide remains haunted by its own construction; that is, it must take into account the myriad of voices, alive and dead, that form part of its historical memory, and it is also haunted by the understandings it imposes about who is a member of the qualified political community. This is made even more salient by historical exclusions, but the fact that a multiplicity of memorial narratives and forms exists makes it easier to listen to ghostly voices, to be haunted by their inability to be captured in a single memorial logic or story, and for human vulnerabilities to form a basis of how identities are parsed out in contemporary Rwanda, regardless of whether the current government seeks to impose a single understanding of what it means to be Rwandan.

Before discussing Darfur, a context where there are not even any physical memorial sites, it is important to describe the relationship between Rwanda and Darfur. Indeed, Rwanda has politically made very much of the fact that it has

[7] This itself is a controversial memorial form, as bones are not usually displayed post-atrocity. Rwanda is an exception, where the display is situated within concerns about ensuring that the evidence of the genocide is displayed to guard against genocide denial, though there are examples in other cases of genocide, such as Cambodia.

gotten involved in the genocide in Darfur, even while, and precisely because, the international community was unwilling to intervene in Rwanda. As Douglas Becker (2014: 69-70) lays out, Rwandan involvement in Darfur is conditioned by its sense of abandonment during its own genocide. He characterizes Paul Kagame as a memory entrepreneur:

> Kagame then used his involvement in the AU/UN peacekeeping force in Darfur to protect General Karenzi Karake, his old friend and comrade, from charges of war crimes and atrocities during and following the 1994 war. Karake was set to command the Rwandan forces in Darfur. Rwanda had both the first troops as well as the largest contingent on the ground in the battered nation. In February 2008, Spanish judge Fernando Andreu Merelles indicted 40 Rwandans, including General Karake, for their involvement in killings in Rwanda following the RPF victory. Human Rights Watch had alleged that Karake was also responsible for killing civilians in the Congolese town of Kisangani in a 2000 battle between Rwandan and Ugandan forces. The United Nations had known about the charges against Karake and had vetted him for command in Darfur. Upon the indictment, the US State Department urged the UN to renew Karake's contract and supported Kagame's threat of a withdrawal of Rwandan troops from the nation should Karake be forced to step down (Becker, 2014: 69).

As Becker argues, Rwanda has for a long time experienced fewer political constraints on its actions as a result of the invocation of trauma, and the desire of other states and the international community to respect Rwandan historical memory, especially given that they did not intervene to prevent or stop the genocide there. It is thus important to keep in mind the way these two cases are inextricably intertwined.[8] Rwandan memory and memorialization not only has set the tone for understanding genocide in the contemporary era via a comparative genocide studies framework, it has also been key as an example of the way memory and identity can influence foreign policy, in this case, decisions surrounding Rwandan humanitarian intervention in Darfur.

Darfur: where stories take the place of memorials

Much of comparative genocide studies focuses on the way identities and memories are laid out and dispersed within communities and to the outside world via concrete formalizations of testimonies: either memoir or monument. The uniqueness of the memoir of the survivor, which emerges out of the ashes of an oppressed past, became the genre of testimony, which has been so integral to Holocaust studies and genocide studies in general, with its focus on

[8] It should be noted that this is true of many cases of genocide, where the historical preconditions or political contexts are inextricably linked. As Mylonas has noted in the context of the Balkan states, states' foreign policies are intextricably linked to the way they conduct nation building, and conflicts and their historical memories cannot be understood in isolation from wider regional or geopolitical contexts (Mylonas, 2013).

the figure of the witness as the key locus of both individual and community memory. Testimony, according to Eaglestone (2004), is a genre characterized by its disruption of the processes of identification normally associated with the text. As Agamben (1999) writes, the evolution of the 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 (1999) 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 witness to something impossible to bear witness to. 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 dead 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, as Agamben (1999) posits. As such, it poses interesting questions for how stories are told and for the relationship between this traumatic disjuncture and haunting. 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.

As in the Darfur case, testimony need not to be written down, published, or widely dispersed in order to serve a memorial function. What distinguishes the Darfur case from other cases of genocide is that due to the ongoing conflicts and the nature of the targeting, there are not yet any formal memorial sites, and even memoir is not widespread. The genocide in Darfur emerged from a long historical context in Sudan of particular groups being disenfranchised in terms of political and economic participation, which resulted in a long civil war between north and south. Groups in western Sudan, in Darfur, began to demand increased recognition and protested against their circumstances, sometimes by taking up arms. The response by the central government in Khartoum was swift and harsh. Supported by local militias known as Janjaweed, often translated as the devil on horseback, and composed of men of herding tribes in the region, the government, which identifies as Arabized African, began a systematic campaign to eradicate black Africans in Darfur, mainly from three agricultural tribes known as the Fur, the Zaghawa, and the Masalit. The government engaged in widespread bombing campaigns from airplanes and helicopters, followed by the Janjaweed's killings, carried out on the ground. Villages were burned and destroyed, civilians massacred, women raped, and water supplies contaminated to prevent the return of groups to their lands. The resulting refugee crisis was immense, and many refugees faced targeting even in refugee camps. United Nations (UN) estimates are that between 200,000 and 300,000 people were killed (Unicef, 2008), though most estimates place the

death toll at closer to 400,000 (United Human Rights Council, n.d.). Nearly three million people remain displaced, either internally or in refugee camps, mostly in neighboring Chad. As of the time of this writing, the crisis in Darfur is ongoing, though the height of the killing occurred from 2003 to 2006.

Though there are several documentary films and memoirs on/about Darfur, these are focused on raising awareness of the atrocities to the outside world, rather than on transmitting and exploring memory within the community. The most common way remembrance takes place on a community level is via shared oral and visual storytelling. Below I will explore two brief examples, the pictures drawn by children that have become well-known via their status as evidence for the International Criminal Court trial proceedings, and oral testimonies, specifically poetry, to illustrate the idea that the construction of memory narratives is fraught with complexities, that memory and identity are inextricably linked, and that these types of storytelling expand our traditional conceptions of what memorialization looks like. I explicate what it might mean politically to be haunted by these stories and pictures.

The memoir is specifically interesting for this examination. Michael Taussig (2006) refers to the poetry that facilitated remembrance, and terms this idea "speaking the past" rather than questioning or interrogating the past. 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 mimesis which disables us from connecting with the past in an ethical way so as to redeem the past. The stories told in the refugee camp exhibit narrative dislocations that accompany the way we typically understand trauma. As Resende and Budryte (2014) have noted, trauma is characterized by the incapacity of language to discuss reality; it lies outside of the normal bounds of comprehension. The narratives and drawings I explore exhibit this same sort of trauma-driven unknowability and undecideability.

Children's drawings have become famous representations of the conflict in Darfur because they have been used as part of the prosecution's package of evidence at the ICC. Members of the humanitarian organization, Waging Peace, traveled to refugee and IDP camps and asked children to draw their strongest memory and their dreams for the future. Their strongest memories were often of the attacks that had destroyed their villages and killed family members. The drawings depict government bombers dropping bombs on villages, government helicopters bombing civilians, Janjaweed on horseback or camelback or in trucks, men, women, and children being killed by gunshots, severed limbs, babies being thrown on fires, children being taken away into slavery or to become child soldiers, and homes burning with people inside (the Drawings, n.d.). The drawings are done by children, and they are not captioned or labeled. They are not traditional monuments or even memoirs. They have been situated in terms of evidence of atrocity because that is how they have been utilized by the international community. They are more than this, however.

They are memorials, stories that represent the trauma of the event that cannot be communicated through words. They are drawings of traumatic rupture, memorialized through crayon and paper. The drawings are similar because the traumatic experiences are similar; they form a collective, shared memory that the refugee and IDP community share precisely because they are witnesses to something which is fundamentally unsayable in conventional language.

Darfur is a unique case because oral testimony does not typically circulate within refugee camps or diaspora communities except when external observers are present, and in those instances it is used to raise awareness. Poetry, on the other hand, is one way that refugees from Darfur reckon with their own circumstances, and circulate ideas within their own communities and to external observers. As noted above, poetry forms a unique way for communities to communicate with one another, both in Chadian refugee camps, and to a wider diaspora population created by the practicalities of refugee flow, which is also true of other cultural forms of remembrance such as music and art. Similarly, as Erica Resende (2012) has noted, poetry and art are unique ways in which we can move beyond explaining international phenomena and instead focus on understanding them, especially in terms of encountering traumas that result from times of crisis. She advocates rejecting the Archimedean point as the basis of social scientific research and instead integrating artistic-poetic language as a way to engage Otherness. Following this same impetus, the poetry I explore here allows for an examination of alternative memorial narratives to trace the relationship between memory and identity, and to illustrate the themes that emerge. First are two poems by Emtithal Mahmoud, written when she was a thirteen-year-old Darfuri refugee living in Philadelphia.

What Would You Do?
What would you do if your town was bombed
And everything near it was gone?
What would you do if you were cold and alone,
And cast to the streets without a home?
What would you do if
someone killed your mom and dad?
And you had lost everything you had?
What would you do if
you were shattered and broken
Because you have witnessed
the unspoken?
If you run, where would you go?
If you died, would anyone know?
I myself would pray
And hope for a better day (Mahmoud, 2011).

The themes in this poem reinforce key themes of the conflict in Darfur: the bombings of villages, deaths of loved ones, and displacement of survivors.

Emtithal Mahmoud herself was forced to flee Darfur with her family as a young child due to the violence, thus she writes from the perspective of a witness to displacement, one whose very identity is bound up with this spatial distancing from her home, as she joins the growing diaspora from Darfur. The experience of survivors in Darfur is one of witnessing these atrocities, of being placed in the position of one who is left to tell the story as the witness, yet the atrocities are themselves unspeakable. In this sense, as noted above in the discussion of trauma, alternative forms of memorialization such as poetry can take into account the ruptures in language that render it impossible to represent these events, as Mahmoud notes in the poem, "because you have witnessed the unspoken". Rather, the ruptures inherent in the style of poetry allow for the rupture and disaggregation of language to mirror the same rupture associated with the trauma itself.

Another poem by Mahmoud, called War in Darfur, reinforces similar themes:

> The merciless soldier,
> With a heart that's a boulder,
> Blinded by fear,
> Desperate cries for help, he'll never hear.
> Roaming the streets with a charred black soul,
> No one is safe, not woman not man, not young and not old.
> Knowledge is forcibly pushed aside,
> Because power has now taken the stride.
> What was once a sanctuary, a haven for all,
> Is now no haven, but a place where innocent lives did fall.
> What's going on is a senseless, cold hearted war;
> Bad against good, strong against weak, all in Darfur.
> Possessions are gone,
> Everything is wrong.
> People aren't happy,
> They're homeless and hungry,
> Worst of all is that no one is free.
> Families are shattered,
> In this big bloody battle.
> Good people loose [sic] jobs,
> And are replaced by slobs.
> No female is safe,
> Because she is a subject to rape.
> People are murdered throughout the nation,
> Because of this, mostly orphans make up the population.
> There is no respect and there is no pride,
> The only thing there is, is GENOCIDE.
> I believe it's time to put this to an end,
> For there are lives to defend.
> Take action, or sit in grief?
> If you still don't know which side to choose,

Ask yourself one question,
"What did the children do?" (Mahmoud, n.d.)

The poem focuses on the atrocities that have been committed, such as rape, and names the soldiers as implicated in the carrying out of these atrocities. Yet the end of the poem is the most striking, because it implicates the reader in Mahmoud's own witnessing, by asking the reader to take a side. Similarly, as she notes that knowledge is pushed aside, she emphasizes the importance of her own and the reader's witnessing to reinforce the power of knowledge and awareness in the face of brute power.

Another poet, a Darfurian translator working with the African Union forces there and listed as an anonymous poet, writes in 2006:

Darfur is a Casualty
Worry nights about poor babies
whose life on the ground resources
Still waiting for the cloud raining
cleans starvation conflict boiling
The youth instead of standing by
They left Darfur to North Sky
Music of Darfur drums noising
not only for singing and dancing
neither for harvest nor collecting
only for chairs politicians are fighting
also for diet many people are suffering
The youth instead of standing by
They left Darfur for North Sky
Darfur is a great mother of men
she paid for now and then
but nature of life is often
loses hand of generous thieving smile
wonderful world beautiful people exile!
and the robust case which is alive
When do we build responsible life?
The youth instead of standing by
They left Darfur to North Sky (Soldier of Africa, 2006).

The poem gestures to the suffering experienced by residents of Darfur, including conflict, but also makes reference to the cultural identity of Darfur's people. North Sky could be a reference to the Nuer people's belief that God is the spirit of the sky (Nuäär, n.d.). But the overarching theme of the poem is indicated by its title, "Darfur is a Casualty", which renders the issue larger than one of individual targeting, and focuses on the loss of culture and identity itself.

As I have noted, both the drawings and the stories and poems told by refugees focus on several key recurring themes: Antonov bombers, Janjaweed on horseback or other form of transport, fire, rape (though this is often only implicitly stated),

direct violence usually described or depicted as shootings, disaggregation of families, displacement, and abandonment by the international community. When the international community in the form of a relief or human rights organization interviews refugees, the stories also often focus on how Omar al-Bashir should be brought to justice, a narrative that is likely disseminated by the human rights activists and then re-circulated by the refugees themselves.[9]

Yet what is missing from these narratives, what remains at the margins, is the racialized rhetoric that is the cause of the genocide itself. That is, the stories are often told in such a way that the identity of particular groups is pushed into the background. These are not stories about identity, but about victimization. Yet the victimization occurs precisely because of identity contestations. And the storytelling itself, as a form of memorialization, despite its lack of concrete permanence, is also a key way these refugees construct their community identity. Despite alternative tribal identities, their status as witnesses and their trauma-language have created new identities for them, ones which subvert the genocidal logic of ethnic identity, and instead bring to bear how shared identity can emerge from what Judith Butler (2004) might call "precarious life": the way in which the human being has experienced vulnerability and witnessed death in a way that we are all precariously close to. Though most people have not witnessed what these refugees have witnessed, we can still understand the precariousness of human existence via the ruptures and sutures rendered by these communities in the drawings and poems that act as forms of memorialization. Via these forms of storytelling, what becomes memorialized is human vulnerability rather than racial divisions.

Concluding remarks: on being haunted by Rwanda and Darfur

What I have traced above is an exploration of the complexities of memory and identity in two very different contexts. In both cases, efforts are made to retrench identity through memorialization, and yet there are always numerous varied stories to be told, about the particular experiences of individuals. This resistance to the official co-opting of memory narratives for political use often only exists on the margins of memorialization as a project, but it demonstrates how political communities and identities are being reimagined and re-envisioned after genocide.

Ultimately, what I have demonstrated in this paper using these two cases is that identity is what haunts the memorial narratives. In Rwanda, physical memorial sites focus on telling the story of the genocide as one where the blame lies with genocide ideology and agitators, without making the notion of ethnic identity central. Instead, the story is told in the service of a unified Rwandan identity, said

[9] This is particularly evident by the testimonies available on the Waging Peace website, the source of the children's drawings as well. Available at http://www.wagingpeace.info/index.php/the-drawings/testimonies, accessed 12 January, 2015.

to be the aim of memorialization in the first place. Thus, memorials serve two impetuses: to tell the story of what happened, and to unify the country with one identity based out of a self-perception of Rwandans as the keeper of an important memory that belongs to part of their history. But tensions between memorialization and forgetting allow us to perceive Rwandan genocide identity as multiple, and to parse out the implications for political reconciliation within Rwanda. In Darfur, memorial testimonies focus on drawing attention to atrocity, made even more salient by the existence of humanitarian aid groups in refugee camps and the context of ICC proceedings. Yet these stories remain haunted by questions of identity that linger in the background, and by the precariousness of human existence highlighted by the violence in Darfur. Both of these cases demonstrate that ethnic identity is not the salient factor in memorialization, indeed that it is possible to move beyond ethnic divisions even as these divisions were at the root of the atrocity that was perpetrated. Instead, they raise questions about what it means for identity to emerge out of witnessing, and whether communities can form out of shared human vulnerabilities that are contested and memorialized. If this is the case, then it beckons to a shared ethics of witnessing that may not be limited to a victim community and could instead form the basis for an ethics and politics of haunting that refigures and reimagines the very concept of identity as a basis for political communities. This offers the potential for memorialization to break down boundaries rather than entrench identity divides by broadening the basis for memorialization of atrocity to human vulnerability, which is shared by all.

References

Adorno, Th. W. (1986). What does coming to terms with the past mean? In G. Hartman *(Ed.), Bitburg in moral and political perspective* (pp.114-129). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Agamben, G. (1999). *Remnants of Auschwitz*. New York, NY: Zone Books.

Agathangelou, A. (2009). Bodies of desire, terror and the war in Eurasia: impolite disruptions of (neo) liberal internationalism, neoconservatism, and the "new" imperium. *Millennium*, 38(3), 693-722.

Andrieu, K. (2009). Sorry for the genocide: how public apologies can help promote national reconciliation. *Millennium*, 38(1), 3-23.

Auchter, J. (2014a). *The politics of haunting and memory in international relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Auchter, J. (2014b). Conceptualizing alternative forms of justice: the politics of memorialization in Rwanda. In E. Bird and F. Ottanelli (Eds.), *The performance of memory as transitional justice* (pp.167-180). Antwerp/ Cambridge: Intersentia.

Becker, D. (2014). Memory and trauma as elements of identity in foreign policymaking. In E. Resende and D. Budryte (Eds.), *Memory and Trauma in International Relations* (pp. 57-73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bell, D. (2006). *Memory, trauma, and world politics: reflections on the relationship between past and present*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bell, D. (2009). Memory and violence. *Millennium*, 38(2), 345-360.

Booth, W. J. (2001). The unforgotten: memories of justice. *The American Political Science Review,* 95(4), 777-791.

Booth, W. J. (2009). Kashmir road: some reflections on memory and violence. *Millennium,* 38(2), 361-377.

Buckley-Zistel, S. (2009). We are pretending peace: local memory and the absence of social transformation and reconciliation in Rwanda. In Ph. Clark and Z. Kaufman (Eds.), *After genocide* (pp. 125-144). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Burnet, J. (2009). Whose genocide, whose truth? In A. L. Hinton and K. L. O'Neill (Eds.), *Genocide: truth, memory, and representation* (pp. 80-110). Durham: Duke University Press.

Butler, J. (2003). Afterword. In D. Eng and D. Kazanjian, *Loss: the politics of mourning* (pp. 467-474). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Butler, J. (2004) *Precarious life: the powers of mourning and violence.* London: Verso.

Caruth, C. (1995). *Trauma: explorations in memory*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Caruth, C. (1996). *Unclaimed experience: trauma, narrative, and history.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cobban, H. (2007). *Amnesty after atrocity: Healing nations after genocide and war crimes*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Cubitt, G. (2007). *History and memory* (pp. 175-6). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Douglass, A., and Vogler, Th. (2003). *Witness and memory: the discourse of trauma* (pp. 42-43). New York: Routledge.

Drawings (n. d.). Retrieved January 12, 2015 from http://www.wagingpeace.info/index.php/the-drawings

Eaglestone, R. (2004). *The Holocaust and the postmodern.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hite, K., and Collins, C. (2009). Memorial fragments, monumental silences and reawakenings in 21st-century Chile. *Millennium*, 38(2), 379-400.

Hutchison, E., and Bleiker, R. (2008). Emotional reconciliation: reconstituting identity and community after trauma. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 11(3), 385-403.

Huyssen, A. (1994). *Twilight memories: marking time in a culture of amnesia*. London: Routledge.

Kagame, P. (2013, April 8). Rwanda: President Kagame's speech. *The New Times*, unpaginated.

Kattago, S. (2009). War memorials and the politics of memory: the soviet war memorial in Tallinn. *Constellations,* 16(1), 150-166.

Lambek, M. (1996). The past imperfect: remembering as moral practice. In P. Antze and M. Lambek (Eds.), *Tense Past* (pp. 235-255). New York: Routledge.

Lemarchand, R. (2009). The politics of memory in post-genocide Rwanda. In Ph. Clark and Z. Kaufman (Eds.), *After genocide* (pp. 65-76). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Mahmoud, E. (n.d.). *War in Darfur*. Retrieved January 12, 2015 from http://www.postpoems.org/authors/sudan/poem/805142

Mahmoud, E. (2011). What would you do? *World History Bulletin*, 27(2), 40.

Margalit, A. (2002). *The ethics of memory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mayo, J. (1998). *War memorials as political landscape*: *the American experience and beyond*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Mylonas, H. (2013). The politics of nation-building. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nichanian, M. (2003). Catastrophic mourning. In D. Eng and D. Kazanjian (Eds.), *Loss: the politics of mourning* (pp. 99-124). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Nuäär (n.d.). Retrieved January 12, 2015 from http://www.nueronline.com/thok-nath/nuaar/

Olick, J. (2003). *States of memory: continuities, conflicts, and transformation in national retrospection*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Resende, E., and Budryte, D. (2014). Introduction. In E. Resende and D. Budryte (Eds.), *Memory and trauma in international relations* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Routledge.

Resende, E. (2012). Self and other in foreign policy discursive practices: resisting othering in processes of knowledge production in IR. In S. Reinke de Buitrago (Ed.), *Portraying the other in international relations* (pp. 143-162). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sherman, D. (1996). Art, commerce, and the production of memory in france after World War I. In J. Gillis (Ed.), *Commemorations: The politics of national identity* (pp. 186-214). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Soldier of Africa (2006). Darfur is a causality. Retrieved January 12, 2015 from http://rsasoldier.blogspot.com/2006/05/darfur-poetry-written-by-darfurian.html

Straus, S., and Aldorf, L. (Eds.) (2011). *Remaking Rwanda: state building and human rights after mass violence*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Taussig, M. (2006). *Walter Benjamin's grave*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Unicef (2008). Darfur- Overview. Retrieved January 12, 2015 from http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/sudan_darfuroverview.html

United Human Rights Council (n. d.). Genocide in Darfur. Retrieved January 12, 2015 from http://www.unitedhumanrights.org/genocide/genocide-in-sudan.htm

Winter, J. (2006). *Remembering war: the great war and historical memory in the twentieth century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Young, J. (1994). *The texture of memory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Zehfuss, M. (2007). *Wounds of memory: the politics of war in Germany.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teorizuojant šmėkliškumą ir tarptautiškumą po genocido: Ruandos ir Darfūro atvejai

Jessica Auchter

Politikos mokslų ir viešojo administravimo fakultetas
Tenesio universitetas Čatanugoje
615 McCallie Aveniu
Čatanuga, Tenesio valstija, JAV
El. paštas: jessica-auchter@utc.edu

Etniškumo studijos, 2015/2. P. 36–56 © Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centras, 2015

SANTRAUKA: Šiame straipsnyje siekiama plėtoti šmėkliškumo (angl. *haunting*) sąvoką analizuojant du atvejus, kai memorializacija vyko labai skirtingai: Ruandoje ir Darfūre. Straipsnyje teigiama, kad leisdami mus persekioti šmėkloms, atveriame naujas politikos erdves, kurios rodo bendrą žmonijos pažeidžiamumą, o ne politiką, paremtą konkurencija dėl aukos statuso. Konkrečiai autorė siekia aptarti šmėkliškumo etikos pasiūlytą alternatyvų objektyvą, per kurį galime žvelgti į masinių žudynių memorializaciją. Ruanda ir Darfūras atskleidžia labai skirtingus šio proceso kontekstus. Ruandoje paminklai ir demonstruojami žmonių palaikai formuoja pagrindines memorializacijos erdves. Priešingai, Darfūre, kur konfliktas tebesitęsia, nėra fizinių atmintinų vietų ir aukų kūnai maišosi su dykumų smėliu, o žodiniai liudijimai išlieka pagrindiniu būdu atsiminti įvykusias mirtis. Abu atvejai kelia klausimus apie tapatybės formavimą ir santykį tarp tapatybės ir fizinių atmintinų vietų. Įtampos tarp to, kaip mirtys ir pasakojimai apie mirtis yra valdomi (ar bandomi suvaldyti), ir tarp tebesitęsiančių konkuruojančių pasakojimų, kurie išlieka atmintinose vietose, analizė leidžia autorei kelti esminius klausimus apie tapatybę: kaip ji siejasi su tuo, kas yra memorializacija, kaip vyksta memorializacijos procesas ir ką gali reikšti būti persekiojamam šmėklų – gyvenimų ir mirčių tų, kurie buvo užtildyti ar įtraukti į specifinius atminties projektus.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: atmintis, poezija, tapatybė, žmonių pažeidžiamumas.