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on more sustaining grounds. This means, in part, hearing beyond what we are able to hear. And it means as well being open to narration that decenters us from our supremacy, in both its right- and left-wing forms. Can we hear that there were precedents for these events and even know that it is urgent to know and learn from these precedents as we seek to stop them from operating in the present, at the same time as we insist that these precedents do not "justify" the recent violent events? If the events are not understandable without that history, that does not mean that the historical understanding furnishes a moral justification for the events themselves. Only then do we reach the disposition to get to the "root" of violence, and begin to offer another vision of the future than that which perpetuates violence in the name of denying it, offering instead names for things that restrain us from thinking and acting radically and well about global options.

I propose to consider a dimension of political life that has to do with our exposure to violence and our complicity in it, with our vulnerability to loss and the task of mourning that follows, and with finding a basis for community in these conditions. We cannot precisely "argue against" these dimensions of human vulnerability, inasmuch as they function, in effect, as the limits of the arguable, even perhaps as the fecundity of the inarguable. It is not that my thesis survives any argument against it: surely there are various ways of regarding corporeal vulnerability and the task of mourning, and various ways of figuring these conditions within the sphere of politics. But if the opposition is to vulnerability and the task of mourning itself, regardless of its formulation, then it is probably best not to regard this opposition primarily as an "argument." Indeed, if there were no opposition to this thesis, then there would be no reason
to write this essay. And, if the opposition to this thesis were not consequent, there would be no political reason for reimagining the possibility of community on the basis of vulnerability and loss.

Perhaps, then, it should come as no surprise that I propose to start, and to end, with the question of the human (as if there were any other way for us to start or end). We start here not because there is a human condition that is universally shared—this is surely not yet the case. The question that preoccupies me in the light of recent global violence is, Who counts as human? Whose lives count as lives? And, finally, What makes for a grievable life? Despite our differences in location and history, my guess is that it is possible to appeal to a “we,” for all of us have some notion of what it is to have lost somebody. Loss has made a tentative “we” of us all. And if we have lost, then it follows that we have had, that we have desired and loved, that we have struggled to find the conditions for our desire. We have all lost in recent decades from AIDS, but there are other losses that afflict us, from illness and from global conflict; and there is the fact as well that women and minorities, including sexual minorities, are, as a community, subjected to violence, exposed to its possibility, if not its realization. This means that each of us is constituted politically in part by virtue of the social vulnerability of our bodies—as a site of desire and physical vulnerability, as a site of a publicity at once assertive and exposed. Loss and vulnerability seem to follow from our being socially constituted bodies, attached to others, at risk of losing those attachments, exposed to others, at risk of violence by virtue of that exposure.

I am not sure I know when mourning is successful, or when one has fully mourned another human being. Freud changed his mind on this subject: he suggested that successful mourning meant being able to exchange one object for another; he later claimed that incorporation, originally associated with melancholia, was essential to the task of mourning. 2 Freud’s early hope that an attachment might be withdrawn and then given anew implied a certain interchangeability of objects as a sign of hopefulness, as if the prospect of entering life anew made use of a kind of promiscuity of libidinal aim. 3 That might be true, but I do not think that successful grieving implies that one has forgotten another person or that something else has come along to take its place, as if full substitutability were something for which we might strive.

Perhaps, rather, one mourns when one accepts that by the loss one undergoes one will be changed, possibly for ever. Perhaps mourning has to do with agreeing to undergo a transformation (perhaps one should say submitting to a transformation) the full result of which one cannot know in advance. There is losing, as we know, but there is also the transformative effect of loss, and this latter cannot be charted or planned. One can try to choose it, but it may be that this experience of transformation deconstitutes choice at some level. I do not think for instance, that one can invoke the Protestant ethic when it comes to loss. One cannot say, “Oh, I’ll go through loss this way, and that will be the result, and I’ll apply myself to the task, and I’ll endeavor to achieve the resolution of grief that is before me.” I think one is hit by waves, and that one starts out the day with an aim, a project, a plan, and finds oneself foiled. One finds oneself fallen. One is exhausted but does not know why. Something is larger than one’s own deliberate plan, one’s own project, one’s own knowing and choosing.

Something takes hold of you: where does it come from? What sense does it make? What claims us at such moments, such that we are not the masters of ourselves? To what are we tied? And by what are we seized? Freud reminded us that when we lose someone, we do not always know what it is in that person that has been lost. 4 So when one loses, one is also faced with something enigmatic: something is
hiding in the loss, something is lost within the recesses of loss. If mourning involves knowing what one has lost (and melancholia originally meant, to a certain extent, not knowing), then mourning would be maintained by its enigmatic dimension, by the experience of not knowing incited by losing what we cannot fully fathom.

When we lose certain people, or when we are dispossessed from a place, or a community, we may simply feel that we are undergoing something temporary, that mourning will be over and some restoration of prior order will be achieved. But maybe when we undergo what we do, something about who we are is revealed, something that delineates the ties we have to others, that shows us that these ties constitute what we are, ties or bonds that compose us. It is not as if an “I” exists independently over here and then simply loses a “you” over there, especially if the attachment to “you” is part of what composes who “I” am. If I lose you, under these conditions, then I not only mourn the loss, but I become inscrutable to myself. Who “am” I, without you? When we lose some of these ties by which we are constituted, we do not know who we are or what to do.

On one level, I think I have lost “you” only to discover that “I” have gone missing as well. At another level, perhaps what I have lost “in” you, that for which I have no ready vocabulary, is a relationality that is composed neither exclusively of myself nor you, but is to be conceived as the tie by which those terms are differentiated and related.

Many people think that grief is privatizing, that it returns us to a solitary situation and is, in that sense, depoliticizing. But I think it furnishes a sense of political community of a complex order, and it does this first of all by bringing to the fore the relational ties that have implications for theorizing fundamental dependency and ethical responsibility. If my fate is not originally or finally separable from yours, then the “we” is traversed by a relationality that we cannot easily argue against; or, rather, we can argue against it, but we would be denying something fundamental about the social conditions of our very formation.

A consequential grammatical quandary follows. In the effort to explain these relations, I might be said to “have” them, but what does “having” imply? I might sit back and try to enumerate them to you. I might explain what this friendship means, what that lover meant or means to me. I would be constituting myself in such an instance as a detached narrator of my relations. Dramatizing my detachment, I might perhaps only be showing that the form of attachment I am demonstrating is trying to minimize its own relationality, is invoking it as an option, as something that does not touch on the question of what sustains me fundamentally.

What grief displays, in contrast, is the thrill in which our relations with others hold us, in ways that we cannot always recount or explain, in ways that often interrupt the self-conscious account of ourselves we might try to provide, in ways that challenge the very notion of ourselves as autonomous and in control. I might try to tell a story here about what I am feeling, but it would have to be a story in which the very “I” who seeks to tell the story is stopped in the midst of the telling; the very “I” is called into question by its relation to the Other, a relation that does not precisely reduce me to speechlessness, but does nevertheless clutter my speech with signs of its undoing. I tell a story about the relations I choose, only to expose, somewhere along the way, the way I am gripped and undone by these very relations. My narrative falters, as it must.

Let’s face it. We’re undone by each other. And if we’re not, we’re missing something.

This seems so clearly the case with grief, but it can be so only because it was already the case with desire. One does not always stay intact. One may want to, or manage to for a while, but despite one’s
best efforts, one is undone, in the face of the other, by the touch, by
the scent, by the feel, by the prospect of the touch, by the memory
of the feel. And so, when we speak about "my sexuality" or "my
gender," as we do and as we must, we nevertheless mean something
complicated that is partially concealed by our usage. As a mode of
relation, neither gender nor sexuality is precisely a possession, but,
rather, is a mode of being dispossessed, a way of being for another
or by virtue of another. It won't even do to say that I am promoting
a relational view of the self over an autonomous one or trying to
 redescribe autonomy in terms of relationality. Despite my affinity
for the term relationality, we may need other language to approach
the issue that concerns us, a way of thinking about how we are
not only constituted by our relations but also dispossessed by them
as well.

We tend to narrate the history of the feminist and lesbian/gay
movement, for instance, in such a way that ecstasy figured prominently
in the sixties and seventies and midway through the eighties. But
maybe ecstasy is more persistent than that; maybe it is with us all
along. To be ecstatic means, literally, to be outside oneself, and thus
can have several meanings: to be transported beyond oneself by a
passion, but also to be beside oneself with rage or grief. I think that if
I can still address a "we," or include myself within its terms, I am
speaking to those of us who are living in certain ways beside ourselves,
whether in sexual passion, or emotional grief, or political rage.

I am arguing, if I am "arguing" at all, that we have an interesting
political predicament; most of the time when we hear about "rights,"
we understand them as pertaining to individuals. When we argue for
protection against discrimination, we argue as a group or a class. And
in that language and in that context, we have to present ourselves as
bounded beings—distinct, recognizable, delineated, subjects before
the law, a community defined by some shared features. Indeed, we
must be able to use that language to secure legal protections and
entitlements. But perhaps we make a mistake if we take the definitions
of who we are, legally, to be adequate descriptions of what we are
about. Although this language may well establish our legitimacy
within a legal framework enunciated in liberal versions of human
ontology, it does not do justice to passion and grief and rage, all of
which tear us from ourselves, bind us to others, transport us, undo us,
implicate us in lives that are not our own, irreversibly, if not fatally.

It is not easy to understand how a political community is wrought
from such ties. One speaks, and one speaks for another, to another,
and yet there is no way to collapse the distinction between the Other
and oneself. When we say "we" we do nothing more than designate
this very problematic. We do not solve it. And perhaps it is, and
ought to be, insoluble. This disposition of ourselves outside our-
selves seems to follow from bodily life, from its vulnerability and its
exposure.

At the same time, essential to so many political movements is the
claim of bodily integrity and self-determination. It is important to
claim that our bodies are in a sense our own and that we are entitled
to claim rights of autonomy over our bodies. This assertion is as
true for lesbian and gay rights claims to sexual freedom as it is for
transsexual and transgender claims to self-determination, as it is to
intersex claims to be free of coerced medical and psychiatric inter-
ventions. It is as true for all claims to be free from racist attacks,
physical and verbal, as it is for feminism's claim to reproductive
freedom, and as it surely is for those whose bodies labor under
duress, economic and political, under conditions of colonization and
occupation. It is difficult, if not impossible, to make these claims
without recourse to autonomy. I am not suggesting that we cease to
make these claims. We have to, we must. I also do not wish to imply
that we have to make these claims reluctantly or strategically. Defined
within the broadest possible compass, they are part of any normative aspiration of a movement that seeks to maximize the protection and the freedoms of sexual and gender minorities, of women, and of racial and ethnic minorities, especially as they cut across all the other categories.

But is there another normative aspiration that we must also seek to articulate and to defend? Is there a way in which the place of the body, and the way in which it disposed us outside ourselves or sets us beside ourselves, opens up another kind of normative aspiration within the field of politics?

The body implies mortality, vulnerability, agency: the skin and the flesh expose us to the gaze of others, but also to touch, and to violence, and bodies put us at risk of becoming the agency and instrument of all these as well. Although we struggle for rights over our own bodies, the very bodies for which we struggle are not quite ever only our own. The body has its invariably public dimension. Constituted as a social phenomenon in the public sphere, my body is and is not mine. Given over from the start to the world of others, it bears their imprint, is formed within the crucible of social life; only later, and with some uncertainty, do I lay claim to my body as my own, if, in fact, I ever do. Indeed, if I deny that prior to the formation of my “will,” my body related me to others whom I did not choose to have in proximity to myself, if I build a notion of “autonomy” on the basis of the denial of this sphere of a primary and unfilled physical proximity with others, then am I denying the social conditions of my embodiment in the name of autonomy?

At one level, this situation is literally familiar: there is bound to be some experience of humiliation for adults, who think that they are exercising judgment in matters of love, to reflect upon the fact that, as infants and young children, they loved their parents or other primary others in absolute and uncritical ways—and that something of that pattern lives on in their adult relationships. I may wish to reconstitute my “self” as if it were there all along, a tacit ego with acumen from the start; but to do so would be to deny the various forms of rapture and subjection that formed the condition of my emergence as an individuated being and that continue to haunt my adult sense of self with whatever anxiety and longing I may now feel. Individuation is an accomplishment, not a presupposition, and certainly no guarantee.

Is there a reason to apprehend and affirm this condition of my formation within the sphere of politics, a sphere monopolized by adults? If I am struggling for autonomy, do I not need to be struggling for something else as well, a conception of myself as invariably in community, impressed upon by others, impinging upon them as well, and in ways that are not fully in my control or clearly predictable?

Is there a way that we might struggle for autonomy in many spheres, yet also consider the demands that are imposed upon us by living in a world of beings who are, by definition, physically dependent on one another, physically vulnerable to one another? Is this not another way of imagining community, one in which we are alike only in having this condition separately and so having in common a condition that cannot be thought without difference? This way of imagining community affirms relationality not only as a descriptive or historical fact of our formation, but also as an ongoing normative dimension of our social and political lives, one in which we are compelled to take stock of our interdependence. According to this latter view, it would become incumbent on us to consider the place of violence in any such relation, for violence is, always, an exploitation of that primary tie, that primary way in which we are, as bodies, outside ourselves and for one another.

We are something other than “autonomous” in such a condition, but that does not mean that we are merged or without boundaries. It
does mean, however, that when we think about who we "are" and seek to represent ourselves, we cannot represent ourselves as merely bounded beings, for the primary others who are past for me not only live on in the fiber of the boundary that contains me (one meaning of "incorporation"), but they also haunt the way I am, as it were, periodically undone and open to becoming unbounded.

Let us return to the issue of grief, to the moments in which one undergoes something outside one's control and finds that one is beside oneself, not at one with oneself. Perhaps we can say that grief contains the possibility of apprehending a mode of dispossession that is fundamental to who I am. This possibility does not dispute the fact of my autonomy, but it does qualify that claim through recourse to the fundamental sociality of embodied life, the ways in which we are, from the start and by virtue of being a bodily being, already given over, beyond ourselves, implicated in lives that are not our own. If I do not always know what seizes me on such occasions, and if I do not always know what it is in another person that I have lost, it may be that this sphere of dispossession is precisely the one that exposes my unknowingness, the unconscious imprint of my primary sociality. Can this insight lead to a normative reorientation for politics? Can this situation of mourning—one that is so dramatic for those in social movements who have undergone innumerable losses—supply a perspective by which to begin to apprehend the contemporary global situation?

"Mourning, fear, anxiety, rage. In the United States, we have been surrounded with violence, having perpetrated it and perpetrating it still, having suffered it, living in fear of it, planning more of it, if not an open future of infinite war in the name of a "war on terrorism." Violence is surely a touch of the worst order, a way a primary human vulnerability to other humans is exposed in its most terrifying way, a way in which we are given over, without control, to the will of another, a way in which life itself can be expunged by the willful action of another. To the extent that we commit violence, we are acting on another, putting the other at risk, causing the other damage, threatening to expunge the other. In a way, we all live with this particular vulnerability, a vulnerability to the other that is part of bodily life, a vulnerability to a sudden address from elsewhere that we cannot preempt. This vulnerability, however, becomes highly exacerbated under certain social and political conditions, especially those in which violence is a way of life and the means to secure self-defense are limited.

Mindfulness of this vulnerability can become the basis of claims for non-military political solutions, just as denial of this vulnerability through a fantasy of mastery (an institutionalized fantasy of mastery) can fuel the instruments of war. We cannot, however, will away this vulnerability. We must attend to it, even abide by it, as we begin to think about what politics might be implied by staying with the thought of corporeal vulnerability itself, a situation in which we can be vanquished or lose others. Is there something to be learned about the geopolitical distribution of corporeal vulnerability from our own brief and devastating exposure to this condition?

I think, for instance, that we have seen, are seeing, various ways of dealing with vulnerability and grief, so that, for instance, William Safire citing Milton writes we must "banish melancholy," as if the repudiation of melancholy ever did anything other than fortify its affective structure under another name, since melancholy is already the repudiation of mourning; so that, for instance, President Bush announced on September 21 that we have finished grieving and that now it is time for resolute action to take the place of grief. When grieving is something to be feared, our fears can give rise to the impulse to resolve it quickly, to banish it in the name of an action invested with the power to restore the loss or return the world to a
former order, or to reinvigorate a fantasy that the world formerly
was orderly.

Is there something to be gained from grieving, from tarrying with
grief, from remaining exposed to its unbearable and not endeavor-
ing to seek a resolution for grief through violence? Is there
something to be gained in the political domain by maintaining grief
as part of the framework within which we think our international
ties? If we stay with the sense of loss, are we left feeling only passive
and powerless, as some might fear? Or are we, rather, returned to a
sense of human vulnerability, to our collective responsibility for the
physical lives of one another? Could the experience of a dislocation
of First World safety not condition the insight into the radically
inequitable ways that corporeal vulnerability is distributed globally?
To foreclose that vulnerability, to banish it, to make ourselves secure
at the expense of every other human consideration is to eradicate one
of the most important resources from which we must take our
bearings and find our way.

To grieve, and to make grief itself into a resource for politics, is
not to be resigned to inaction, but it may be understood as the slow
process by which we develop a point of identification with suffering
itself. The disorientation of grief—"Who have I become?" or, indeed,
"What is left of me?" "What is it in the Other that I have lost?"—
poses the "I" in the mode of unknowingness.

But this can be a point of departure for a new understanding if the
narcissistic preoccupation of melancholia can be moved into a
consideration of the vulnerability of others. Then we might critically
evaluate and oppose the conditions under which certain human lives
are more vulnerable than others, and thus certain human lives are more
grievable than others. From where might a principle emerge by which
we vow to protect others from the kinds of violence we have suffered,
if not from an apprehension of a common human vulnerability? I do
not mean to deny that vulnerability is differentiated, that it is allocated
differentially across the globe. I do not even mean to presume upon a
common notion of the human, although to speak in its "name" is
already (and perhaps only) to fathom its possibility.

I am referring to violence, vulnerability, and mourning, but there
is a more general conception of the human with which I am trying to
work here, one in which we are, from the start, given over to the
other, one in which we are, from the start, even prior to individuation
itself and, by virtue of bodily requirements, given over to some set
of primary others: this conception means that we are vulnerable to
those we are too young to know and to judge and, hence, vulnerable
to violence; but also vulnerable to another range of touch, a range
that includes the eradication of our being at the one end, and the
physical support for our lives at the other.

Although I am insisting on referring to a common human
vulnerability, one that emerges with life itself, I also insist that we
cannot recover the source of this vulnerability: it precedes the
formation of "I." This is a condition, a condition of being laid bare
from the start and with which we cannot argue. I mean, we can argue
with it, but we are perhaps foolish, if not dangerous, when we do.
I do not mean to suggest that the necessary support for a newborn
is always there. Clearly, it is not, and for some this primary scene is
a scene of abandonment or violence or starvation, that theirs are
bodies given over to nothing, or to brutality, or to no sustenance.

We cannot understand vulnerability as a deprivation, however,
unless we understand the need that is thwarted. Such infants still must
be apprehended as given over, as given over to no one or to some
insufficient support, or to an abandonment. It would be difficult, if
not impossible, to understand how humans suffer from oppression
without seeing how this primary condition is exploited and exploitable,
thwarted and denied. The condition of primary vulnerability, of
being given over to the touch of the other, even if there is no other there, and no support for our lives, signifies a primary helplessness and need, one to which any society must attend. Lives are supported and maintained differently, and there are radically different ways in which human physical vulnerability is distributed across the globe. Certain lives will be highly protected, and the abrogation of their claims to sanctity will be sufficient to mobilize the forces of war. Other lives will not find such fast and furious support and will not even qualify as "grievable."

A hierarchy of grief could no doubt be enumerated. We have seen it already, in the genre of the obituary, where lives are quickly tidied up and summarized, humanized, usually married, or on the way to be, heterosexual, happy, monogamous. But this is just a sign of another differential relation to life, since we seldom, if ever, hear the names of the thousands of Palestinians who have died by the Israeli military with United States support, or any number of Afghan people, children and adults. Do they have names and faces, personal histories, family, favorite hobbies, slogans by which they live? What defense against the apprehension of loss is at work in the birthe way in which we accept deaths caused by military means with a shrug or with self-righteousness or with clear vindictiveness? To what extent have Arab peoples, predominantly practitioners of Islam, fallen outside the "human" as it has been naturalized in its "Western" mold by the contemporary workings of humanism? What are the cultural contours of the human at work here? How do our cultural frames for thinking the human set limits on the kinds of losses we can avow as loss? After all, if someone is lost, and that person is not someone, then what and where is the loss, and how does mourning take place?

This last is surely a question that lesbian, gay, and bi-studies have asked in relation to violence against sexual minorities; that transgendered people have asked as they are singled out for harassment and sometimes murder; that intersexed people have asked, whose formative years are so often marked by unwanted violence against their bodies in the name of a normative notion of the human, a normative notion of what the body of a human must be. This question is no doubt, as well, the basis of a profound affinity between movements centering on gender and sexuality and efforts to counter the normative human morphologies and capacities that condemn or efface those who are physically challenged. It must also be part of the affinity with anti-racist struggles, given the racial differential that undergirds the culturally viable notions of the human, ones that we see acted out in dramatic and terrifying ways in the global arena at the present time.

I am referring not only to humans not regarded as humans, and thus to a restrictive conception of the human that is based upon their exclusion. It is not a matter of a simple entry of the excluded into an established ontology, but an inscription at the level of ontology, a critical opening up of the questions, What is real? Whose lives are real? How might reality be remade? Those who are unreal have, in a sense, already suffered the violence of derealization. What, then, is the relation between violence and those lives considered as "unreal"? Does violence effect that unreality? Does violence take place on the condition of that unreality?

If violence is done against those who are unreal, then, from the perspective of violence, it fails to injure or negate those lives since those lives are already negated. But they have a strange way of remaining animated and so must be negated again (and again). They cannot be mourned because they are always already lost or, rather, never "were," and they must be killed, since they seem to live on, stubbornly, in this state of deadness. Violence renews itself in the face of the apparent inexhaustibility of its object. The derealization of the "Other" means that it is neither alive nor dead, but interminably
spectral. The infinite paranoia that imagines the war against terrorism
as a war without end will be one that justifies itself endlessly in
relation to the spectral infinity of its enemy, regardless of whether or
not there are established grounds to suspect the continuing operation
of terror cells with violent aims.

How do we understand this derealization? It is one thing to argue
that first, on the level of discourse, certain lives are not considered
lives at all, they cannot be humanized, that they fit no dominant frame
for the human, and that their dehumanization occurs first, at this
level, and that this level then gives rise to a physical violence that in
some sense delivers the message of dehumanization that is already at
work in the culture. It is another thing to say that discourse itself
effects violence through omission. If 200,000 Iraqi children were
killed during the Gulf War and its aftermath, do we have an image,a
frame for any of those lives, singly or collectively? Is there a story
we might find about those deaths in the media? Are there names
attached to those children?

There are no obituaries for the war casualties that the United
States inflicts, and there cannot be. If there were to be an obituary,
there would have had to have been a life, a life worth noting, a life
worth valuing and preserving, a life that qualifies for recognition.
Although we might argue that it would be impractical to write
obituaries for all those people, or for all people, I think we have to
ask, again and again, how the obituary functions as the instrument by
which grievability is publicly distributed. It is the means by which a
life becomes, or fails to become, a publicly grievable life, an icon for
national self-recognition, the means by which a life becomes note-
worthy. As a result, we have to consider the obituary as an act of
nation-building. The matter is not a simple one, for, if a life is not
grievable, it is not quite a life; it does not qualify as a life and is not
worth a note. It is already the unburied, if not the unburiable.

It is not simply, then, that there is a “discourse” of dehuman-
ization that produces these effects, but rather that there is a limit to
discourse that establishes the limits of human intelligibility. It is
not just that a death is poorly marked, but that it is unmarkable. Such
a death vanishes, not into explicit discourse, but in the ellipses by
which public discourse proceeds. The queer lives that vanished on
September 11 were not publically welcomed into the idea of national
identity built in the obituary pages, and their closest relations were
only belatedly and selectively (the marital norm holding sway once
again) made eligible for benefits. But this should come as no surprise,
when we think about how few deaths from AIDS were publicly
grievable losses, and how, for instance, the extensive deaths now
taking place in Africa are also, in the media, for the most part
unmarkable and ungrievable.

A Palestinian citizen of the United States recently submitted to
the San Francisco Chronicle obituaries for two Palestinian families who
had been killed by Israeli troops, only to be told that the obituaries
could not be accepted without proof of death. The staff of the
Chronicle said that statements “in memoriam” could, however, be
accepted, and so the obituaries were rewritten and resubmitted in the
form of memorials. These memorials were then rejected, with the
explanation that the newspaper did not wish to offend anyone. We
have to wonder under what conditions public grieving constitutes an
“offense” against the public self, constituting an intolerable eruption
within the terms of what is speakable in public? What might be
“offensive” about the public avowal of sorrow and loss, such that
memorials would function as offensive speech? Is it that we should
not proclaim in public these deaths, for fear of offending those who
ally themselves with the Israeli state or military? Is it that these
deaths are not considered to be real deaths, and that these lives not
grievable, because they are Palestinians, or because they are victims
of war? What is the relation between the violence by which these
ungrievable lives were lost and the prohibition on their public
grievability? Are the violence and the prohibition both permutations
of the same violence? Does the prohibition on discourse relate to the
dehumanization of the deaths—and the lives?

Dehumanization’s relation to discourse is complex. It would be
too simple to claim that violence simply implements what is already
happening in discourse, such that a discourse on dehumanization
produces treatment, including torture and murder, structured by the
discourse. Here the dehumanization emerges at the limits of discurs-
ive life, limits established through prohibition and foreclosure.
There is less a dehumanizing discourse at work here than a refusal of
discourse that produces dehumanization as a result. Violence against
those who are already not quite living, that is, living in a state of
suspension between life and death, leaves a mark that is no mark.
There will be no public act of grieving (said Creon in Antigone). If
there is a “discourse,” it is a silent and melancholic one in which there
have been no lives, and no losses; there has been no common bodily
condition, no vulnerability that serves as the basis for an apprehen-
sion of our commonality; and there has been no sundering of that
commonality. None of this takes place on the order of the event.
None of this takes place. In the silence of the newspaper, there was
no event, no loss, and this failure of recognition is mandated through
an identification with those who identify with the perpetrators of that
violence.

This is made all the more apparent in United States journalism, in
which, with some notable exceptions, one might have expected a
public exposure and investigation of the bombing of civilian targets,
the loss of lives in Afghanistan, the decimation of communities,
infrastructures, religious centers. To the extent that journalists have
accepted the charge to be part of the war effort itself, reporting itself

has become a speech act in the service of the military operations.
Indeed, after the brutal and terrible murder of the Wall Street Journal’s
Daniel Pearl, several journalists started to write about themselves
as working on the “front lines” of the war. Indeed, Daniel Pearl,
“Danny” Pearl, is so familiar to me: he could be my brother or my
cousin; he is so easily humanized; he fits the frame, his name has my
father’s name in it. His last name contains my Yiddish name.

But those lives in Afghanistan, or other United States targets,
who were also snuffed out brutally and without recourse to any
protection, will they ever be as human as Daniel Pearl? Will the
names of the Palestinians stated in that memorial submitted to the
San Francisco Chronicle even be brought into public view? (Will we
feel compelled to learn how to say these names and to remember
them?) I do not say this to espouse a cynicism. I am in favor of
the public obituary but mindful of who has access to it, and which deaths
can be fairly mourned there. We should surely continue to grieve for
Daniel Pearl, even though he is so much more easily humanized for
most United States citizens than the nameless Afghans obliterated by
United States and European violence. But we have to consider how
the norm governing who will be a grievable human is circumscribed
and produced in these acts of permissible and celebrated public
grieving, how they sometimes operate in tandem with a prohibition
on the public grieving of others’ lives, and how this differential
allocation of grief serves the derealizing aims of military violence.
What follows as well from prohibitions on avowing grief in public is
an effective mandate in favor of a generalized melancholia (and a
derealization of loss) when it comes to considering as dead those the
United States or its allies have killed.

Finally, it seems important to consider that the prohibition on
certain forms of public grieving itself constitutes the public sphere
on the basis of such a prohibition. The public will be created on the
condition that certain images do not appear in the media, certain names of the dead are not utterable, certain losses are not avowed as losses, and violence is de-realized and diffused. Such prohibitions not only shore up a nationalism based on its military aims and practices, but they also suppress any internal dissent that would expose the concrete, human effects of its violence.

Similarly, the extensive reporting of the final moments of the lost lives in the World Trade Center are compelling and important stories. They fascinate, and they produce an intense identification by arousing feelings of fear and sorrow. One cannot help but wonder, however, what humanizing effect these narratives have. By this I do not mean simply that they humanize the lives that were lost alone with those that narrowly escaped, but that they stage the scene and provide the narrative means by which “the human” in its grievability is established. We cannot find in the public media, apart from some reports posted on the internet and circulated mainly through email contacts, the narratives of Arab lives killed elsewhere by brutal means. In this sense, we have to ask about the conditions under which a grievable life is established and maintained, and through what logic of exclusion, what practice of effacement and denormalization.

Mourning Daniel Pearl presents no problem for me or for my family of origin. His is a familiar name, a familiar face, a story about education that I understand and share; his wife’s education makes her language familiar, even moving, to me, a proximity of what is similar. In relation to him, I am not disturbed by the proximity of the unfamiliar, the proximity of difference that makes me work to forge new ties of identification and to reimage what it is to belong to a human community in which common epistemological and cultural grounds cannot always be assumed. His story takes me home and tempts me to stay there. But at what cost do I establish the familiar as the criterion by which a human life is grievable?

Most Americans have probably experienced something like the loss of their First World War as a result of the events of September 11 and its aftermath. What kind of loss is this? It is the loss of the prerogative, only and always, to be the one who transgresses the sovereign boundaries of other states, but never to be in the position of having one’s own boundaries transgressed. The United States was supposed to be the place that could not be attacked, where life was safe from violence initiated from abroad, where the only violence we knew was the kind that we inflicted on ourselves. The violence that we inflict on others is only—and always—selectively brought into public view. We now see that the national border was more permeable than we thought. Our general response is anxiety, rage; a radical desire for security; a shoring-up of the borders against what is perceived as alien; a heightened surveillance of Arab peoples and anyone who looks vaguely Arab in the dominant racial imaginary, anyone who looks like someone you once knew who was of Arab descent, or who you thought was—often citizens, it turns out, often Sikhs, often Hindus, even sometimes Israelis, especially Sephardim, often Arab-Americans, recent arrivals or those who have been in the US for decades.

Various terror alerts that go out over the media authorize and heighten racial hysteria in which fear is directed anywhere and nowhere, in which individuals are asked to be on guard but not told what to be on guard against; so everyone is free to imagine and identify the source of terror.

The result is that an amorphous racism abounds, rationalized by the claim of “self-defense.” A generalized panic works in tandem with the shoring-up of the sovereign state and the suspension of civil liberties. Indeed, when the alert goes out, every member of the population is asked to become a “foot soldier” in Bush’s army. The loss of First World presumption is the loss of a certain horizon of experience, a certain sense of the world itself as a national entitlement.
I condemn on several ethical bases the violence done against the United States and do not see it as “just punishment” for prior sins. At the same time, I consider our recent trauma to be an opportunity for a reconsideration of United States hubris and the importance of establishing more radically egalitarian international ties. Doing this involves a certain “loss” for the country as a whole: the notion of the world itself as a sovereign entitlement of the United States must be given up, lost, and mourned, as narcissistic and grandiose fantasies must be lost and mourned. From the subsequent experience of loss and fragility, however, the possibility of making different kinds of ties emerges. Such mourning might (or could) effect a transformation in our sense of international ties that would crucially rearticulate the possibility of democratic political culture here and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, the opposite reaction seems to be the case. The US asserts its own sovereignty precisely at a moment in which the sovereignty of the nation is bespeaking its own weakness, if not its growing status as an anachronism. It requires international support, but it insists on leading the way. It breaks its international contracts, and then asks whether other countries are with America or against it. It expresses its willingness to act consistently with the Geneva Convention, but it refuses to be bound to that accord, as is stipulated by its signatory status. On the contrary, the US decides whether it will act consistently with the doctrine, which parts of the doctrine apply, and will interpret that doctrine unilaterally. Indeed, in the very moment in which it claims to act consistently with the doctrine, as it does when it justifies its treatment of the Guantánamo Bay prisoners as “humane,” it decides unilaterally what will count as humane, and openly defies the stipulated definition of humane treatment that the Geneva Convention states in print. It bombs unilaterally, it says that it is time for Saddam Hussein to be removed, it decides when and

where to install democracy, for whom, by means dramatically anti-democratic, and without compunction.

Nations are not the same as individual psyches, but both can be described as “subjects,” albeit of different orders. When the United States acts, it establishes a conception of what it means to act as an American, establishes a norm by which that subject might be known. In recent months, a subject has been instated at the national level, a sovereign and extra-legal subject, a violent and self-centered subject; its actions constitute the building of a subject that seeks to restore and maintain its mastery through the systematic destruction of its multilateral relations, its ties to the international community. It shores itself up, seeks to reconstitute its imagined wholeness, but only at the price of denying its own vulnerability, its dependency, its exposure, where it exploits those very features in others, thereby making those features “other to” itself.

That this foreclosure of alterity takes place in the name of “feminism” is surely something to worry about. The sudden feminist conversion on the part of the Bush administration, which retroactively transformed the liberation of women into a rationale for its military actions against Afghanistan, is a sign of the extent to which feminism, as a trope, is deployed in the service of restoring the presumption of First World impermeability. Once again we see the spectacle of “white men, seeking to save brown women from brown men,” as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak once described the culturally imperialist exploitation of feminism. Feminism itself becomes, under these circumstances, unequivocally identified with the imposition of values on cultural contexts willfully unknown. It would surely be a mistake to gauge the progress of feminism by its success as a colonial project. It seems more crucial than ever to disengage feminism from its First World presumption and to use the resources of feminist theory, and activism, to rethink the meaning of the tie, the bond, the
alliance, the relation, as they are imagined and lived in the horizon of a counterimperialist egalitarianism.

Feminism surely could provide all kinds of responses to the following questions: How does a collective deal, finally, with its vulnerability to violence? At what price, and at whose expense, does it gain a purchase on “security,” and in what ways has a chain of violence formed in which the aggression the United States has wrought returns to it in different forms? Can we think of the history of violence here without exonerating those who engage it against the United States in the present? Can we provide a knowledgeable explanation of events that is not confused with a moral exonerating of violence? What has happened to the value of critique as a democratic value? Under what conditions is critique itself censored, as if any reflexive criticism can only and always be construed as weakness and fallibility?

Negotiating a sudden and unprecedented vulnerability—what are the options? What are the long-term strategies? Women know this question well, have known it in nearly all times, and nothing about the triumph of colonial powers has made our exposure to this kind of violence any less clear. There is the possibility of appearing impermeable, of repudiating vulnerability itself. Nothing about being socially constituted as women restrains us from simply becoming violent ourselves. And then there is the other age-old option, the possibility of wishing for death or becoming dead, as a vain effort to preempt or deflect the next blow. But perhaps there is some other way to live such that one becomes neither affectively dead nor mimetically violent, a way out of the circle of violence altogether. This possibility has to do with demanding a world in which bodily vulnerability is protected without therefore being eradicated and with insisting on the line that must be walked between the two.

By insisting on a “common” corporeal vulnerability, I may seem to be positing a new basis for humanism. That might be true, but I am prone to consider this differently. A vulnerability must be perceived and recognized in order to come into play in an ethical encounter, and there is no guarantee that this will happen. Not only is there always the possibility that a vulnerability will not be recognized and that it will be constituted as the “unrecognizable,” but when a vulnerability is recognized, that recognition has the power to change the meaning and structure of the vulnerability itself. In this sense, if vulnerability is one precondition for humanization, and humanization takes place differently through variable norms of recognition, then it follows that vulnerability is fundamentally dependent on existing norms of recognition if it is to be attributed to any human subject.

So when we say that every infant is surely vulnerable, that is clearly true; but it is true, in part, precisely because our utterance enacts the very recognition of vulnerability and so shows the importance of recognition itself for sustaining vulnerability. We perform the recognition by making the claim, and that is surely a very good ethical reason to make the claim. We make the claim, however, precisely because it is not taken for granted, precisely because it is not, in every instance, honored. Vulnerability takes on another meaning at the moment it is recognized, and recognition yields the power to reconstitute vulnerability. We cannot posit this vulnerability prior to recognition without performing the very thesis that we oppose (our positing is itself a form of recognition and so manifests the constitutive power of the discourse). This framework, by which norms of recognition are essential to the constitution of vulnerability as a precondition of the “human,” is important precisely for this reason, namely, that we need and want those norms to be in place, that we struggle for their establishment, and that we value their continuing and expanded operation.

Consider that the struggle for recognition in the Hegelian sense requires that each partner in the exchange recognize not only that the
other needs and deserves recognition, but also that each, in a different way, is compelled by the same need, the same requirement. This means that we are not separate identities in the struggle for recognition but are already involved in a reciprocal exchange, an exchange that dislocates us from our positions, our subject-positions, and allows us to see that community itself requires the recognition that we are all, in different ways, striving for recognition.

When we recognize another, or when we ask for recognition for ourselves, we are not asking for an Other to see us as we are, as we already are, as we have always been, as we were constituted prior to the encounter itself. Instead, in the asking, in the petition, we have already become something new, since we are constituted by virtue of the address, a need and desire for the Other that takes place in language in the broadest sense, one without which we could not be.

To ask for recognition, or to offer it, is precisely not to ask for recognition for what one already is. It is to solicit a becoming, to instigate a transformation, to petition the future always in relation to the Other. It is also to stake one’s own being, and one’s own persistence in one’s own being, in the struggle for recognition. This is perhaps a version of Hegel that I am offering, but it is also a departure, since I will not discover myself as the same as the “you” on which I depend in order to be.

I have moved in this essay perhaps too blithely among speculations on the body as the site of a common human vulnerability, even as I have insisted that this vulnerability is always articulated differently, that it cannot be properly thought of outside a differentiated field of power and, specifically, the differential operation of norms of recognition. At the same time, however, I would probably still insist that speculations on the formation of the subject are crucial to understanding the basis of non-violent responses to injury and, perhaps most important, to a theory of collective responsibility. I realize that it is not possible to set up easy analogies between the formation of the individual and the formation, say, of state-centered political cultures, and I caution against the use of individual psychopathology to diagnose or even simply to read the kinds of violent formations in which state- and non-state-centered forms of power engage. But when we are speaking about the “subject” we are not always speaking about an individual: we are speaking about a model for agency and intelligibility, one that is very often based on notions of sovereign power. At the most intimate levels, we are social; we are comport toward a “you”; we are outside ourselves, constituted in cultural norms that precede and exceed us, given over to a set of cultural norms and a field of power that condition us fundamentally.

The task is doubtless to think through this primary impressionability and vulnerability with a theory of power and recognition. To do this would no doubt be one way a politically informed psychoanalytic feminism could proceed. The “I” who cannot come into being without a “you” is also fundamentally dependent on a set of norms of recognition that originated neither with the “I” nor with the “you.” What is prematurely, or belatedly, called the “I” is, at the outset, entailed, even if it is to a violence, an abandonment, a mechanism; doubtless it seems better at that point to be entalled with what is impoverished or abusive than not to be entalled at all and so to lose the condition of one’s being and becoming. The kind of radically inadequate care consists of this, namely, that attachment is crucial to survival and that, when attachment takes place, it does so in relation to persons and institutional conditions that may well be violent, impoverishing, and inadequate. If an infant fails to attach, it is threatened with death, but, under some conditions, even if it does attach, it is threatened with non-survival from another direction. So the question of primary support for primary vulnerability is an ethical one for the infant and for the child. But there are broader ethical
consequences from this situation, ones that pertain not only to the adult world but to the sphere of politics and its implicit ethical dimension.

I find that my very formation implicates the other in me, that my own foreignness to myself is, paradoxically, the source of my ethical connection with others. I am not fully known to myself, because part of what I am is the enigmatic traces of others. In this sense, I cannot know myself perfectly or know my "difference" from others in an irreducible way. This unknowingness may seem, from a given perspective, a problem for ethics and politics. Don't I need to know myself in order to act responsibly in social relations? Surely, to a certain extent, yes. But is there an ethical valence to my unknowingness? I am wounded, and I find that the wound itself testifies to the fact that I am impressionable, given over to the Other in ways that I cannot fully predict or control. I cannot think the question of responsibility alone, in isolation from the Other; if I do, I have taken myself out of the relational bind that frames the problem of responsibility from the start.

(If I understand myself on the model of the human, and if the kinds of public grieving that are available to me make clear the norms by which the "human" is constituted for me, then it would seem that I am as much constituted by those I do grieve for as by those whose deaths I disavow, whose nameless and faceless deaths form the melancholic background for my social world, if not my First Worldism.) Antigone, risking death herself by burying her brother against the edict of Creon, exemplified the political risks in defying the ban against public grief during times of increased sovereign power and hegemonic national unity. What are the cultural barriers against which we struggle when we try to find out about the losses that we are asked not to mourn, when we attempt to name, and so to bring under the rubric of the "human," those whom the United States and its allies have killed? Similarly, the cultural barriers that feminism must negotiate have to take place with reference to the operation of power and the persistence of vulnerability.

A feminist opposition to militarism emerges from many sources, many cultural venues, in any number of idioms; it does not have to—and, finally, cannot—speak in a single political idiom, and no grand setting of epistemological accounts has to be required. This seems to be the theoretical commitment, for instance, of the organization Women in Black. A desideratum comes from Chandra Mohanty's important essay "Under Western Eyes," in which she maintains that notions of progress within feminism cannot be equated with assimilation to so-called Western notions of agency and political mobilization. There she argues that the comparative framework in which First World feminists develop their critique of the conditions of oppression for Third World women on the basis of universal claims not only misreads the agency of Third World feminists, but also falsely produces a homogeneous conception of who they are and what they want. In her view, that framework also reproduces the First World as the site of authentic feminist agency and does so by producing a monolithic Third World against which to understand itself. Finally, she argues that the imposition of versions of agency onto Third World contexts, and focusing on the ostensible lack of agency signified by the veil or the burka, not only misunderstands the various cultural meanings that the burka might carry for women who wear it, but also denies the very idioms of agency that are relevant for such women. Mohanty's critique is thorough and right—and it was written more than a decade ago. It seems to me now that the possibility of international coalitions has to be rethought on the basis of this critique and others. Such a coalition would have to be modeled on new modes of cultural translation and would be different from appreciating this or that position or asking for recognition in ways that assume that we are all fixed and frozen in our various locations and "subject-positions."
We could have several engaged intellectual debates going on at the same time and find ourselves joined in the fight against violence, without having to agree on many epistemological issues. We could disagree on the status and character of modernity and yet find ourselves joined in asserting and defending the rights of indigenous women to health care, reproductive technology, decent wages, physical protection, cultural rights, freedom of assembly. If you saw me on such a protest line, would you wonder how a postmodernist was able to muster the necessary “agency” to get there today? I doubt it. You would assume that I had walked or taken the subway. By the same token, various routes lead us into politics, various stories bring us onto the street, various kinds of reasoning and belief. We do not need to ground ourselves in a single model of communication, a single model of reason, a single notion of the subject before we are able to act. Indeed, an international coalition of feminist activists and thinkers—a coalition that affirms the thinking of activists and the activism of thinkers and refuses to put them into distinctive categories that deny the actual complexity of the lives in question—will have to accept the array of sometimes incomensurable epistemological and political beliefs and modes and means of agency that bring us into activism.

There will be differences among women, for instance, on what the role of reason is in contemporary politics. Spivak insists that it is not reason that politicizes the tribal women of India suffering exploitation by capitalist firms, but a set of values and a sense of the sacred that come through religion.13 And Adriana Cavarero claims that it is not because we are reasoning beings that we are connected to one another, but, rather, because we are exposed to one another, requiring a recognition that does not substitute the recognizer for the recognized.14 Do we want to say that it is our status as “subjects” that binds us all together even though, for many of us, the “subject” is multiple or fractured? And does the insistence on the subject as a precondition of political agency not erase the more fundamental modes of dependency that do bind us and out of which emerge our thinking and affiliation, the basis of our vulnerability, affiliation, and collective resistance?

What allows us to encounter one another? What are the conditions of possibility for an international feminist coalition? My sense is that to answer these questions, we cannot look to the nature of “man,” or the a priori conditions of language, or the timeless conditions of communication. We have to consider the demands of cultural translation that we assume to be part of an ethical responsibility (over and above the explicit prohibitions against thinking the Other under the sign of the “human”) as we try to think the global dilemmas that women face. It is not possible to impose a language of politics developed within First World contexts on women who are facing the threat of imperialist economic exploitation and cultural obliteration. On the other hand, we would be wrong to think that the First World is here and the Third World is there, that a second world is somewhere else, that a subaltern subsumes these divisions. These topographies have shifted, and what was once thought of as a border, that which delimits and bounds, is a highly populated site, if not the very definition of the nation, confounding identity in what may well become a very auspicious direction.

For if I am confounded by you, then you are already of me, and I am nowhere without you. I cannot muster the “we” except by finding the way in which I am tied to “you,” by trying to translate but finding that my own language must break up and yield if I am to know you. You are what I gain through this disorientation and loss. This is how the human comes into being, again and again, as that which we have yet to know.
NOTES

1. EXPLANATION AND EXONERATION, OR WHAT WE CAN HEAR


2. VIOLENCE, MOURNING, POLITICS

4. Ibid.
8. The memorials read as follows: “In loving memory of Kamla Abu Sa’id, 42, and her daughter, Amma Abu-Sa’id, 13, both Palestinians from the El Bureij refugee camps. Kamla and her daughter were killed May 26, 2002 by Israeli troops, while working on a farm in the Gaza Strip. In loving memory of Ahmed Abu Seer, 7, a Palestinian child, he was killed in his home with bullets. Ahmed died of fatal shrapnel wounds to his heart and lung. Ahmed was a second-grader at Al-Sidaak elementary school in Nablus, he will be missed by all who knew him. In loving memory of Fatime Ibrahim Zakarna, 30, and her two children, Bassem, 4, and Sulhaim, 3 all Palestinian. Mother and children were killed May 6, 2002 by Israeli soldiers while picking grape leaves in a field in the Kabatiya village. They leave behind Mohammed Yussef Zukarna, husband and father, and Yasmine, daughter and age 6.” These memorials were submitted by the San Francisco chapter of Arab-American Christians for Peace. The Chronicle refused to run the memorials, even though these deaths were covered by, and verified by, the Israeli Press (private email).


3 INDEFINITE DETENTION

1. “Detention, Treatment, and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War Against Terrorism,” Department of Defense, December 12, 2001. This statement clarifies the statement made on November