The Structuring Enemy and Archival War

ALLEN FELDMAN

The Lost Enemy

IN THE WAKE OF THE COLLAPSE OF THE COLD WAR BIPOLAR WORLD order, Jacques Derrida wrote:

> Losing the enemy would simply be the loss of the political itself. . . . The invention of the enemy is where the urgency and the anguish are: this invention is what would have to be brought off, in sum to repoliticize, to put an end to depoliticization. Where the principal enemy, the "structuring" enemy, seems nowhere to be found, where it ceases it to be identifiable and thus reliable—that is, where the same *phobia* projects a mobile multiplicity of potential interchangeable metonymic enemies, in secret alliance with one another: conjuration. (*Politics* 84)

Derrida refers to the friend/enemy schema that Carl Schmitt theorized as the origin of the political (Schmitt 25–26, 28, and 51). The loss of the structuring enemy would not be a political crime but a crime against the political, insofar as the disappearing enemy defaces the threshold between the political and the nonpolitical, war and murder. As that which threatens *kenosis*, the emptying of value equivalence and relational identity, the recession of a structuring enemy would not be the absence of war or structuration.

> . . . losing the enemy would not necessarily be progress, reconciliation or the opening of an era of peace and human fraternity. It would be worse: an unheard-of violence. The evil of a malice knowing neither measure nor ground, an unleashing incommensurable in its unprecedented—therefore monstrous forms. . . . The figure of the enemy would then be helpful—precisely as a figure—because of the features that will allow it to be *identified* as such, still identical

ALLEN FELDMAN, a cultural anthropologist teaching visual culture at New York University, is the author of *Formations of Violence: The Narrative of the Body and Political Terror in Northern Ireland* (U of Chicago P, 1991), numerous essays on political violence as visual and performance culture, and the forthcoming book *Archives of the Insensible: War, Terror, and Violence as Dead Memory* (Duke UP, 2010).

© 2009 BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> to what has always been determined under this name. (Derrida, *Politics* 83)

The principal enemy is replaced by *figures* of the enemy, metaphors, doubles, typifications, traces, apparitions, place holders, envoys and specters that operate as mnemotechniques for political identity threatened by the loss of the enemy as a political archive and exteriorized support. What is now being determined under the name *enemy*? Recall the post-cold-war rush to produce authenticating political emblematica: the empires of evil; the war of civilizations (in which one is an anticivilization); the burnt, ruined Twin Towers; the solarized cosmogenesis of Shock and Awe; the manifold faces and voices of Osama bin Laden; the leashed dog people of Abu Ghraib; the specter of masked, hooded terrorist–prisoners of war at black sites; the abysmal scenography of the homeless and paperless asylum seekers, boat people, and cargo-container corpses; the immune-compromised and virally toxic; a landscape of disassociation and incongruity; a frontier of bad names, bodies, and forms of life; an inventory of the dehistoricized and the desubjectified.

Derrida's disappearing enemy evokes the theorem that the name of the name is not the name, and we are today embroiled in wars of naming and unnaming, including what can be named or not named as war and violence. The departure of a reliable enemy seriously threatens war as a system of political-discursive commensuration and capitalization that a calculable and prognosticated enemy secures and anchors. The loss of the reliable enemy is the unleashing of the incommensurable, of an alterity without measure or end and requiring an isomorphic means without end, a means that we have come to know as asymmetric warfare, as the unending war of global terror. This war has also become one of political effects and consequences deemed unworthy of measurement, such as the collateral, dis-counted Iraqi wounded and dead and the unlimited detention of perpetual terrorists at black sites.

What unfolds between a war without measure and a war that refuses measurement? The subjects of extraordinary rendition and torture cannot be indicted, accused, or tried, as such steps would *not only render them calculable*, measuring their offenses and nonoffenses, but also render their very detention and torture measurable and recallable by ethics and law and thus calculate the limits and thresholds of the nonlaw that warehouses these figures. The American debate on the legality or illegality of torture occurs in the aftermath of torture's routinization on concrete bodies in anomic spaces. The rogue body of the political other becomes the surface of procedural discontinuity that traverses the negotiability and nonnegotiability of torture. At issue here is not the measure of torture's lawfulness or criminality but rather the institutionalizing of its legal indeterminacy. The terminus of such deniable detention and torture is to render the detainees virtually guilty, sentenced, and judged, to project them as legal specters and as screen memories for a founding terror. Like the captives held in their bowels, these very cached tombs of disappearance, rendition, and law's suspension function as self-canceling depositories in which memory and forgetting are intermingled—where archivization takes shape as both a crypt and as encrypted power.

Hypomnematic War

The divorce of destination from derivation, of war's teleology from its originating enemy, the expanding chasm between the war on terror as a project of 9/11 anamnesis and the recessional enemy that subverts secured memory enmeshes the war machine in the aporias of archivization. Rather than focus on how critical memory can be recovered from the destruction, attrition, and erasures of war, a project to which many cultural memory and

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

human rights theorists aspire, I contend that war in its violence, destruction, and technicity can be remapped as *hypomnemata*, the supplemental, artificed devices that support, repeat, and preserve memory in prosthetic media.[1] Anamnesis is written into the functionality and political utility of targeting and imaging systems of damage, securitization, occupation, and territorialization as spatiotemporal exteriorizations of memory. Nuclear weapon reserves and other such technological potentialities are stockpiles of sovereignty and thus archives of historical trajectory and political normativity. Hegel could thus hail the march of Bonaparte's armies across Europe as materializing the idea of progress, an idea echoed by the technomilitary doctrine of compulsory democracy known as regime change.[2] Such technohistorical ambitions are currently evidenced in the prosthesis of drone weaponry and particularly by the initial attempts to program ethical discriminations into robotic weapons. Ethical programming and utility ratchet up the cultural power of detachable automated killing. As programmed moral memory, weaponized ethical discriminations transform robotic projectiles into autonomic archives of a sovereign will to decision, judgment, and moral calculation.[3]

Derrida writes, "There is no archive without a place of consignation, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside" (*Archive Fever* 11). The formative division of inside and outside is a founding condition of both war and the archive. Can we conceive the destructive but enabling technics of war as commemorating, archiving, and conserving the structuring and promised enemy as a memory form? If war, particularly a war against global terror, is an exercise in securitization that is consigned to military technics and their projection, enactment, and damage, to what degree does this reassuring technicity embody, or is collateralized and underwritten by, stockpiled connotations that store, reenact, and shape what can be targeted under the name and memory of the structuring enemy?

The friend/enemy relation is itself an archiving power. This power emerges as the self-archiving and conserving of sovereignty through its transcription onto and enclosure within the semiotic membrane of the hypostatic enemy. Derrida would call this conveyance of sovereignty consignation; to consign is to assign residence, to insert in a domicile. In the Schmittian friend/enemy constellation the identity and normativity of the sovereign subject to all effects and purposes is consigned to the enemy under a house arrest and as a representative, memorandum, support, metaphor, and transport of that sovereignty. The structuring and archived enemy is a political screen (as in showing and concealing); it is covered by and a cover for sovereignty. The war archive is a hauntological scene of spectral possession, where the sovereign subject and the enemy inhabit, house, and parasite each other and where each becomes the host, hostage, and shelter of the other.[4]

In speaking of the incommensurability unleashed by the (de)structuring enemy, Derrida tacitly disputes any sequence of before and after between the calculable and incalculable enemy. He presents a dialectical law of the enemy (one without any reconciliation); the present enemy and the promised enemy contaminate and interpenetrate each other; the structuring enemy is an amalgam of mimetic surrogates promised, manifest, and receding, within and without, forthcoming and withheld.[5] Derrida's reference to a mobile multiplicity of enemies also infers a mobile multiplicity of sovereignties that posit and pursue the multiple enemy—state power as law preserving, law transgressing; overt, covert; automated and outsourced. Mimetic proliferation, which renders both the sovereign and its structuring enemy reciprocally unstable, accompanies the extraction of the archival supplement from the living derivation; it is coterminous with the original divi-

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sion between inside and outside as a relation of fidelity/infidelity.

The faithful repetition of sovereign authorial beginnings are prescriptions of what must be remembered, yet they can usurp inaugurating archival enunciation, script, and event. The originating enemy becomes recessional and absent in being displaced and dispersed by the archival duplication of its memory:

> The space of writing, space *as* writing, is opened up in the violent movement of this surrogation, in the difference of mnēmē and hypomnēsis. The outside is already *within* the work of memory. The evil slips in within the relation of memory to itself, in the general organization of mnesic activity. . . . Memory always therefore already needs signs in order to recall the nonpresent with which it is necessarily in relation. . . . Memory thus is contaminated by the first substitute: *hypomnēsis*. . . . Why is the surrogate or supplement dangerous? It is not, so to speak, dangerous in itself, in the aspect of it that can present itself as a thing, as a being-present. In that case it would be reassuring. But here, the supplement is *not*, is not a being (*on*). It is nevertheless not a simple nonbeing (*mē on*) either. Its slidings slip it out of the simple alternative presence/absence. *That* is the danger. And that is what always enables the type always to pass for the original. As soon as supplementary outside is opened, its structure implies that the supplement itself can be "typed," replaced by its double, and that a supplement to the supplement, a surrogate for the surrogate is possible and necessary. (Derrida, *Dissemination* 109)

The unreliability and incalculability of the enemy as enemy refracts a structural insecurity of sovereign memory. This insecurity speaks to the slippage of those exteriorizations, supplements, prosthetics, substrates, and supports that supposedly stabilize political memory and sovereignty in (en)durable media. Archival apparatuses of absolute protective enclosure, such as "ground zero" and "9/11," freeze history against the slippage and forgetful loss of normative time. However, the recession of the unreliable enemy both threatens and animates the archival project of arrest, repetition, duplication, and return, precipitating new and remediating modes of consignation, new campaigns against terror. For archivization also commences from memory's structural breakdown and loss, from the originating precipice of referential disappearance—the violence the enemy promises to inflict on sovereignty and its memory and the threat that Derrida discerns as always afflicting the friend/enemy relation.

Reaccrediting the War Archive

Archivization is a sovereign action that duplicates and simulates yet displaces sovereignty as a discrete authorial and inaugurating locus in its very conserving repetition. Archival crisis is situated at the disjuncture intrinsic to the productive power of duplication—sovereignty's delegation and self-differentiation of itself in various memory forms, from black sites to automated targeting mechanisms to military outsourcing. The potential for the drift, depletion, and dislocation of memory and identity is engendered by technics of duplication and delegation. Mnemotechnics are inherently politicized, for as derivatives they can provoke contestations of fidelity and infidelity over what is being stored and how. Archival infidelity and unreliability is negatively sanctioned as improper duplication, subversive mimesis, mimetic parody, forgetfulness, and deviant remembering. It is at this conjuncture of fidelity/infidelity where the structuring yet lost enemy can be situated.

Discontinuity between the structure and objects of archiving also affects how sovereignty as the power that archives is remembered, lived, and understood: "The archive has always been a pledge, and like every pledge [*gage*] is a token of the future. To put it more trivially: what is no longer archived in the same way is no longer lived in the same

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

way. Archivable meaning is also and in advance codetermined by the structure it archives" (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 18).

As the war in Iraq, the bad war, descended into a politics of bribery (the Sunni Awakening Movement) Barack Obama pledged to secure our future purchase on the disappearing enemy with war on the Afghani and Pakistani frontier and thus to stabilize our own precarious political identity—now even in greater need of securitization in response to the crisis of equally virtualized terror-objects of toxic subprime credit. Because of political devaluation in Iraq, these recalculated West Asian wars were posed as derivatives recalled to an accrediting origination banked and entombed at the ground-zero archive. However, presidential campaign innuendo rescripted the grammatology of the war on terror, transferring the war's axioms from the thresholds of Middle Eastern green zones to the inner courts of national electoral conversation. Despite the pledge of fidelity Obama made to the ground-zero archive, his critics turned him into an archive of the disappearing-promised enemy, making him the Obama of the bad names; the Islamic mole posing as a Christian; the sleeper harboring the excess of racial mixing and transcultural promiscuity; Obama, exemplar of African American natal alienation; Obama, the transient and transitive subject indexical of covert migrancy (his contested birth certificate, his madrassa schooling, and his illegally resident aunt); Obama, guilty by association with a reformed minister of terrorism and an unreformable terrorizing minister; and Obama, the African American whose epidermal and alien natality precipitated calls for his branding with American flag pins—updated surrogates of the branding irons that once disciplined and domesticated the enslaved in America. These ceremonies of fidelity to the 9/11 archive expressed more than the panic of Obama's Republican and Democratic adversaries and the avarice of predatory media; they were a broader sociological reflex capable of as much flexible targeting as the war on terror itself. The global war on terror, first mobilized to defend the memory of democracy assaulted, was redeployed to immunize that democracy from assaulting itself, from falling into the archive's exteriority—the forgetfulness termed "Obamanation." Long-standing tropes and typologies of the war on terror retroactively toxified the political landscape, seeking new forms of accreditation by mortgaging Obama's race and (non)origins, transforming Obama into a parasite of American electoral democracy and thereby reigniting campaigns of national autoimmunization.[6] Obama became for many the structuring enemy who never quite arrives, who resists location, and whose promised threat fills a political lack.

The 9/11 grammatology of fear overprinted on Obama, turning him into the living organ of encrypted dead memory, of an archive bequeathed by the World Trade Center dead, for whom he became an instrument of conveyance and conservation. Racialized natal alienation in this context can be defined as Obama's consignation to a past that refuses its valence to its place holder, Obama as its nominated repository. This consignation is nothing new in our public culture, where racial archives historically exhibit anamorphic mobility; the African American body from slavery onward has repeatedly served as the archive and domicile for the transmutable fantasy, fears, violence, and occluded memory of the democratic majority without color. That this archival violence did not prevail in the election does nothing to mitigate its presence, currency, circulation, and malleability in American political culture, for it discloses that the unwinnable exteriorized war on terror can be recalled, ameliorated, supplemented, and commemorated by an interiorized war of surplus securitization. In this culture of bad names and returning revenants, it is no surprise that Obama in turn inoculated his candidacy with the Afghani-Pakistani war as the good, winnable, and

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

calculable war, thereby bending the arc of American exceptionality to the West Asian frontier, a passage that will betray his promise of military closure and homecoming.

Preemptive Archives and Seizures

The structuring enemy is envisioned through interminable alterity, delay, and tactical anticipation engendering particular forms of temporalizing violence. The promised enemy has a particular mode of appearing in time, that of traumatic earliness or the future anterior, a mode of anticipatory archivization that deploys vicarious violence to manifest a memory that

> will produce *après coup* what it was destined in advance to produce, namely, proper interpretive models to read in return, to give sense, necessity and above all legitimacy to the violence that has produced, among others, the interpretative model in question, that is the discourse of its self-legitimation. (Derrida, "Force" 993)

Proleptic violence is in search of not only a reliable enemy but a calculable law of the enemy that would enforce or simulate reliability. This forensic operation can both suspend law (as archive) and constitute new law and memory. Proleptic violence proposes the interpretive conditions for its own irruptive and remediating opening of a space of decoding, legibility, and archiving—particularly when it does not arrive at a terminal enemy or preemptively arrives before the enemy. Proleptic violence, such as first-strike aggression or detention and torture without charge or evidentiary corroboration, unfolds as a sovereign act before all communicability, legibility, and code; it founds the possibility of what Derrida calls a reined-in order of reading within which such law constituting violence can reign. The violence, which before law gives law to itself, also preemptively gives an enemy and its metonyms to itself:

> [T]his violence is certainly legible, indeed intelligible since it is not alien to law, no more than *polemos* or *eris* is alien to all the forms and significations of *dikè*. But it is in *droit* what suspends *droit*. It interrupts the established *droit* to found another. This moment of suspense, this *épokhè*, this founding or revolutionary moment of law is, in law, an instance of non-law. But it is also the whole history of law. *This moment always takes place and never takes place in a presence*. It is the moment in which the foundation of law remains suspended in the void or over the abyss, suspended by a pure performative act that would not have to answer to or before anyone. The supposed subject of this pure performative would no longer be before the law or rather he would be before a law not yet determined, before the law as before a law not yet existing, a law yet to come, *encore devevant et devant venir*. ("Force" 991, 993)

To see war as archiving that which is not there or manifest is to detach archivization from a purely retrospective foreclosure and to explore how the war archive militarizes futurity and temporality. Preemption means "prior seizure of," the interrupting expropriation of the mode of arrival of that which is seized, of that which is yet to come. Preemptive violence intervenes as a power of priority over the arrival and even nonarrival of the object of interdiction. Preemption derives from the Latin *praeemptio* 'previous purchase,' from *praeemere*, which means to buy before or to claim an early share of something that was meant to be held in common, such as the law or life. Preemption interrupts circulation and exchange through an appropriation before its time and exerts a suspending a priori over law, event, and time. The violence of preemption seizes the law and the enemy as its destined interpretive orders and in so doing seizes the archive within which the violence of preemption ultimately attains legibility and legitimacy. Preemption prefigures law just as it interdicts by prefiguring, previsioning, and premediating the enemy and its violence.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Preemptive violence also precipitously seizes exemption or immunity for itself as the exception to law that law will excuse and indemnify. Preemptive violence enacts and archives a nonactuality that usurps its imputed referent; it is the mimetic tracing of the enemy that becomes the origin of that origin through which the promised enemy attains a position but no determinate actuality. Preemption not only anticipates a virtualized law to come but also installs violence as *a law of virtualization*.

The Quick and the Dead

Derrida posits the politics of hypomnēsis as the technics of crafting dead memory that supplements and replaces mnēsis, living memory, with encrypted containers of monumentalization, and commemoration, and with citational inventories and rituals such as the chronic invocation of 9/11, WMDs, color-coded terror alerts, and bioterror first-responder dress rehearsals. In Derrida's reading of the *Phaedo*, hypomnēsis as inscribed prosthesis and supplement is provisionally polarized to living logos and memory understood as sovereign and authorial speech, primary recall, nomothetic discourse, and inceptive event. Living logos as event is the imposed sovereignty of reason, law, or spoken command that dominates and shapes *phusis* as nature, life, birth, and naked voice. "Logos is *zoon*. An animal that is born, grows, belongs to the *phusis*" (*Dissemination* 79). What Derrida terms the "cadaverous rigidity" of mnemotechnical inscription consigns living logos to the inorganic, which petrifies and secures precarious speech, event, and life (79). Platonic logos, in having a life, has a beginning and end, whereas mnemotechnology, such as ground zero, is ideally without end, as it enables preserved speech, event, and memory to circulate interminably, as long as the *hypokeimenon*—the *subjectum* or substrate that supports, carries, and stabilizes identity, speech, and event—is itself relayed and sustained across a network of transductive memory supports such as interminable campaigns against terror:

> Knowing that he can always leave his thoughts outside or check them with an external agency, with the physical, spatial, superficial marks that one lays flat on a tablet, he who has the *tekhnē* of writing at his disposal will come to rely on it. . . . They will represent him even if he forgets them; they will transmit his word even if he is not there to animate them. Even if he is dead. . . . The *pharmakon* and writing are thus always involved in questions of life and death. . . . The written traces no longer belong to the order of *phusis*, since they are not alive. . . . They do violence to the natural, autonomous organization of the *mnēmē*. . . . (104)

Archival war commits to the acceleration of mnemic duplication (from telematic imaging and target acquisition to rhetoricized body counts), which paradoxically threatens the loss of archival retention and political accountability. War's projectile anamnesis is unable to detain and recall the ballistic velocities of weaponized time materialized in targeting ordinance, which can drift and deviate from the inaugural event and enemy object, thereby producing mistargeted victims as collateral damage and technologized mimetic speed as collateral violence. Yet it is only through mimetic acceleration that the war archive can remain commensurate with the peripatetic enemy as a defining outside, to double it by passing it inward to simulate synchronicity with the nonarchive to which it is bound and promised. However, archival exteriority restructures the archive; in its mimetic displacement by and in the archive, it resists stabilization in bypassing and overtaking the archive's doubling of exterior alterity. The archive is condemned to a war of catch-up with its outside, a war of immobilization and containment that is only won virtually on the inside. Consequently the war archive overreaches for an immunizing enclosure beyond time and acceleration and yet requires dislo-

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cating mimetic velocity in order to enclose and encompass the differential. This aporia becomes a death drive in the enucleation of difference (the outside, the disappearing enemy, the frontier, the invisible, and the illegible). This mortifying memory is distributed across deathlike conservation and what it omits and loses. The binding of life and living memory to the inorganic, which is crucial to political violence and archivization, can lead to the death of memory through the quickening medium of dead memory—of memory conserved in a corpus of petrifaction, which in war will invariably be manifested as the corpse, *the* locus of decay, ruin, and impermanence.

The capacity to impose political form via the imprinting, repetition, and enclosure of the living (speech, memory, and natal event) in the inorganic unites the archive and war as death drives. The archival death drive can be understood as a biopolitical infiltration of the bared natal *zōē* of speech, memory, and event by exterior and inorganic mnemotechniques. Event, speech, and memory are bared in being rendered exposable to technical penetration and envelopment by archival registration. The echographic violence of the archiving impress is a preserving internment of living substance in commemorative dead substance. This fall of life into the inorganic and preserving supplement caused Plato to designate mnemotechnology as a pharmakon, remedy and poison, as a politically toxic intervention producing and not reducing forgetfulness. The archive preserves only by effacing mnēmē in hypomnēsis as a political form of nonlife, as a thanatopolitics. Giorgio Agamben and Michel Foucault treat the thanatopolitical as the lack of qualified life and law, but the thanatopolitics of the archive is an encrypting technology that qualifies life in rememoration and legislates the "productive organization of death" through rigidifying techniques of consignment and conservation (Derrida, *Dissemination* 92).

In war the act of striking as a flattening inscriptive impress and graphic force is a double marking of the receiving support, for it simultaneously creates both the archived and an archive in a single blow. This installation becomes apparent when we detach transcribed surfaces of writing, commemorating, and archiving from technocratic and communicative neutrality and recognize that the enveloped surface of violent inscription can encompass political geography and the body in which the act of striking, or impress, can entail graphic projectiles and missives, from smart bombs and armed drone planes to the electric current coursing across the body of the interrogated and tortured.

The structuring enemy restructures by recession spacing and by absence. This expanding interval between the archiving sovereign subject and a terminal other that refuses absolute interiorization implicates war as teleopoiesis, as a projectile technology of dispatch, delivery, sending, transmission, and envelopment; this is a prostheticized contact with the recessional enemy as an archival lack to be bridged.[7] The graphic creation of the archival *subjectum*, the support, from out of an exposed body creates a hybrid of life and death. These inscribed and receiving surfaces, alcoves, and orifices become political topographies reconstructed as repositories of inorganic sovereign memory. In war the territorializing dispatch, reach, missile, and missive of archiving violence itself becomes an orchestrated spectacle exposed, dramatized, and enframed in the receiving surface malformed into a political proscenium. This tableau conveys a double envelopment of life and death constituted by the mnemic codes that are deposited in political flesh, and the act of aggressive impress that converts the receiving support into a murderous memory and disfigured topos. In this context the archive of infamous Abu Ghraib photos is a compendium of misdirection that evades that even more formidable archive shaped at Abu Ghraib and other black sites from out of the bodies and senses of the tortured. As

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a writing in light these photos are an archive of an archive written with damaged flesh and built with embodied pain, position abuse, and sensory deprivation. The heaped naked bodies with orifices opened to supplementary political imprinting and rememoration by the camera were already hieroglyphs of regime change and compulsory democracy as dead memory.

Nonarrival and Misaddress of the Enemy: Collateral Damage

In a war without end in search of interchangeable enemies without measure, violence is mystified as collateral and mediate rather than principal and terminal. An antidemography of the discounted and misappropriated has emerged as collateral damage in Iraq, Guantánamo, Afghanistan, and now Pakistan. The doctrine of collateral damage is a calculated discounting of the wounded, the tortured, and the dead; it is a systematic (de)archivization, deactualization, and virtualization of violence and its consequences. Such unwritten inventories function as mnemotechniques, not of inadvertent collateral victims but of that which they were not—the terminal enemy. What is deemed collateral damage is the trace of the enemy that is erased as that trace. The victims and ruins of collateral damage constitute the nonarrival of the enemy; they materialize a missive that has missed its mark, an illegibility gone astray, scratched out, and misaddressed. The victim of collateral damage is the envoy of the enemy in withdrawal, a postal artifact of war, a dead letter that has been dispatched and canceled in place of the terminal enemy to whom it refers. Collateral damage as the nonarrival of the enemy is atopic, without place, and anachronic, a nontime within wartime. The untimely dead of collateral damage are the dispatched who cannot be claimed and who have to be dissapropriated and re-sent as accident and apology. In being discarded as discounted and unmeasured, collateral damage invariably persists as a remainder beyond and yet a consequence of the archive. Anachronic and atopic nonarrival cannot be readily historicized or domiciled in the war archive without contesting its preemptive reach. Thus the accretions, ruins, and remainders of admitted and deniable collateral damage become the unwritten archive of the unarchivable and the uninheritable. It is from this anti-archive that unwrites itself that the only critical ethics of the war archive and the only just liquefaction of its petrifying memory can be derived, but that event is yet another unarchivable story at the present time.

A thin and permeable membrane fails to separate proper from improper enemies and victims, the archivable from the nonarchivable, and proper destination or consignment from nonarrival. The victim of collateral damage represents an aporia of the time and space of war, an impasse that must be quickly bypassed and forgotten for it interrupts the mnemic reproduction of the enemy and thus war's claims to technomimetic efficacy and proper dispatch. However, the scandalous incalculability of the promised structuring enemy is also stored in the ruins, substances, residue, and remainder consigned to collateral damage. This damage is depoliticized and dehistoricized as collateral, as untimely and dislocated, only in terms of what is politically determined under the name of an appropriate destination: a terminal enemy and a propriety of war. Collateral damage is no inadvertency but at the ideological core of the war on terror, for it preempts any singular target as a terminus and conserves both the enemy and the end of war as a reserve yet to come. The death and wounds of collateral damage condense the anomaly of an enemy promised and an enemy vanished in the same form and medium. The disfiguration of collateral damage is a congealment of deadened memory; as a killing amnesia it is the material substrate that divides the war into event and nonevent, the archive and its other. Collateral damage is the calculation that permits archival war to

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press

return time after time to the memory and the forgetting of what counts and does not count as the enemy beyond count.

Notes

1. For Heidegger, modernity is a culture of technicity defined by the historical fetishization of rationality as a mode of control typified by scientism, specialization, and the hyperobjectification of beings.

2. As discussed by Darby 221.

3. See Asaro for a depoliticizing treatment of this issue that takes the vulgar definition of ethics for granted and assumes that ethical programming will transform roboticization but that this programming as *hypomnemata* will not alter ethics as decision, response, witnessing, and accountability: "For the most part, the nature of robotic technology itself is not at issue, but rather the morality behind human actions and intentions exercised through the technology" (11).

4. Hauntology is Derrida's subversive rereading of the ontological as the insistence and return of presence/absence. Derived from *hantise*, *hauntology* refers to the return of ghosts, specters, and revenants as the nonarrival of presence and ontological stability that is compensated by repetitive and compulsive acts such as archivization (*Spectres* 51, 118).

5. In this war dialectic, this amalgamation can also include the moment when a former enemy is recataloged and recalculated as friend, such as the new Awakening Movement of Sunni paramilitaries in Iraq or, conversely, when friends become enemies, such as the neo-Taliban composed of a significant number of former Taliban adversaries and former de facto American allies.

6. Roberto Esposito writes of political autoimmunization, "[We] have already seen how the most incisive meaning of immunitas is inscribed with its contrary that indicates that the concept of immunization presupposes that which it negates. Not only does it appear to be derived logically, but it also appears to be *internally inhabited* by its opposite. . . . What is immunized in brief is the same community . . . through a negation of its original horizon . . . *the fold that separates community from itself, sheltering it from an unbearable excess*" (51–52; emphasis mine).

7. Teleopoetic violence is not in any way a hospitable contact, for it confirms, as Derrida has asserted elsewhere, that to be a subject of the signifier such as "the enemy" is also to be a subjecting and subjugating subject of the signifier ("And Say" 132).

Works Cited

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. D. Heller-Roazen. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. Print.

Asaro, Peter. "What Should We Want from a Robot Ethics?" *International Review of Information Ethics* 6.12 (2006): 9–16. Print.

Darby, Tom. *The Feast: Meditations on Politics and Time*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1982. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. "And Say the Animal Responded?" *Zoontologies: The Question of the Animal*. Ed. Cary Wolfe. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2003. 121–46. Print.

———. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998. Print.

———. *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981. Print.

———. "Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority." *Cardozo Law Review* 11 (1989–90): 920–1046. Print.

———. *The Politics of Friendship*. Trans. George Collins. New York: Verso, 1997. Print.

———. *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. Trans. Peggy Knauft. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Esposito, Roberto. *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Trans. Timothy Campbell. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2008. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "The Right of Death and Power over Life." *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984. 258–72. Print.

Heidegger, Martin. "The Question concerning Technology." *"The Question concerning Technology" and Other Essays*. 1954. Trans. William Lovitt. New York: Harper, 1977. 3–35. Print.

Schmitt, Carl. *The Concept of the Political*. Trans. George Schwab. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996. Print.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.5.1704 Published online by Cambridge University Press