

FOUND, FOUND, FOUND: LIVED, LIVED, LIVED¹

Eunsong Kim

I want to be clear here that when I use the term ghostly I am not speaking metaphorically.

Dennis Childs, *Slaves of the State*, 2015

Those early Africans came with nothing but the body, which would become the repository of everything they would need to survive. The Body Memory if you will. For four hundred years those black bodies would withstand the onslaught of empire. Those black bodies are, in fact, the only thing standing between empire and a state of total annihilation. The erasure of memory in the face of history. Because to erase the body is to erase the memory.

M. NourbeSe Philip, *Interview with an Empire*, 2002

This version of FOUND:

Whose Culture? The modern nations' within whose borders antiquities—the ancient artifacts of peoples long disappeared—*happen* to have been found? Or the world's peoples' heirs to antiquity as the foundation of culture that has never known the political borders but has always been *fluid*, *mongrel*, made from contact with *new*, strange, and wonderful *things*. [Emphasis mine]

James Cuno, CEO of the Getty Museum, *Whose Culture?* 2009

In taking the next step in my work, the exploration of non-intention, I don't solve the puzzle that the mesostic string presents. Instead I write or find a source text which is then used as an oracle. I ask it what word shall I use for this letter and what one for the next, etc. *This frees me from memory, taste, likes and dislikes... with respect to the source material, I am in a global situation.* Words come first from here and then from there. The situation is not linear. It is as though *I am in a forest hunting for ideas.* [Emphasis mine]

John Cage, *Composition in Retrospect*, 1982

Appropriation and plagiarism are here to stay. Kenneth Goldsmith, "I Look to Theory Only When I Realize That Somebody Has Dedicated Their Entire Life to a Question I Have Only Fleetingly Considered," 2015

WHOSE FOUND—WHOSE LIVED?

In thinking about found and appropriated art I was reminded of a project that I began a few years ago that I have been unable to finish. It was started by an *Art 21* interview of the artist Carrie Mae Weems discussing "From Here I Saw What Happened and I Cried"—a powerful photographic series that appropriated daguerreotypes of enslaved men and women and other "found" images. Weems discussed how one of the archives that she "appropriated from" contacted and threatened to sue her.

In the interview she discusses how Harvard, the most affluent University in the world, told her that she didn't have the right to use their images, their slave daguerreotypes. So Weems responded, yes sue me. She states, "I think I maybe don't have a legal case, but maybe I have a moral case that could be made that might be really useful to carry out in public." And after some worry, she responded to the institution that a court case might be "a good thing" and that this was a conversation that "we" should have in court, because such a discussion "would be instructive for any number of reasons..."

Harvard responded and stated that if they could just receive a portion of the sales, that that would suffice. Weems disagreed—she would

not pay. Then like a true neoliberal corporation, Harvard purchased the series, flexing their monetary and legal power to hold both the original and the appropriated daguerreotypes.

It turns out, the Getty Museum “commissioned” the series that Harvard contested, and the Getty—the richest museum in the world—also has daguerreotypes of captive men and women (comprising the few of such objects that exist in the world). I spent some time at the Getty researching, learning about provenance, contacting archivists and experts on the ideas of “ownership” and emailing Harvard (to be rerouted to their PR team).

I learned that Louis Agassiz, a Swiss zoologist and marine biologist—the founder of many U.S. natural history museums and the biological classification system—immigrated to Boston in 1846, and commissioned the daguerreotype portraits to be taken in 1850. I learned that when he immigrated he showed immediate public support for the abolition movement but became close friends with phrenologists such as Samuel Morton.² I learned that he wrote his mother hundreds of letters, describing his encounters with black men and women in Boston, about his desires for “them to stay far away.”³ As he was writing these letters, he formulated scientific theories of the separate spheres of racial classification. In staunch opposition to budding Darwinian theories, Agassiz wanted to use the newly invented medium of photography as his proof for the separation of races, and to promote the necessity of scientific racial classification.

He commissioned a daguerreotypist to travel to a plantation in South Carolina, one that he knew was continuing the importation (theft) of slaves (the law forbidding this had already been placed in 1808). The plantation owner was a “science” enthusiast and fully supported Agassiz’s theories of racial segregation and wanted to assist in providing scientific evidence. As Hortense Spillers writes in “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe”: “To that extent, the procedures adopted for the captive flesh demarcate a total objectification, as the entire captive community becomes a living laboratory.”⁴ For Agassiz, the bodies of those captive under chattel

slavery constituted the objects of a “living laboratory”; the subjects of his commissioned daguerreotypes were interchangeable and yet essential to his studies. As objects, rather than subjects of a material world, they were evidence, albeit abstracted. Photography was thus used to abstract and interrogate what he could not know, but felt he could capture and theorize.⁵

After the daguerreotypes in South Carolina were captured, Agassiz also wanted to document what he thought were “the dangers of miscegenation.” With the help of the philosopher William James, he traveled to Brazil⁶ during the U.S. Civil War to document what he believed were the horrors of miscegenation, and to collect more “evidence” for his scientific theory concerning racial classification. When Agassiz and James returned, Darwin’s theories were being contested, but also circulated with passion. It became clear that a collection of photographs would not suffice as scientific proof.⁷ It would not be enough to sway the shrill community—his early theories for apartheid would be shelved and put to use at another time.

Since the daguerreotypes no longer sufficed as scientific evidence, they, along with images of Greek statues and Roman figures, sat in a box in the zoology department at Harvard University. Agassiz’s son donated his father’s research to the university and the archive remained in the zoology department until 1975, when they were “discovered” and quickly moved to the museum and exhibited in 1986. They remain the property of Harvard University: this is the provenance of their *ownership*.

There is a question asked by postcolonial and Indigenous archivists of utmost importance: If these are your records, where are your memories? If the “portraits” of faces are yours, where are your stories?

When Carrie Mae Weems takes the daguerreotypes of captive men and women, she does this through the language of grief, the politics of haunting, and impossible encounter. She has written on one of the daguerreotypes, clothed in blue: “You became a scientific profile.”

**LIVED AND FOUND.
FOUND THROUGH LIVED.
LIVED AND STOLEN.**

When Weems goes into the archive and writes onto the photographs, she implicates herself into their lineage. She displays the archive and impresses herself into them and transforms the objects into witnesses. Michelle Caswell describes this as the making of “new records [that] repurpose the old, transforming them from objects of mass murder to agents of witnessing.”⁸

Nelson Mandela’s archivist, Verne Harris, has described that all archival work is for this reason “spectral”—that it is not archive making, but “archive banditry.” Where through memory, the archive must be taken. Harris posits that rather than finding the archive and owning it, we go into the archive because we are already haunted. And those with their memories—and I say memories here deliberately, as processes that not all of us have for the artifacts and objects in question. I would argue that Harvard has no memories connected to the daguerreotypes. Acquisition, institutional ownership, and storage are not memories. However, we can absolutely argue that black communities have memories linked to the daguerreotypes. My usage of memory here is political: memories not as storage but as the ancestral, bodily apparitions that link some to witnesses. And those with such memories have access to an archive as the process of thievery. The process that might say: you have always belonged with us.

Similarly, Weems’s work displays how one goes into the archive to say: “Not yours. Not yours one bit.”

As if to say: If these are your records, where are your stories? Where are your ghosts?

In contrast, conceptual poets such as Kenneth Goldsmith have built their careers on the notion that plagiarism and appropriation are the only vehicles left in poetry worth exploring. He recommends that we discontinue writing—and commit to the full possibilities of appropriation.

In his understanding, appropriation is the taking of objects, bodies, and stories: an unregistered transaction that requires only the desire of the artist. In March of this year, in order to display full dedication to his decree, he appropriated an autopsy report of Michael Brown, the young African-American student who was murdered by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri. After his shooting, multiple city, state, and national autopsy reports were constructed under the tutelage of truth and accountability. However, as with almost all cases of U.S. police shootings of unarmed black persons, the police officer that executed Brown was acquitted of all charges. Goldsmith attempted to repurpose and appropriate one of the autopsy reports, altering its language and changing the document to end with a description of Brown’s “unremarkable” testicle. Goldsmith appropriated and refashioned the language of the report to re-configure a lynching scene.

As Saidiya Hartman argues in *Scenes of Subjection*, it is imperative to resist recounting, narrating, and circulating reports and images of black suffering. I wish for this reason to focus on Goldsmith’s entitlement to Brown’s story, body, and archive. I want to argue that while Goldsmith might have access to such an archive, without memories they are not his.⁹ The misappropriation of this autopsy report displays the extent to which, as contemporary poetry strives for the “new,” the “uncharted,” and the “avant-garde,” white supremacy grounds the logic of ownership, authorship, archive, and appropriation—and that this is what undergirds white modernist/post-modernist cultural production.

We—and I use this word as Ailish Hopper¹⁰ used it in Montana, as an “invitational” we, but also the we that is comprised of the poets who have been screaming against the replication of white supremacy and anti-blackness as value:

We reject the notion of a scientific found. Of the removed found. Of the found that does not live. Of the found that institutions practice. Of found devoid of memory. The colonial “found”—the found that declares MINE when bodies and

memories and ghosts are present. The found that declares MINE when movements are in place tending to the damage. The found that declares MINE to be property, property without memory, property for sale.

We care not one bit about: conceptualism, conceptualist strategies, the branding, the legacy, the tradition, the threat it supposedly “poses” against the equally omnipresent white lyric I (and what does it mean that advocates of the “I” and opposers of the “I” cannot and refuse to discuss the relationship between power and language, whiteness and language?).

We find the language of both notions to be dull, rooted in the imagination of capital.¹¹

We do not believe that form and content are ever separable. No matter how much they test¹² us, no matter how much they fail us and force us and press us to repeat.

& if we lie to their faces we will go home and whisper no.

Equally, we believe that poets have not spoken up enough about the intimate implications of form and power, form as justice. We believe some of the older poets have convinced themselves that poetry is not the realm to discuss power, accountability, and radical justice.¹³

We disagree. We disagree. We disagree.

Form & Content, Form & Power are inseparable.

We consider commentary like “people of colour use found text too, why can’t we do this”:

To be a derailing tactic. We have and live under neoliberal capitalism. We can spot a sideshow when we see one.

to say “conceptualism” created the “found text” methodology is akin to crediting surrealism with the invention of dreams

or the situationists with the invention of the absurd

or the futurists as inventors of revolutionary language

violent rewriting of history, forms, aesthetics.

violent rewriting to celebrate their history.

Provincialize all their forms—¹⁴

It should already be familiar that Black and postcolonial historians have done an immense amount of work arguing about the appropriative tenants of all such European movements.¹⁵

What might it be to imagine a future, present and a history—where Black artists and poets are not “sharing” or borrowing “forms” from white institutions

but are fundamentally prompting and innovating all forms?

Altering from the root, always from the root.

In addition, what might it be—to situate the word “found” not as “accidentally” or “new” or as the euphemism for the colonial encounter—

but as Carrie Mae Weems, Sasha Huber, M. NourbeSe Philip and others have situated—as encounter memories? Rather than “found this,” what if it were “found you,” “finding you,” searching tending caring for you—

rather than “found this,” haunted¹⁶ by, lived through, survived—

so that it isn’t “I” go into some place and take you and make you and sell that

but are connected haunted torn searching for these memories & will never be the same again once they find us—

And not to be mistaken: not all of us are connected in the same ways. Some of us have been granted access by the law but have none of the memories.

Questions of Provenance:

In “Ethnicity as Provenance,” archivist Joel Wurl writes of state and archival documents: “History is filled with accounts of protest mobs destroying sites of records that were seen as representing authoritarian rule. Such were not records of the people but of the regimes—information used to control, distort, intimidate, and punish.” However, archival “material is now owned by the repository: the attention given to it is aimed at a largely imagined group of potential users, most of whom are not seen as being affiliated with the originators.” Wurl thus posits that provenance (“who owns what”) is in itself a political question, asking what might it be like, in this political thought experiment, to configure the root not to the “owner” of the records, but the body? The community the phantoms congregate around, for, long:

Ethnicity as provenance
Memory as root
grasping by the root—Angela Davis notes—is the definition of radicality
finding, searching, rooting, pleading for those already part of the continuum

Swiss-Haitian artist Sasha Huber and a team of academics, artists, poets, and activists have been working on an impossible petition to rename a stretch of the Swiss Alps. They have located the sites dedicated to Agassiz’s name: they have begun researching how this name came to be. They have met with politicians and challenged them during their meetings. They have traveled through all the routes provided by the state and have been denied. They write that they have been “rejected by all the authorities. Petition to be continued nevertheless.”¹⁷ They have suggested renaming the sites with the slave name provided on the daguerreotypes “Rentyhorn”; this is not a perfect solution, but there is no perfect solution. Just stabs and love and tears and endless labour.

Huber has traveled to sites of Agassiz’s name: in Brazil, Boston, all over Europe, creating a series of lists, maps—a cartography of his name.

She has haunted the sites, and documented her body, as bodies before have been documented.

The documentation of her performance, titled “Agassiz: The Mixed Traces Series, Somatological Triptych of Sasha Huber, Rio Janeiro, 2010,” displays Huber’s nude body against the backdrop of Agassiz’s site in Brazil. Huber inserts her body both as a subject of Agassiz’s somatology and within the site of Agassiz’s name. Huber poses her body the way Agassiz’s subjects were posed: nude, and from the front, back, and side.

Huber says of the performance that she is the “product of what Agassiz would not approve” and that this was a way for her to show “solidarity with the people in the photographs.”

Huber’s project is research-driven, confrontational, argumentative—with a target. It is situated in the local, in bringing together residents, academics, and curators to discuss the significance of Agassiz’s legacy. In addition, it is

transnational. She links her body to the historical and violently international reach of Agassiz’s sites, from Boston to Switzerland to Brazil.

Her body unforgettable,¹⁸ entered, authored, objectified, at the site of damage, her unforgettable body catalogued, documented, enters to alter the archive forever—

In defining provenance and “new records,” Caswell writes: “In the view from the continuum, all of these activations—past, present, and future—form the never-ending provenance of these records, each adding a new layer of meaning to a constantly evolving collection of records that open out into the future.”

Huber ruptures and continues: Archive as continuum, as activations, as where the past, present and future collide, negotiate, find: live.

In *Slaves of the State*, Dennis Childs writes that “the legal atrocity of prison slavery has been evacuated through the pastoralizing, criminalizing, and dehumanizing lens of white supremacist mnemonic reproduction.” Such is the lens taking that which is unknowable (such as chattel slavery) and attempts to convert it to white property (representation). Additionally, Childs utilizes the term “punitive staging” to describe the ongoing representations of white supremacy. “Punitive staging” and the “dehumanizing lens of white supremacist mnemonic reproduction” are the exact methodologies that “artists” and “poets” like Kenneth Goldsmith, Vanessa Place, Santiago Sierra and others committed to neoliberal aesthetics¹⁹ utilize as their fundamental basis.

Because when Goldsmith selects one autopsy report—from among the many—as his newest poem, when he is invited by Brown University, and reads this appropriated report out loud in flat poetry voice, when he fumbles over the medical terminology but loudly because he is proud of all of his precious, entitled failures:

he does this because he believes the modernist tradition of found means “TAKE” because for him FOUND means DEAD and without LIFE

Found means CONQUER
 Found means MINE
 Found means I ANOINT YOU AS RAW
 unaffected
 scientist
 removed
 hunter

Found means *you* are my objects

“I” have no connection to you—

Of this version of a linear process, an archive driven by state power, Caswell declares: “Instead of redeeming the archival conception of creatorship through its expansion, we should complicate creatorship’s direct ties to provenance.”²⁰

Complicate, challenge, destroy their notion of ownership, their ownership to this material—the owner is not the man who paid once, a long time ago, the photographer, the scientist, the white male artist WITH NO MEMORIES WITH NO TIES NO PHANTOMS TO TEND FOR. The museum. That library. Complicate all such ties to provenance and ask: Where are your memories? Are you a witness? Who do you care for? What are you continuing? Who do you remember?

While the various white camps bicker over notions of “romantic,” “expression,” “lyric,” “found,” and “conceptual,” the one thing that they continue to implicitly agree on is that poetry is dependent on abjection. And abjection—in our imperial imaginaries—is fundamentally racialized. While supposedly at opposite ends of the lyric-conceptual spectrum, in their appropriation of black suffering and death lyric poet Frederick Seidel and conceptual poet Kenneth Goldsmith align themselves as *representors* and *depictors* of abjection. U.S. poetry celebrates the replication of the position of the dominator—does it not? Prove us wrong. Its deepest gesture of empathy is a fleeting sense of guilt that comes in the form of high, institutionalized art, under the shield of Duchamp and T.S. Elliot.

What figures like Seidel and Goldsmith could never imagine, what their poetry could never produce—as their poetic project is dependent on the racial violence, abjection, and sacrifice NOT OF THEIR OWN—is a poetics that supports the imagination of Bree Newsome. Or poems—if they must continue writing poems—that inspect the language of police, and the metaphors of white modernism/hollywood/the constitution. A poem whose existence fundamentally debilitates whiteness. Rather than poetry dependent on racial abjection as its core spectacle—poetry that makes whiteness abject.

There are some examples of this. Poet and researcher Brett Zehner tells me that over a hundred investment bankers took their lives in the last few months, that he could count. Most of this did not make the news because what would we do with this information. He tells me that highly rewarded technicians of financial capitalism cannot survive within their projected designs. He tells me that he’s working on a poem titled “A Living Dream of Dead Bankers” that lists their deaths. He asks me what I think about radical suicide and I’m horrified. But I realize that the site of this terror is the site that white modernism could never work from: the site of self-betrayal, the site of risk where damage will absolutely follow.

I am going to state very plainly (so that when you call me a philistine I can say: yes, YES), something so didactic and repetitive as to ensure against confusion: there are no better white modernisms.²¹ What is made legible through the discourse of modernism is made through the discourse dependent on colonialism and chattel slavery. What is made powerful by modernism, what is made great, is made so because: *whiteness as property*, *whiteness as abstract*.²²

Fred Moten, discussing M. NourbeSe Philp’s work: “Modernity (the confluence of the slave trade, settler colonialism and the democratization of sovereignty through which the world is imaged, graphed, and grasped) is a socio-ecological disaster that can neither be

calculated nor conceptualized as a series of personal injuries.”²³

Modernism/avant-garde/conceptualism being challenged, being contested, and decaying does not mean those that have been classified as such will be erased. Rather, we will be tasked with reading all such artifacts radically anew. If something or someone is made illegible because the branding/legacy structure of modernism is dismantled—it is because they should’ve been illegible all along. Black artists and writers of colour do not disappear because critiques of whiteness are entered into modernism/avant-garde/conceptualism. This is to suggest that black and other non-white artists exist by the grace of whiteness. The critique of white supremacy is a challenge to examine our gaze—and to acknowledge what has always been damaging, illegible to us (because we are without access, because we are with access but cannot be near it).

Additionally, the critique of conceptualism should not and cannot be contained to those who self-identify as such—the roots of this practice run back to a longer, historical discourse in which the black body, or blackness (as appropriated, antagonized, or as the marker of the retrograde) is necessary to move the idea, the concept forward.

But this isn’t the only tradition. And this tradition has always existed with critiques.

This is to state once again, very plainly, that black artists sought to critique the premise of modernism, conceptualism, abstraction—by looking into the materiality and the archive of their making.

“There is another instrumentality for POCs and Black women, and that is for white people to take the processes and concepts of our work and turn them into the grounds for their careers, as niches on the job market, as beacons of a magical singularity that had no presence or expression in them before they absorbed our light. To make our stuff into ‘a thing’ that they do, theorize, brand and perform. But here is notice: you cannot do

what I do because you do not love who I love.”
 Tisa Bryant, 28 September 2015

You cannot do what I do because you do not love who I love.

i am accused of tending to the past
 as if i made it,
 as if i sculpted it
 with my own hands. i did not.
 this past was waiting for me
 Lucille Clifton, “I Am Accused of Tending to the Past”

M. NourbeSe Philip has written that her *Zong!* is “ritual masquerading as conceptual work.”

Ritual—as illegible to the western, modernist tradition. Traveling via illegibility. Carrie Mae Weems and archival banditry. Sasha Huber and impossible solidarity:

Question provenance. Complicate those without memories—complicate and destroy their ties to ownership, to the archive, to the found, to appropriation.

militant commitment, care for impossible solidarity
 as Philip writes: Ritual
 Inserting the body to transform the archive
 offering objects and poems
 so that that they may live, look through and breathe

The risk has always been with here and in them now the risk cannot be transferred
 Searching through records of violence for glimpses

Waiting waiting
 endless, impossible labor
 Rejected by all authorities—ritual to continue nonetheless

- 1** This essay is an extension of one of my dissertation chapters, currently titled "Violence & Provenance: The Transmission of Louis Agassiz's Slave Daguerreotypes in the Work of Carrie Mae Weems and Sasha Huber." I would like to thank Fatima El-Tayeb, Page duBois, Grace Kyungwon Hong, Michelle Caswell, Tisa Bryant, Duriel Harris, Tonya Foster, Samiya Bashir, Dennis Childs, Lucas de Lima, Bhanu Kapil, Lara Glenum, Jennifer Tamayo, Gregory Laynor, Don Mee Choi, micha cárdenas, Yelena Bailey, and Allia Griffin for guidance and encouragement throughout every stage of this essay. Brian Reed offered invaluable criticism, concern, and care. Sasha Huber graciously looked over an early draft and I am forever grateful for her input and generosity. I would like to thank the editors at *Scapegoat*, Marcin Kedzior, Jeffrey Malecki and Nasrin Himada, for their editorial counsel and for publishing this oddly formed essay.
- 2** Samuel Morton was a doctor, professor and a notable collector of human skulls. He authored *Crania Americana; or, A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America: To which is Prefixed An Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species*, published in 1839.
- 3** This is from Agassiz's letter to his mother concerning his life in Boston and his feelings towards them. Agassiz to his mother, December 1846 (Houghton Library, Harvard University). I first found this letter reading Brian Wallis's "Black Bodies, White Science: Louis Agassiz's Slave Daguerreotypes," *American Art* 9, no. 2 (1995): 38–61.
- 4** Hortense J. Spillers, "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book," in *The Black Feminist Reader*, ed. Joy James and T. Denean Sharpely-Whiting (Malden, MA.: Blackwell, 2000), 63.
- 5** This paragraph comes from my dissertation chapter, currently titled "Violence & Provenance: The Appropriation and Transmission of Louis Agassiz's Slave Daguerreotypes in the Work of Carrie Mae Weems and Sasha Huber."
- 6** This was titled the "Thayer Exhibition" and spanned 1865–1866.
- 7** In (*T*)races of Louis Agassiz: *Photography, Body and Science: Yesterday and Today*, Maria Helena P. T. Machado and Sasha Huber explain why the South Carolina and Brazil daguerreotypes remained unpublished: "The Brazilian collection never reached the public eye. The delicate political climate of post-bellum New England, along with Louis Agassiz's own loss of scientific credibility following the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* prevented him from making public what was to be his definitive work in establishing the inferiority of blacks and the ills of hybridism." Maria Helena P. T. Machado and Sasha Huber (eds.), (*T*)races of Louis Agassiz: *Photography, Body and Science: Yesterday and Today* (São Paulo: Capacete, 2010), 26.
- 8** Michelle Caswell, *Archiving the Unspeakable: Silence, Memory and the Photographic Record in Cambodia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014), 160.
- 9** This argument is indebted to archivist Michelle Caswell, who in a personal email from June 2015 stated: "Just because you can access something, doesn't mean you should." Just because we have access to records of state violence does not mean they are ours to use. Access should not and cannot justify modification, appropriation, and ownership.
- 10** This was stated during her talk, "The Death of White Supremacy," at the "Thinking its Presence, Race & Writing" conference at the University of Montana in 2015.
- 11** Max Haiven, "Finance as Capital's Imagination? Reimagining Value and Culture in an Age of Fictitious Capital and Crisis," *Social Text* 29, no. 3/108 (2011): 93–124.
- 12** And they don't know this but we do: we enter their classes and exit suspiciously. We know their narratives are their fantasies. We know when they write: it is also constant erasure. To remain suspicious and alive: this is one communiqué from our ancestors that many of us have received and abide by.
- 13** I am borrowing this term from Luis Martín-Cabrera's book title and theoretical framework, *Radical Justice* (Bucknell University Press, 2011).
- 14** Regarding the word "provincialize," see *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, by Dipesh Chakrabarty (Princeton University Press, 2009).
- 15** Robin D. G. Kelley, in *Freedoms Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Beacon Press, 2003), discusses how the Surrealists took explicitly from North African occult traditions.
- 16** For a theoretical mediation on "haunting," see *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, by Avery Gordon (University of Minnesota Press, 1997).
- 17** For full text and petition see www.rentyhorn.ch.
- 18** Regarding the "unforgettable," Giorgio Agamben's writes: "The exigency of the lost does not entail being remembered and commemorated; rather, it entails remaining in us and with us as forgotten, and in this way and only in this way, remaining unforgettable." Giorgio Agamben, *The Time that Remains*, trans. Patricia Dailey (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), 40.
- 19** This is a term I've been using to describe the works of Santiago Sierra. See my article, "Neoliberal Aesthetics: 250 Cm Tattooed on 6 Paid People," *Lateral* 4 (2015).
- 20** Caswell, *Archiving the Unspeakable*, 158.
- 21** I do want to note that Black Studies has articulated traditions and ruptures that should not be covered by modernism and could not be subsumed by the avant-garde. Audre Lorde wrote extensively about Black feminist poetics, "Afro Modernity" has been theorized by Michael Hanchard, and the Watts Writers Workshop examined in *Black Arts West: Culture and Struggle in Postwar Los Angeles*, by Daniel Widener (Duke University Press, 2010), to name a few formative examples.
- 22** See Cheryl Harris, "Whiteness as Property," *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (1993): 1707–1791.
- 23** See Fred Moten, "Blackness and Poetry," *The Volta* 55 (2015), www.thevolta.org/ewc55-fmoten-p1.html.