

GUANTANAMO

by Frank Smith

translated by Vanessa Place

No ideas but in things.

-William Carlos Williams

*Nous allons vous poser quelques questions
afin de mieux comprendre votre histoire.*

INTRODUCTION

“That we are constantly asked to cooperate, to say what we know, and that this keeps us here, in prison.” In clear violation, a lawyer might say, of the principle of habeas corpus, which rules out indefinite detention without charge.¹ There is, however, also an absurdity. The reason for being kept in prison, indefinitely, is for one to speak. *Guantanamo* is a synecdoche for this absurdity; as Frank Smith writes in his author’s note to the original French publication, “The members of the tribunals and the detainees speak — there’s the point of departure.”² The tribunals in question are sessions of the CSRT, or Combatant Status Review Tribunals, instituted in 2004 after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that prisoners held at Guantánamo Bay were to be “allowed some form of tribunal.”³ In 2006 some transcripts of these hearings were released, by order of a judge, to the Associated Press.

Smith appropriates from these transcripts — although, if one compares his text with them, one notices important adaptations.⁴ It is as if he is experimenting, in order to discover the right form. We find, for instance, a series within the twenty-nine-section book in which “The man” is a protagonist in a story in which, under the belief that he is traveling from Uzbekistan back to his homeland of Tajikistan, he is taken to Afghanistan, where he is handed over to American forces. Deception is a feature of this tale, as professed helper turns into betrayer. Books by former Guantánamo detainees include similar stories.⁵ Other details of what appears to be the same story emerge from sections in which interrogator and prisoner exchange

words. A desire for a narrative free of the coercion of the interrogation, or at least shorn of the outward signs of interrogation, is thus acknowledged. One of Smith's epigraphs, taken from the interrogation in Section II, suggests this desire could bring about questionable elision: "We are going to ask you some questions so we can better understand your story."

But the first of Smith's epigraphs is "No ideas but in things," from William Carlos Williams, which may be taken as a signal that the book before us aligns itself with objective poetry — in which the subjective expressivity understood to typify poetry is eschewed by means of techniques including appropriation. For when we note that alignment, we begin to realize that the signs of interrogation, of which some sections of *Guantanamo* are indeed shorn, constitute a guiding, even governing, concept for the book. Kenneth Goldsmith tells us that, with the conceptualist work, to read is not to so much to read, but to "get the concept."⁶ And, for a great deal of *Guantanamo*, the concept grasped is precisely that, in an interrogation, specifically a CSRT interrogation, it is never a question of narrative pure and simple — as if it could ever be — but a set of narrative elements necessary to establish "combatant status."

We could usefully compare Smith's book to one by its translator — Vanessa Place's *Statement of Facts*, which, containing devastating narratives of sex crimes, also schools the reader on the programming of every, or just about every, moment in those narratives, by the court's demand for evidence establishing the elements of the crime: *mens rea* and *actus reus*. In other words, law — or, more precisely, legal writing, since Place appropriates her own appellate briefs — moves according to its own concept, which is what *Statement of Facts*⁷ doubles. Similarly, Smith's presentation shows this demand at work: accusation and rebuttal proliferate, leading on occasion to *reductio ad absurdum*: "It is said that at the time he was captured, the interrogated had a Casio watch, model F-91W, used by Al-Qaeda to make explosives. / The interrogated says that this evidence is surprising. That millions of people around the world wear this kind of Casio watch. That if it is a crime to own one, why not condemn the stores that sell them and the people who buy them? That a watch, that's not a logical or likely piece of evidence." It also

underlines the demand by including some seemingly irrelevant (forensically speaking) thing, which, in terms of the chain of interrogative reasoning, stands out as a non sequitur: “Answer: Sir, I already told you, the ground in Afghanistan is really very bad, nothing really grows. Vegetables don’t really grow there.”

Perhaps Smith’s most decisive adaptation of the appropriated material is his use, in several sections, of the French pronoun *on* — which, depending on the context, can be translated — and this list is far from exhaustive — as *they*, *we*, or, impersonally, as *one*. This decision functions as what conceptual artists and writers call a constraint — a deliberately chosen rule of exclusion and/or inclusion governing the production of an artwork. Lars von Trier’s film, *The Five Obstructions* (2003), is an entertaining dramatization of what happens when one artist accepts constraints introduced by another. The constraint may produce nothing particularly interesting — there is no thought-provoking concept to be grasped — although, should things turn out favorably, it produces an unforeseen *problem* for thought, a goad to questioning. At first glance — or at first grasp — one thinks that, perhaps, the *on* in *Guantanamo* is there to denote hearsay — evidence that, because neither party to the interrogation attests to it, cannot be admissible. This would or ought to, as did the CSRT’s use of secret evidence in actuality, destabilize the conditions of possibility for properly determining the “combatant” status of the one being interrogated.

What should be fully apparent straight away, but may not be, is that translation is playing a fundamental role. Smith’s translation of the “original” documents, because of his adaptations of them, places the very idea of an original in question. Then there is the fact that the interrogations themselves have been mediated by interpreters. This is alluded to only once, and the translation is material: “Translator: Excuse me, could I clarify this? Because yesterday, someone said ‘military,’ but meant to say ‘police’ . . . [*The translator determines that this was police training, not military.*]” But where the reader is most struck by the act/fact of translation is with Vanessa Place’s rendering of *Guantanamo* into English. No “original” therefore no restoring of a source text (or even an obligation to consult it), so the challenge becomes: How

to translate those sections in which *on* generates maximum instability and ambiguity? Place does not attempt to stabilize or to disambiguate. Instead she introduces a series of conceptualist constraints to govern her rendering of the *on*. In early sections, subjectless verbs have a striking effect: “States [*On dit*] has ‘kin’ who is a member of a terrorist group responsible for attacks in Uzbekistan. / Answers [*On répond*] no one in the family has any connection with any terrorist group in Uzbekistan to speak of. / States [*On dit*] lived in housing provided by the Taliban and worked as a cook in one of their camps.” Who states, and who answers? That can only be ascertained if one assumes that a change of introductory verb also indicates a change of speaker.

The chances of disambiguating the identity of the speaker grow slimmer in later sections of the book, in which *on* is translated as *we* and *they* in ways that begin to strain the attribution of speaker that the reader has made on the basis of an alternation of verbs. Section XII: “We state that they reportedly said [*On dit qu'on aurait déclaré*] that we served as governor of the Narang district while the Taliban was in power. / They respond [*On répond qu'on*] that they did not work for the Taliban government, but for the Karzai government [. . .] // They state that we reportedly said that [*On dit qu'on aurait déclaré que*], during a raid on May 2, 2003, we [*on*] were apprehended in possession of Taliban property [. . .]” Although the principal speakers may still be distinguished according to the verbs, and now also by the alternation of *we* and *they*, the source of the evidence confronting the prisoner is rendered ambiguous as the subject of “reportedly said” is translated as *they*, and then as *we*. A more thoroughgoing destabilization occurs in Section XV: “They ask [*On demande*] if we [*on*] were born in Afghanistan. / They answer [*On répond*] yes. / They ask [*On demande*] if we [*on*] have lived in Afghanistan our entire life. / They answer [*On répond*] we [*on*] have lived in Afghanistan our entire life.” The subject of the alternating introductory verbs is now designated by the same pronoun, eliminating the effect of the shifter *we*, which had been orienting the *they*, and the reader begins to question whether the verbs alone can any longer serve to distinguish speakers, and thus sources of statement/question and answer.

Let these be preliminary observations as to how the constraints adopted by Frank Smith — and by Vanessa Place in her translation — generate unforeseen “concepts.” Readers will enjoy elaborating on them. I offer my elaboration, by introducing, locally, a variation on a constraint, so that the passage that I quoted at the beginning now reads: “That we are constantly asked to cooperate, to say what they know, and that this keeps us here, in prison.”

Mark Sanders
New York City
November 2013

1. For an eloquent statement of this position, see Clive Stafford Smith, *Eight O’Clock Ferry to the Windward Side: Seeking Justice in Guantánamo Bay* (New York: Nation Books, 2007).
2. Frank Smith, *Guantanamo* (Paris: Seuil, 2010), p. 125.
3. Clive Stafford Smith, *Eight O’ Clock Ferry*, p. 152.
4. The transcripts, known collectively as Reprocessed Combatant Status Review Tribunal and Administrative Review Board Documents, are publicly available on line at the following US Department of Defense website: http://www.dod.mil/pubs/foi/operation_and_plans/Detainee/csrt_arb/.
5. See, for instance, Moazzam Begg, with Victoria Brittain, *Enemy Combatant: My Imprisonment at Guantánamo, Bagram, and Kandahar* (New York: New Press, 2006), and Murat Kurnaz, *Five Years of My Life: An Innocent Man in Guantanamo*, translated by Jefferson Chase (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008).
6. Kenneth Goldsmith, *Uncreative Writing: Managing Language in the Digital Age* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), p. 100.
7. Vanessa Place, *Statement of Facts* (Los Angeles: Blanc Press, 2010).

GUANTANAMO

I

On demande si on s'est rendu du Kazakhstan à Kaboul, en Afghanistan, en septembre 2000.

On répond qu'on a oublié, que ça fait deux ans et demi, qu'on ne se souvient plus du mois.

On demande si on est passé par Karachi, Islamabad et Peshawar, au Pakistan, et par Kandahar, en Afghanistan.

On répond que c'est ça, que c'est bien ça.

On demande si on a des liens familiaux avec des terroristes notoires au Pakistan.

On répond en demandant de préciser quel genre de liens.

On reformule la question, on demande si on a des liens de parenté avec des terroristes au Pakistan.

On répond qu'on n'a pas de famille au Pakistan. Comment pourrait-on ?

On dit qu'on a pour « parent » le membre d'un groupe terroriste responsable d'attaques en Ouzbékistan.

On répond que dans la famille personne n'a aucun lien avec quelque groupe terroriste que ce soit en Ouzbékistan.

On dit qu'on a vécu dans un logement fourni par les Talibans et travaillé comme cuisinier dans un de leurs camps.

I

Asks if went from Kazakhstan to Kabul, Afghanistan, in September 2000.

Answers forgets, it's been two and a half years, no longer remembers the month.

Asks if went through Karachi, Islamabad and Peshawar, to Pakistan, and through Kandahar, Afghanistan.

Answers that's it, that's right.

Asks if has family ties with known terrorists in Pakistan.

Answers exactly what kind of ties?

Rephrases the question, asks if any relatives have ties to terrorists in Pakistan.

Answers has no family in Pakistan. How could this be?

States has "kin" who is a member of a terrorist group responsible for attacks in Uzbekistan.

Answers no one in the family has any connection with any terrorist group in Uzbekistan to speak of.

States lived in housing provided by the Taliban and worked as a cook in one of their camps.

Answers already said this during an earlier interrogation, wasn't a cook, was a kitchen gardener, doesn't know how to cook. Since childhood, mother was the one who always made food for the family.

States was captured in December 2001, in Kabul.

On répond qu'on l'a déjà mentionné lors d'un interrogatoire précédent, qu'on n'est pas cuisinier, qu'on s'occupait d'un potager, qu'on ne sait pas cuisiner. Que c'est la mère, depuis l'enfance, qui préparait à manger pour la famille entière.

On dit qu'on a été capturé en décembre 2001, à Kaboul.

On répond que oui, c'était en 2001, mais qu'on ne se souvient pas du mois, que c'était au milieu du Ramadan en 2001.

Answers yes, it was in 2001, but can't remember the month, it was in the middle of Ramadan in 2001.

II

Question : Bonjour.

Réponse : Bonjour.

Question : Nous n'avons pas beaucoup d'informations vous concernant, les seuls renseignements dont nous disposons proviennent du « Procès-Verbal Non Classifié ». Nous allons donc vous poser quelques questions afin de mieux comprendre votre histoire...

Êtes-vous citoyen du Kazakhstan ?

Réponse : Oui.

Question : Pourriez-vous nous dire pourquoi vous avez quitté, avec votre famille, le Kazakhstan pour l'Afghanistan ?

Réponse : Il n'y a pas de travail au Kazakhstan. Gagner sa vie y est difficile.

Question : Vous êtes-vous rendu en Afghanistan avec toute votre famille pour y trouver du travail ?

Réponse : On avait entendu dire qu'en Afghanistan les immigrés y étaient nourris.

Question : Est-ce vrai ? Vous a-t-on nourris et logés, quand vous êtes arrivés en Afghanistan ?

Réponse : Oui.

Question : Comment avez-vous su aller du Kazakhstan jusqu'en Afghanistan ?

Réponse : *On ne répond pas à la question.*

Question : C'est un très long voyage. Comment vous y êtes-vous pris ?

II

Question: Hello.

Answer: Hello.

Question: We don't have very much information about you, the only intelligence we have comes from the "Unclassified Verbal Charges." We are going to ask you some questions so we can better understand your story . . .

Are you a citizen of Kazakhstan?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Can you tell us why you left, you and your family, Kazakhstan for Afghanistan?

Answer: There's no work in Kazakhstan. Earning a living there is hard.

Question: You went to Afghanistan with your entire family to look for work there?

Answer: We heard that in Afghanistan immigrants are given food.

Question: Is that true? Did they give you food and housing when you got to Afghanistan?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How did you know how to go from Kazakhstan to Afghanistan?

Answer: *Does not respond to the question.*

Question: It's a very long trip. How did you do it?

Answer: There was no money. A man named J knew the way. We went with him.

Réponse : On n'avait pas d'argent. Un homme du nom de J. connaissait la route. Nous sommes partis avec lui.

Question : Vous souvenez-vous du temps qu'il vous a fallu pour parvenir jusqu'à Kaboul ?

Réponse : Deux, trois jours à peu près.

Question : Comment vous y êtes-vous rendus ? En avion, en voiture ?

Réponse : Nous avons voyagé du Kazakhstan à Karachi, au Pakistan, en avion. De là, nous avons pris un car jusque Kaboul.

Question : Vous vous êtes donc tous retrouvés dans une maison à Kaboul, et vous vous êtes contenté, vous, de vous occuper d'un potager. Avez-vous eu d'autres activités ?

Réponse : Je veillais sur la maison, rien d'autre.

Question : Toute votre famille vivait dans la même maison ?

Réponse : Les membres de ma famille vivaient dans la maison, oui. J. travaillait comme cuisinier. Les membres de ma famille restaient à la maison, c'est tout.

Question : Vous n'avez pas eu, votre famille et vous, à payer la nourriture ou le logement ?

Réponse : Nous n'avons rien payé. La nourriture et tout le reste étaient fournis. J. se faisait payer par l'État afghan.

Question : Vous a-t-on demandé quoi que ce soit en échange ?

Réponse : Non.

Question : L'État afghan n'a jamais rien exigé de vous en contrepartie ?

Réponse : Non.

Question : Vous avez vécu à Kaboul près d'un an... ou un peu plus longtemps peut-être ?

Réponse : À peu près un an.

Question: Do you remember how long it took you to get to Kabul?

Answer: About two, three days.

Question: How did you travel? By plane, by car?

Answer: We went from Kazakhstan to Karachi, Pakistan, by plane. From there, we took a bus to Kabul.

Question: So you all found a house in Kabul, and you were content, you, to tend a vegetable garden. Did you have other activities?

Answer: I watched over the house, nothing else.

Question: The entire family lived in the same house?

Answer: The members of my family lived in the house, yes. J worked as a cook. The rest of my family stayed at home, that's all.

Question: You didn't have to, your family and you, pay for food or housing?

Answer: We didn't have to pay anything. Food and everything else was provided. J was paid by the state of Afghanistan.

Question: Did anyone ask you to do anything at all in exchange?

Answer: No.

Question: The Afghan state never demanded you do anything in exchange?

Answer: No.

Question: You lived in Kabul almost a year . . . or maybe a little longer?

Answer: About a year.

Question: Did you find the situation in Afghanistan better than in your home country, Kazakhstan?

Answer: It wasn't a hard life. They brought us what we needed, like food for example. Me, I helped with the garden.

Question: When did you realize that Afghanistan was in the middle of a civil war?

Answer: Could you please repeat the question?

Question: When did you finally understand that the country was in the middle of a civil war?

Question : Avez-vous trouvé la situation en Afghanistan meilleure que dans votre pays d'origine, le Kazakhstan ?

Réponse : Ce n'était pas une vie difficile. On nous apportait ce dont nous avons besoin, de la nourriture par exemple. Moi, j'aidais au jardin.

Question : Quand vous êtes-vous rendu compte que l'Afghanistan se trouvait en pleine guerre civile ?

Réponse : Pourriez-vous, s'il vous plaît, répéter la question ?

Question : À quel moment avez-vous fini par comprendre que le pays se trouvait en pleine guerre civile ?

Réponse : Sur la route, on croisait des maisons dévastées, des chars d'assaut . . . On comprenait alors qu'il y avait la guerre.

Question : Avez-vous jamais été menacés par la guerre civile, là où vous viviez avec votre famille ?

Réponse : Non, les maisons n'étaient pas menacées.

Question : Les Talibans vous ont-ils demandé de les assister ?

Réponse : Non.

Question : Les Talibans ont-ils sollicité l'assistance de votre famille ?

Réponse : Non. Ma famille, c'est surtout une femme et des enfants . . .

Question : Il semble assez extraordinaire qu'un État ait pu à ce point se montrer généreux envers vous et votre famille sans rien exiger en échange. Pourriez-vous nous expliquer cela ?

Réponse : *On ne répond pas à la question.*

Question : Que pouvez-vous nous dire des autres accusations portées contre vous, et que vous avez déclarées fausses jusqu'ici ? Que veut signifier l'État américain quand il prétend que vous avez des « liens familiaux » avec des terroristes ?

Réponse : On essaie de me faire porter le chapeau. Alors que tout est faux.

Answer: While on the road, we passed ruined houses, tanks . . . we understood then that there was a war.

Question: Were you ever threatened by the war, where you lived with your family?

Answer: No, the houses weren't threatened.

Question: Did the Taliban ask you to help them?

Answer: No.

Question: Did the Taliban ask for help from your family?

Answer: No. My family is basically a woman and some children . . .

Question: It seems extraordinary that a State would be so generous to you and your family without asking anything in return. Can you explain this?

Answer: *Does not respond to the question.*

Question: What can you tell us about the other charges against you, which you have so far denied? What does it mean when the U.S. government says that you have "family ties" with terrorists?

Answer: They're trying to pin something on me. But it's all lies.

Question: Do you think it's related to some other member of your family?

Answer: We moved to Afghanistan because we're Muslim. We were housed and fed because that is what Islam prescribes.

Question: We're trying to understand why you're being kept here . . . They don't keep someone for over two years for simply growing vegetables. Can you help us understand your situation?

Answer: *Does not respond to the question.*

Question: Can you tell us what, according to you, you're doing here?

Answer: I have been detained because one day I went with my family in search of a better life in Afghanistan. They captured me in an Afghan house. This is the reason I am here.

Question : Pensez-vous que cela concerne un autre membre de votre famille ?

Réponse : Nous nous sommes installés en Afghanistan parce que nous sommes tous musulmans. On nous a nourris et logés parce que c'est ce que préconise la religion musulmane.

Question : Nous essayons de comprendre pourquoi vous êtes retenus ici . . . On n'irait pas jusqu'à détenir quelqu'un plus de deux ans pour une simple question de potager. Pourriez-vous nous aider à comprendre cette situation ?

Réponse : *On ne répond pas à la question.*

Question : Pourriez-vous nous dire ce que, selon vous, vous faites ici ?

Réponse : Je suis détenu ici parce qu'un jour je suis allé avec ma famille chercher une vie meilleure en Afghanistan. On m'a capturé dans cette maison afghane. C'est pour cette raison que je suis là.

Question : Qui vous a capturé à Kaboul ?

Réponse : *On ne répond pas à la question.*

Question : Des Américains ?

Réponse : Ce sont des Afghans qui m'ont capturé. En prison, j'ai entendu dire que ce sont les hommes de M. qui m'ont capturé.

Question : Quand vous avez été capturé, des membres de votre famille se trouvaient-ils également dans la maison ?

Réponse : Il y avait trois autres personnes dans la maison.

Question : Et J. ?

Réponse : Aussi.

Question : S'est-on opposé à l'arrestation ?

Réponse : Je ne sais pas. On m'a capturé chez moi, c'est tout.

Question : Vous n'aviez pas de quoi vous défendre ?

Réponse : Il n'y avait pas d'armes là-bas.

Question : Avez-vous idée de l'endroit où se trouve votre famille maintenant ?

Question: Who captured you in Kabul?

Answer: *Does not respond to question.*

Question: The Americans?

Answer: It was some Afghans who captured me. In prison, I heard it was M's people who caught me.

Question: When you were captured, were members of your family also in the house?

Answer: There were three other people in the house.

Question: And J?

Answer: Him, too.

Question: Did anyone resist arrest?

Answer: I don't know. They caught me at home, that's all.

Question: You didn't have anything to defend yourself with?

Answer: There were no weapons there.

Question: Do you have any idea where the rest of your family could be found now?

Answer: God only knows.

Question: Did you have the chance to receive any kind of training in Afghanistan?

Answer: Training for what?

Question: To do something besides grow vegetables, to help the government perhaps . . .

Answer: Vegetables, that's all I know.

Question: Were you ever asked if you wanted to help with something else?

Answer: No.

Question: What kind of vegetables did you grow in Afghanistan?

Answer: Green peppers, tomatoes, green beans and sweet potatoes.

Réponse : Dieu seul le sait.

Question : Avez-vous eu l'opportunité de recevoir le moindre type d'entraînement en Afghanistan ?

Réponse : D'entraînement à quoi ?

Question : À vous occuper d'autre chose que d'un potager, à aider le gouvernement peut-être . . .

Réponse : Les légumes, c'est tout ce que je connais.

Question : Vous a-t-on jamais demandé si vous vouliez aider à autre chose ?

Réponse : Non.

Question : Quelle sorte de légumes cultiviez-vous en Afghanistan ?

Réponse : Des poivrons verts, des tomates, des haricots verts et des patates.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

Is this who we are?

-Barack Obama, May 23, 2013, calling for the shutting down of the Guantanamo detention center during a speech at the National Defense University.

Walter Benjamin's question, "Is translation meant for readers who do not understand the original?" presumes, as most translations assume, an original. To translate *Guantanamo* is to translate with no original, for there is no linguistic origin. When I began my consideration of this project, Frank Smith provided me with copies of the interrogation transcripts that he had worked with, first by translating the Pentagon documents from English to French, next by performing a Reznikoffian poetic interpolation to the text. I decided not to look at them. After all, the interviews they chronicled were also not conducted in English, or, more accurately, half of each interview may have been stated in English, but even in its English articulation, was already in translation because of its context. A tribunal is a trial. To say something in a trial is to say something at trial, which says something of trial itself. Note that to say nothing at trial is no less a speech act, just as the fact of real time courtroom interpretation lets everyone know the language law of the land, just as each letter is its destination as it is written and in the writing. I also understood *Guantanamo* concerns in part the question of the infidel and infidelity. This was useful in considering the thorny problem of

Smith's use of the third person neutral pronoun *on*, for which there is no satisfying English equivalent. Of the series of usual substitutes — *you, we, he, she, they, one* — none were sufficiently close yet impersonal, particular yet universal, i.e., inclusionary yet exculpatory or vice versa. All pronouns, as you know, are relational, or, as the old joke goes, “What do you mean *we*, kemosabe?” So I thought to shift these relations commensurate with their possible alliances, linguistic and otherwise. For the language lesson of Guantanamo is there is no point of origin, no fidelity to any event that can be counted by calendar or clock, because the text event as such is the only event which counts. Put another way, the only person telling the truth is *on*. Of course, having said all this, it should be noted that as the doubled text here suggests, there is now an original for *Guantanamo*, and once there is an original, at least hypothetically, there is the possibility of recapture and redemption. Just as in sin.

Vanessa Place
Los Angeles
December 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank President Barack Obama, without whom this book would not be possible.

BIOGRAPHIES

FRANK SMITH is a French journalist, nonfiction writer, and author of multiple books of poetry including the recent collections *Guantanamo* (Seuil, Coll. 2010), *États de faits* (l'Attente Editions, 2013), and *Gaza, d'ici-là* (Al Dante Editions, 2013). He has worked as a producer for France Culture since 1999 where, after collaborating to create the programs *Surpris par la nuit* and *Surpris par la poésie* with Alain Veinstein, he codirected *l'Atelier de création radiophonique* for ten years. He also heads the book/CD collection “ZagZig” that he founded with Dis Voir, a publishing house, and contributes to *L'Impossible/L'autre journal* (led by Michel Butel).

VANESSA PLACE was the first poet to perform as part of the Whitney Biennial; a content advisory was posted. Place is also a conceptual artist, a critic, a criminal defense attorney, and CEO of VanessaPlace Inc, the world's first poetry corporation.

MARK SANDERS is Professor of Comparative Literature at New York University. He is author of *Complicities: The Intellectual and Apartheid*, *Ambiguities of Witnessing: Law and Literature in the Time of a Truth Commission*, and *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Live Theory*.

LES *f* FIGUES
PRESS