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INTRODUCTION

AT THE NEXUS

MEERA ATKINSON
AND MICHAEL RICHARDSON

The story of trauma [...] as the narrative of a belated experience, far from telling of an escape from reality—the escape from a death, or from its referential force—rather attests to its endless impact on a life.

—Cathy Caruth, Unclaimed Experience, 7.

Affect is an impingement or extrusion of a momentary or sometimes more sustained state of relation as well as the passage (and the duration of passage) of forces or intensities. That is, affect is found in those intensities that pass body to body (human, nonhuman, part-body, and otherwise), in those resonances that circulate about, between, and sometimes stick to bodies and worlds, and in their very passages or variations between these intensities and resonances themselves.

—Melissa Gregg & Gregory Seigworth, The Affect Theory Reader, 1.

These quotes gesture towards the heart of this collection: the question of how trauma might be approached with respect for, and recognition of, its existence, recurrence, and lived presence as an “impossible event,” while nonetheless examining the form, substance and dynamics of that impossibility in new ways. How might we recognize the continuum between personal and collective, without collapsing them into dichotomy? How can we think about trauma in terms of present relation rather than absence or disconnection? How would we re-imagine the transmission of trauma between bodies? How might we acknowledge, and even intervene upon, the cycle of affect and effect between individual and collective, familial and national? It is the contention of this volume that thinking trauma in terms of affect offers enormous promise. In what follows, we aim to set out a theoretical topology of the intersection of trauma and affect. Our intent here is not to provide a complete account of either field,
but rather to establish those dynamics and relations of theory upon which these essays intervene.

**Traumas**

Trauma is inescapable. Inevitable. It is not rare, but common. The word “trauma” comes with innumerable connotations: hysteria, suffering, damage, and catastrophe, to name a few. What is catastrophic or exceptional for some—rape, war, torture—might constitute the everyday for others. Distinctions such as “everyday” and “extraordinary” between certain traumas are a useful shorthand, but prone to collapse all too readily. Trauma occurs on a relational spectrum—it is impossible to divorce it from context, whether personal or collective. Thus while it is crucial to address, theoretically and therapeutically, those most violent traumas, it is equally necessary to recognize those “less” shatterings that nonetheless shake not the world, but the inner workings of an individual body and psyche, or the dynamics and trajectory of a family or a group of friends, co-workers, neighbors or strangers. These are often the hidden sites of trauma: cyber bullying, porn culture, sexual harassment, violent video games, anorexia chat rooms, work and exercise addictions, just to name a few.

Globalized technology and the Internet have ushered in an era of unprecedented trans-national communication, transmitting information and affect in ways, at speeds, and across distances previously impossible. The question of what this means for the proliferation of trauma is an urgent one. Turn on the television, open a newspaper, click on a news site: disaster, death, loss, grief and pain in images of accidents, violent crime, children disappeared, rivers dried up, freak storms, refugees drowning in sinking boats, exported sheep slaughtered un-stunned and fighting for life in foreign harbors. That the world has always been a place of trauma is a given, but in our age we are implicated and confronted with it on a newly grand scale; we are thoroughly bound up with its endless mutations, complexities and ubiquity. A horror film shot in HD video can be edited on home computers and released to the world. Photographs of starving children and cats being experimented upon in a university laboratory go viral in Facebook newsfeeds. Adam Lanza kills 26 children and adults at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, and within hours a town’s trauma is known to the world through cable news, web sites, amateur video. Our exposure to different and multiple traumatic events occurs in new modes and practices, proliferating at a pace our understanding and nervous systems struggle to keep up and cope with.
Faced with mounting trauma, either face to face or via media networks, many of us wish to close our eyes, to refuse the overwhelming onslaught from without and, often enough, from within. There is comfort in doing so; in staying within the safe bounds of knowing, recognizing trauma at a distance—as if through fog—but declining to draw closer. But at what cost? Even when the knowledge of trauma is refused, justified, minimized, or rationalized, can anyone ever hope to escape the affect that often generates it, and is generated by it? One option is to accumulate one’s own traumas, attempting to keep them at arm’s length and hoping to be spared that of others. To do so may well be the most common mode of existence in contemporary society. Yet to turn away from trauma is also to fail a crucial test of humanity. It might be that being open to one’s own trauma is necessary in order to be open to that of another, and conversely opening to the trauma of others facilitates opening to one’s own; a kind of Levinasian “responsibility to the Other.” There may be no more urgent necessity than this—to the degree that in denying one’s own trauma, the other is exposed to the consequences of trauma and its affect. And by the same token, the trauma of others, irresponsibly unacknowledged, has a way of making itself known in the form of damaging effects. In this way, a dangerous cycle is perpetuated, a cycle in which everyone is affected and implicated.

Being implicated in complex and enduring trauma is something that we, as non-indigenous writers and editors working in the “Great Southern Land” of Australia, must acknowledge. We view the devastating and egregious post-colonial, post-traumatic cycle of denial around the trans-generational suffering of the Indigenous peoples of Australia to be one of the most pressing concerns, in practical and ethical terms, of our nation. The telling of Aboriginal stories is critical to addressing, and intervening in this cycle, yet working in tension to this is the notorious difficulty of speaking trauma, especially trauma of a profound and intergenerational nature. The question of traumatic representation and embodiment is particularly interesting in the Indigenous context since traditionally Indigenous storytelling takes place through song, dance, body art and ceremony. Despite such tensions, Indigenous stories—traditional and traumatic—feature not only in the unique visual art now heartily embraced by the International art community, but also in a rich canon of

2 This is discussed in the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination’s “Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (Australia),” (United Nations, 2010).
contemporary, diverse and emergent Indigenous textuality. Writers like Lionel Fogarty and Tara June Winch, who appeared in the *Macquarie PEN Anthology of Aboriginal Literature* and Alexis Wright, whose novel *Carpentaria* won the 2007 Miles Franklin Award—offer insights into Aboriginal experience. Film is another medium in which Indigenous stories are shining and surprising. *Samson and Delilah*, director Warwick Thornton’s indomitable and poignant portrayal of a young couple up against the odds, competed in and then won the Un Certain Regard section of the Caméra d’Or (“Gold Camera Award” for best first feature film). It was also nominated in the Academy Awards best foreign language film category and was critically acclaimed around the world. Rachel Perkin’s feature film, *Bran Neu Dae*, was a radically different and paradoxical take on collective trauma with its ironic employment of the soap and musical comedy genres and plot in which “everyone turns out to be related to everyone else to ameliorate traumatic loss by laughter, possibly because the effects of forcible separation touch almost everyone in that community.” Though the tunes are cheery, the deadly serious trauma at the heart of the film cannot be mistaken in lyrics like “There’s nothing I would rather be than to be an Aborigine and watch you take my precious land away.” The ground breaking six-part drama series *Redfern Now*, produced by Blackfella Films in association with ABC TV, tells the stories of six inner-city households living in one street in the infamous Sydney suburb of Redfern. In each, the complexity of urban Indigenous life is conveyed with extraordinary skill. At every turn trauma intertwines with the remarkable spirit, resilience and resourcefulness of this community to yield stories with as much courage as heart; uncompromisingly honest and smart, these are not just stories by Indigenous people for Indigenous people: they even demand the attention of those who would not readily give it, commanding witness, engagement, ethical response.

From the macro world of geopolitics to the micro of familial relations, the recognition of trauma as trauma is crucial because it gives name and shape to a form of experience that is a rupturing of the capacity to make sense of the world; it recognizes the impossible event as existing, lived in

---

7 Anna Gibbs in a private conversation in December 2012.
the catastrophic, the everyday and every gradation between. But to name something trauma is also to inscribe it within the discourses and definitions of clinical trauma studies and literary trauma theory. Trauma has its scientific meaning, particularly within medicine, and is also a deeply loaded psychological and psychoanalytic term. It is the latter understanding that has gained common currency in political, cultural, and social uses of the word. By the end of the 20th century trauma theory had emerged from its origins in psychoanalysis and the experience of listening to the testimony of Holocaust survivors to deepen understandings of violence and vulnerability. Theorists such as Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, Dominick LaCapra, and Cathy Caruth brought this emergent interest in trauma to bear on literature in ways that expanded understanding of the operations of both.\(^9\) While their work is varied in focus and sensibility, in broad terms it views trauma as the delayed manifestation of a psychic wound sustained during an experience that has happened too quickly to allow registration and processing of the event at the time of its occurrence. To study trauma in literary or cultural terms, then, is to be concerned with the tension between what is known and what is not known, and with the impact and dynamics of the woundedness and machinations of trauma—not only its purely physical instantiation, but in all its reverberations. This is what brings the study of trauma to the uncertainty of truth, the impossibility of bearing absolute witness to catastrophe, the multiplicity of historical narratives.

If one were to imagine what comes after the ground-breaking work of the aforementioned scholars, it is surely not an effort to resolve the dilemmas outlined with such elegance and perspicacity by such thinkers. Rather, it would be to seek to understand the relationality of trauma. This relationality applies to the traumatic event itself—to the dynamic between knowing and not, between body and event, between event and memory. It is hardly surprising that during the 20th century, with its two world wars

and countless other conflicts, genocidal hot spots, and forging and crumbling of empires, trauma and its testimony became something of a norm. As Felman has noted, testimony is the literary mode of our times, and “our era can precisely be defined as the age of testimony.”¹⁰ Not only is trauma central to life in our age, it increasingly takes new forms, is transmitted in new ways, and has new effects. We need to consider what advanced dimensions might be brought to our understanding of trauma, and what those fresh understandings might produce.

When trauma theory emerged as a distinct mode of literary and cultural analysis in the 1990s, Felman and Laub, Caruth, LaCapra, and others drew extensively on poststructuralism and deconstruction, the dominant theoretical discourses of the time. Re-thinking psychoanalytic models of trauma through a poststructural lens enabled texts—literature, cinema, art—to be read as structurally and linguistically traumatized, rather than simply describing, directly or thematically, the experience of trauma. Arguably, it was this linking of theoretical modes that facilitated the establishment of trauma theory as a field in and of itself, emerging as a coherent critical practice grounded in the key thought of the day. Since the turn of the century, poststructuralism, while still a productive and useful mode of analysis, has ceded ground in the academy to a renewed materialism. At the forefront of this new materialism is the revitalized study of affect. This volume contends that affect theory offers productive possibilities for thinking differently about trauma.

**Affects**

For much of the 20th century, mainstream literary criticism in the west was dominated by “New Criticism,” which held that literature was to be “examined with exclusive attention to the facts of the work undistorted by the reader’s personal encounter with it.”¹¹ Likewise, the poststructural revolution was concerned solely with the pure text, but this time in terms of instabilities, linguistic play, and structures of meaning. Fragmentation, decentered narratives, disrupted binaries, marginalized terms—these and other entities made their way into the light in deconstructive analysis. Singular truth claims no longer stood, felled by the end of metanarratives—an event that found its political mirror in the collapse of the Soviet Union. But where poststructuralism reached its theoretical limit was in the
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experience of the body, the singularity within the multiplicity that is
moved by an encounter—with a text, with an other, with art or culture,
politics or experience. For example, Paul de Man’s *Allegories of
Reading*, for all its analytic brilliance and persuasive force, leaves
the encounter of body and text in the wake of his deconstructive philosophy of
textual referentiality.

It is exactly this question of encounter the “affective turn” addresses.
As Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth write, “Affect is in many
ways synonymous with force or forces of encounter.” Affect is always
about moving or being moved. Affect theory—and emotions studies—also
challenges the assumptions of both traditional psychoanalysis and
certain central tenets of poststructuralism, in particular its tendency toward
abstraction. Feminist and critical race theorists have long been at the
forefront of challenges to such assumptions and abstractions in
championing focus on the body, on specific bodies, and in particular on
those bodies most ignored, maligned and exploited, whether in social,
political or theoretical realms. Elaborated through the study of film, art,
literature, and the everyday, affect theory has been concerned with a
steadfast refusal to establish homogeneity. “Affect theory” is, in this sense,
a misnomer. Not singular, it is rather a complex, and often contradictory,
jesting of theoretical approaches, some of which existed well before the
term “affect theory” gained currency. If trauma theory is rooted in

---

13 Patricia Ticento Clough, “Introduction,” in *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the
14 Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, “An Inventory of Shimmers,” in *The
Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth (Durham, NC:
15 For an account of the study of both affect and emotion in relation to politics,
culture and the everyday, see Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (New
16 To cite just a handful of influential texts, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A
Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi
(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987); Gilles Deleuze and Felix
York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual:
Movement, Affect, Sensation*, Post-Contemporary Interventions (Durham: Duke
University Press, 2002); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect,
Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2003);
Teresa Brennan, *The Transmission of Affect* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,
2004); Silvan S. Tomkins, *Affect, Imagery, Consciousness*, 4 vols. (New York &
diverse locations, spanning industrial accidents, psychiatric interest in sexuality, the psychology of war and more, and generating a range of proto-traumatic ideas such as shell shock and railway spine syndrome, affect theory similarly boasts a multifaceted conceptual genealogy. As Gregg and Seigworth show in the introduction to *The Affect Theory Reader*, there are at least eight recognizable strands of affect, but we share their view that the two most significant are “Silvan Tomkins’s psychobiology of differential affects and Gilles Deleuze’s Spinozist ethology of bodily capacities.” 17 While the former rebels against traditional psychoanalytic thinking in establishing an alternative framework for thinking about human development and interaction, the latter focuses on the visceral and autonomic forces and capacities that constitute and transform bodies and the relations between them. 18 Broadly speaking, the essays in this volume work with understandings of affect that draw from one or both of these strands. As such, these two approaches deserve some explication.

On the first page of *The Affective Turn*, Michael Hardt names 17th century scholar Baruch Spinoza as the “philosopher who has advanced furthest the theory of the affects and whose thought is the source, either directly or indirectly, of most of the contemporary work in this field.” 19 He goes on to identify Spinoza’s challenge to the Cartesian mind/body split by way of his theory of the affects, which, in effect, posits affect as straddling the relationship between mind and body in what amounts to an affect-ethic. 20 Spinoza’s ethics refers to the increase or decrease of the power, or being-ness, of a being—that which increases being-ness is ethical; that which decreases it is unethical. Spinoza cites affect as the capacity to

---


18 For more detailed discussion on these and other approaches to affect, see Gregg and Seigworth, “An Inventory of Shimmers,” and Patricia Clough’s introduction to her edited collection *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007).


20 Ibid., x.
increase being-ness through its facilitation of perception leading to understanding and reason. Whatever decreases this capacity is unethical. He states:

Whatever so disposes the human body that it can be affected in a great many ways, or renders it capable of affecting external bodies in a great many ways, is useful to man; the more it renders the body capable of being affected in a great many ways, or of affecting other bodies, the more useful it is; on the other hand, what renders the body less capable of these things is harmful.\(^2\)

This combination of ethics and affectivity, or bodily capacity, deeply influences Deleuze’s conception of affect. For Deleuze, affect is constitutive of the body, which is the “capacity for affecting and being affected.”\(^2\) In his works on cinema, for example, Deleuze emphasizes the necessity of considering cultural artifacts in terms of encounter. The there-ness of the cinematic image—its sheer existence without the scaffolding of words—demands attention.\(^2\) One must view it and view it over time. Which is to say, one must encounter it bodily, affectively. Deleuze, along with Félix Guattari, influences the work of Brian Massumi, author of the influential essay “The Autonomy of Affect.”\(^2\) Here affect is also termed “intensity” and is considered operative as virtual. It is, writes Massumi, “something that happens too quickly to have happened.”\(^2\) Massumi defines affect as “unqualified. As such, it is not ownable or recognizable,” whereas emotion is “subjective content,” “qualified intensity” that is “owned and recognized.”\(^2\) Massumi declares that affect is “resistant to critique,” pointing out that: “It is not that there are no


\(^{26}\) Ibid., 222.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., 221.
philosophical antecedents to draw on. It is just that they aren’t the usual ones for literary and cultural studies.”28 Viewing affect in this way is to view existence as a continuum, clusters of intensity within a swirling world of changing bodies.

This neo-Spinozan view of affect as an autonomous force or intensity of relation has its counter-point in those affect theorists whose work was rooted in the study of emotions, and who responded not to the linguistic turn of deconstruction but to Freudian psychoanalysis. While the modern study of emotions might be said to begin with Charles Darwin’s *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*29 and be developed further by William James,30 it was Freud’s linking of affect to instinct and the unconscious that brought forth the concept of an autonomic bodily force within the purview of psychoanalysis. In the 1960s Silvan Tomkins re-cast affects as “the primary motivational system in human beings” and “the primitive gods within the individual.”31 While some echoed these ideas in academic contexts, such as Daniel N. Stern with his work on infant psychology, numerous authors adopted them for the burgeoning market of pop psychology, which gave rise to the proto-affective idea of “toxic shame” so prevalent in the self-help annals of the 1980s and 1990s. This trend spawned a trove of titles, and was epitomized by the John Bradshaw best-seller, *Healing the Shame That Binds You*, a book Amazon.com refers to as a “Recovery Classic.”32

Teresa Brennan, in her innovative work *The Transmission of Affect*, writes that “The term ‘affect’ is one translation of the Latin affectus, which can be translated as ‘passion’ or ‘emotion’.”33 For Brennan, then, affects “are material, physiological things” that “may be felt and taken on board by the other, depending on circumstances.”34 In this, Brennan follows Silvan Tomkins,35 who put forth a model of affect/feeling/emotion that

---

28 Ibid., 222.
30 Interestingly, James’s philosophy of perception has also significantly influenced the recent work of Massumi, further pointing to the productive dynamics to be found between differing approaches to affect and emotion. Brian Massumi, *Semblance and Event: Activist Philosophy and the Occurrent Arts* (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2011).
31 Sedgwick and Frank, *Shame and Its Sisters*, 57.
33 Ibid., *The Transmission of Affect*, 3.
34 Ibid., 6.
35 Tomkins, *Affect, Imagery, Consciousness*. 
views affect as a distinct biological, innate response to stimulus (biology/trans-cultural); while feeling is the awareness of the affect and the ability to comprehend it (psychology/subjective) and emotion is the affect/feeling filed away as memory (biography/individual history). There is a subtle distinction here between the conceptions of affect, sensation and emotion offered by Massumi, but, as a number of works in this volume demonstrate, productive possibility resides in working with both understandings of affect (and emotion). The work of Tomkins and Brennan show that affect is both specific and lived. Diverse thinkers such as Elspeth Probyn, Anna Gibbs, and Sara Ahmed\(^3\)\(^6\) tease out the more material conception of affect espoused by Tomkins in different ways, often inflecting their work with Deleuzian notions of flux in their application of theory to lived experience and real-world situations. Affect, then, is concerned with what occurs in the currents and exchanges between bodies, not just what happens within them. It is this that gives it so much potential to deepen and widen our understanding of trauma.

**Traumatic Affect**

Thinking trauma in terms of affect is not without risk. The danger of doing so lies in either translating bodily experience to whole societies and cultures on the one hand, or on the other slipping into an endless field of Deleuzian multiplicities that coalesce, cohere, then erupt, decay or drift apart. The works collected here avoid these problems by grounding both affect and trauma within specific cultural, literary, cinematic, artistic and political milieus. Each asks questions at the intersection of trauma and diverse fields and forms of affect. In terms of methodology, specific chapters tend to focus on cultural works, but the stakes are higher: such analysis works through new thinking and is rarely the limit of the possible applications of each chapter.

---

Shoshana Felman’s 1999 essay, “Benjamin’s Silence,”37 published just as the wave of affect theory was gathering strength, foreshadows the nexus of trauma and affect with which this collection is concerned. We are proud to be able to include this essay here. It is the first in this collection and the only reprint. “Benjamin’s Silence” foreshadowed the nexus of trauma and affect the other contributors take up. As such, it is something of a foundation for the chapters that follow. For Felman, Benjamin is “a thinker, a philosopher, and a narrator of the wars and revolutions of the twentieth century.” His life and writing are bound up with not only collective trauma, but also his own, particularly that which struck him silent in the wake of both the First World War and the suicide of his best friend Fritz Heinle, and of Heinle’s girlfriend. According to Felman, “Benjamin’s whole writing could be read as work of mourning, structured by a mute address to the dead face and the lost voice of the young friend who took his own life in desperate protest in the first days of the First World War.” Although she does not use the term affect explicitly, Felman reveals how Benjamin’s writings evoke trauma’s affective resonances and forces within his silences. Felman’s essay, then, prefigures the interrelation of affect and trauma with which this volume is concerned.

It is at this nexus of affect and trauma that we locate our vision of traumatic affect. There is no unitary definition of traumatic affect that can do justice to the varied approaches taken in this volume, or to the multiplicity of experiences of traumatic affect. Traumatic affect can, however, be understood as the mode, substance and dynamics of relation through which trauma is experienced, transmitted, conveyed, and represented. Traumatic affect crosses boundaries, between personal and political, text and body, screen and audience, philosophy and culture. It is not a prescriptive and contained concept, but an open one. Rather than narrowing the meaning of its constitutive terms, traumatic affect brings them into relation in dynamic and surprising ways, sometimes discovering spaces in between that refuse to conform to either.

Anna Gibbs’s essay does more than discover surprising spaces of traumatic affect; it performs them in the affective resonance between apparently unrelated events. Over the past decade, Gibbs has written compellingly on affective contagion and the notion that “bodies can catch feelings as easily as catch fire.”38 While productive work no doubt needs to be done in considering trauma in such terms, in this volume Gibbs pushes her thinking on affect in exciting new directions when she speaks to the concatenation of traumatic affect in the everyday, from European
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Concatenation: a term borrowed from formal language theory and computer programming, a word with a connection to circuitry, evoking linkages, patterns, a chain, and chain-reactions. Resonating between personal narrative and theory, Gibbs’s “Apparently Unrelated: Affective Resonance, Concatenation and Traumatic Circuitry in the Terrain of the Everyday” asks that we re-imagine what constitutes traumatic relations. Conceiving of trauma as a shattering of the complex structure of the self, something that while not ubiquitous occurs across a range of spectrums and in numerous circumstances, Gibbs explores that which is inherent to the viewing of images, the way in which something is communicated before being cognitively grasped, as a structure analogous to trauma itself. Her text enacts and evokes this affectivity, not just in moving from unrecognized affect to grasped concept but with intensities spilling over, outside the words, remaining purely affective. Chantal Akerman’s film D’Est, shot in 1991 in Paris, resonates with a traumatic academic institution, and with the act of writing her text for this collection—apparently unrelated traumas in circuit, affectively experienced.

Circuitries of trauma and affect are at the heart of Ben O’Loughlin’s careful consideration of the complex ways in which we are at once increasingly subject to the gaze of the media and more empowered as media agents. “The Mediatization of Trauma and the Trauma of Mediatization: Benjamin, Tulloch, and the Struggle to Speak” asks how the traumatic event might be brought to a new audience. O’Loughlin “explores the ways in which trauma becomes publicly present in a mediatized environment but also examines the trauma of finding oneself mediatised.” There is, he shows, an inherent tension between the news media paradigm of “stories” and the breaking of narrative that occurs in the traumatic event. After reading Benjamin’s writings on history against the contemporary media environment, O’Loughlin draws on the case of John Tulloch, communications professor and survivor of the 7/7 London bombings, to explore the process of being traumatized by mediatization, as well as how such an experience can be worked through, and agency regained. Significantly, O’Loughlin argues that “the breakdown of distinctions between mass and personal communication and between public and private creates new opportunities for ordinary citizens to mediatize trauma on their own terms.”

If the media environments of the 21st century present new challenges for both the understanding and experience of trauma, the catastrophic collective traumas of the 20th century—it’s two world wars, multiple genocides, and the struggle against colonial empires, to name a few—
presented their own distinct problems for processing trauma through visual media. While in the west Godzilla is more pop icon than serious metaphor, Aaron Kerner shows how Gojira (a closer transliteration of the Japanese name) is a crucial response to Japan’s national trauma following both the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and collapse of empire and ensuing military emasculation. In “Gojira’s Bones: The Monster as a Vessel of Affective Energy,” Aaron Kerner traces traumatized Japanese nationalism’s through the Gojira series of films, which are “a complex matrix of highly fluid historical and socio-cultural concerns.” Kerner shows how Gojira represents “the traumatic experience the Japanese people endured.” The monster, who must return to the ocean, enacts “an expulsion of what is impure, what is abject.” As the “visible manifestation of social anxiety in the face of the stranger within the national-self,” Gojira functions as an affective vessel for the “national(ist) trauma” of post-war Japan. Kerner’s careful analysis reveals how identity itself can become traumatized, and how the affects of that trauma are taken up and given shape and intensity by the Gojira series, which not only dramatizes this process, but asks viewers to experience it affectively.

Jennifer Biddle, visual anthropologist of Aboriginal art, explores this territory in relation to the Indigenous nations of Australia. In “Radical Realism and Other Possibilities in Contemporary Intercultural Indigenous Australian Cinema” Biddle takes a sharply critical look at the post-colonial establishment. Turning her attention from the central desert art so globally celebrated and coveted in recent decades, to the under-rated, under-the-radar, yet essential and vital medium of short film, Biddle shows that such films, only minutes long, “shock, stun; they hurt, humiliate; they tantalize, delight and tickle.” She adds that, “Their effectiveness / affectiveness resides in their very troubling of the supposed distinction between the drama taking place on the screen and the experience incited in viewer response.” Drawing on Laura Marks’s conception of “intercultural cinema,” Biddle teases the political out of the personal in four short films that straddle worlds black and white and in-between. These celluloid snapshots of traumatic affect stretch across generations, harking back to pre-invasion bonds and traditions while simultaneously portraying present-day realities, both fractured and cunning. And in the background of these films and Biddle’s analysis of them looms the “Apology,” the history that gave rise to it, and the policies and practices currently part of the Northern Territory Intervention for which, perhaps, some as-yet-unknown Prime Minister of the future may be called upon to apologize.

An in-depth consideration of traumatic affect asks questions such as: what are the affective operations, aftershocks and echoes of a traumatic
Introduction: At the Nexus

What implications and potential does affect have for our understanding of trauma as a social force? What are its limitations? Where does a radical revisioning of the substance of social relations leave us? What is trauma in a poststructural world? What recourse is there from the failure of language, when language is everything? Affect allows exploration of the prospect that trauma may not be inherently, or merely, a discreet subjective experience, but rather it might primarily be a cultural and transgenerational operation. Exploration at the nexus of trauma and affect is nothing less than an attempt to guide trauma theory into brave new territory, territory that makes it possible to consider trauma beyond cognition and language, beyond the individual and the collective, and even beyond the human.

Several chapters in this volume stretch the nexus in each of these ways, among them Jonathan L. Knapp’s “Where the Buffalo No Longer Roam: Affect and Allegory in The Last Hunt and The Last Buffalo Hunt.” Rarely does writing on trauma consider the non-human, and in his bid to do so Knapp examines the interplay of affect and allegory in depictions of animal death in the American west. Both films use footage of real buffalo slaughters, serving “to elicit affect and to allegorize the traumatic history of violence—against animals, Native Americans, and the land itself—that haunts the Western landscape.” Drawing on both Benjamin and Deleuze, Knapp shows how the doubling layers of allegories are given an affective intensity by time-images of death, decay, and meat, and holds the attention of the audience such that “the viewer feels the suffering of the animal and reacts to it viscerally—with shudders of physical disgust, flashes of rage and agony, and waves of grief.” Histories of trauma—the death and dispossession of native populations, the slaughter of buffalo, the reshaping of landscapes—are affectively allegorized. Watching, we cannot help but be both implicated in trauma, and made viscerally aware of our mortality.

Intricate relations between natural disaster, philosophy, literature, and individual experience are the subject of Karyn Ball’s contribution to this volume, “The Earthquake after Kant’s Lisbon: ‘Visceral Reason’ in Kleist’s Precarious Modernity.” Ball shows how trauma is not limited in transmission between individuals or within collectives. Rather, trauma can be affectively charged across events and texts, philosophies and experiences, fiction and theory. Where the Lisbon earthquake had rocked the metaphysical world of Kant and his generation, Kleist felt its aftershock within philosophy and the revolutionary upheavals of his time. In Ball’s reading, trauma ripples affectively through texts and bodies and societies, manifesting in the visceral, over-spilling reason that dooms social relations in Kleist’s novellas. As Ball shows, “Kleistean violence
Meera Atkinson and Michael Richardson

attests to an *inescapably volatile affective economy*, which pre-empts a social contract that enlists emotional control while ensnaring Kleist’s rationalistic protagonists in nasty, brutish, and foreshortened fates.” Tracing the web of relations between Kantian philosophy, the Lisbon earthquake, social contract theory, and Kleist’s own trauma, Ball finds in his fiction a visceral awareness of the fragile existence that derives from trust in the habits and conventions of both the state and civility.

Meera Atkinson also addresses political, historical, and textual movements across time, space and spheres in her examination of trauma via theories of “hauntology.” In her account of a poetics that reaches past cognition, the individual, and the human, Atkinson argues that texts and practices of writing can be spooked by the traumas of previous generations and specifically what she calls “trans-trauma”—the transgenerational transmission of trauma—can thereby stand as testimony beyond subjective trauma. Reflecting on her own creative practice in her essay “Channeling the Specter and Translating Phantoms: Hauntology and the Spooked Text,” Atkinson shows how such writing is “not simply about trauma, but rather it is writing that embodies its subjective and cultural processes.” Following Derrida, Atkinson argues that traumatic affect—particularly grief and shame—can be brought to consciousness through an active process of textual engagement, one that renders the neither-past-nor-present quality constitutive of trauma into literature. She performs “a Derridean inflected reading of the psychoanalytic phantom that subverts the impulse toward interrogation in favor of a kind of experiential witnessing” which, she claims, is a central objective of the poetics of trans-trauma. In this sense, embodied affect is what enables that quality of trauma that remains unknowable and outside language to be spectrally evoked within the haunted text.

Traumatic affect thus encompasses the rich and dense territory between trauma and affect and the potential of as yet untapped discoveries, as well as the productive tensions between trauma and affect theories. But traumatic affect opens up more portals than those in the study of literature, cinema, and culture. What we need—and what this collection proposes—are ways of thinking about trauma that work with the uncertainty and instability inherent in the contemporary fluidity and proliferation of trauma, rather than looking for fixity or cohesive, cognitive representation. Clearly, there are no easy answers, yet grapple with these questions we must, not just in the journals of academic publications and the arts, but in countless everyday situations and in the streets.

Ricardo Mbarkho’s chapter, “Trauma Stimulated Art, or the Embodiment of Affect in Lebanon: An Allegory,” departs from academic
discourse to offer a glimpse into life on one such avenue. Mbarkho’s depiction of Beirut’s bustling and conflicted art community grounds the nexus of trauma and affect in lived experience and in the daily lives of traumatized and affected societies. It is, as the title suggests, an allegorical exploration of trauma, art and affect in post-civil war Lebanon. Through two figures symbolic of the deeply entrenched political tensions in the Lebanese art world, Mbarkho meditates on the complex interplay of art, funding, cultural politics, and societal and personal trauma. Mbarkho describes the Beirut art world as occupying a difficult liminal space: of necessity concerned with the traumatic aftermath of war, but at risk of being co-opted as political propaganda. This tricky position means that “for art to negotiate trauma it sometimes needs to mutate into other kinds of art that can exist in a traumatized society without compromise.” That project has led to art that embodies “the residual traumatic affect” of the country’s violent histories.

Writing traumatic violence also presents distinct challenges to creative practice, particularly when that violence is torture, the pain of which is frequently understood as not simply beyond language, but destroying language. Michael Richardson’s speculative essay, “Torturous Affect: Writing and the Problem of Pain,” contemplates how affect theory might open new ways of understanding the relationship between pain, language, and the act of writing. Bringing the work of Massumi and Tomkins on affect into dialogue with trauma theory, Richardson suggests that the temporal aspect of trauma, both the latency inherent in the traumatic event itself and the passing of time in its aftermath, provide a way of writing pain beyond language. Writing to evoke an affective semblance rather than direct representation might enable fiction to gesture past the page and, in doing so, to express both the instance and aftermath of world-destroying pain.

Another way to think about the communication of trauma beyond language (indeed at the point of language’s very failure) is to consider the body itself and in particular its gestures from within silence. In her chapter “‘Un Petit Geste’: Affect and Silence in Claude Lanzmann’s Shoah” Magdalena Zolkos brings the corporeality of affect to bear on one of the most oft-analyzed traumatic representations, Lanzmann’s epic film about the Holocaust. Focusing on the single scene in which the hairdresser Bomba tells his story, Zolkos shows how existing interpretations tend to “either overlook the rich non-verbal semiotics of Bomba’s testimony’s, which include silence, gesturality, movement, and other forms of bodily expression, or to regard them as indicative of trauma’s non-representability and as the breakdown of meaning.” Drawing on Giorgio
Agamben’s essays on gesture, Zolkos shows that what occurs within silence and narrative collapse is not so much un-representable, as outside language. It is, in a word, affective. Zolkos proposes the notion of “testimonial gesturality” as a response to the apparently unbridgeable divide between knowing and not. When language fails for Bomba, gesture both performs that failure and compensates for the “unavailability or inaccessibility of traumatic memories, and the aporias of narrativization and recollection.”

Anne Rutherford engages a similar problematic in her consideration of the “enunciative present,” when she seeks to “understand filmic affect in trauma-related work within an ethics of address.” Where Zolkos is concerned with gesture and affect as a way of understanding “unspeaking” or “un-narratable” silences, in “Film, Trauma and the Enunciative Present” Rutherford is interested in the complex affectivity of witnessing trauma, particularly from a position removed from the experience itself. Identifying intensities of affect and narrative, or somatics and semantics, “as dimensions of film through which affect can draw spectators into a heightened sensory-affective engagement can enable ways to explore how these elements are deployed across a range of film genres that address experiences of trauma.” Elaborating her theoretical propositions through analysis of Bashu, an Iranian drama, and A Poet: Unconcealed Poetry, an Indonesian film, Rutherford calls for an ethical approach to the act of translating trauma into language, whether visual or verbal.

As even this brief movement through the essays collected here reveals, this volume does not pretend to offer a cohesive approach to traumatic affect. Far from it. Their diverse approaches to both affect and trauma, the degree to which their theorizing is implicit or explicit, conceptualized or allegorized, speaks to the multiplicities to which trauma is open, both inside the clinic and beyond it. The scholars gathered together in this volume grapple in diverse ways with the intersection of two theoretical fields, between subject, image, and text, in considering whether affect theory can account for, or move beyond, the unrepresentability of the traumatic event. They consider circuitries within and between affect and trauma, suggesting previously uncharted ways of thinking about testimony and witnessing and asking how trauma and affect might offer insight into creative practice. They question how the anti-essentialist currents in affect theory and their conception of a relational subject might potentially undermine certain presuppositions of trauma theory and how the ethical imperatives of trauma might require a rethinking of aspects of affect theory.
These essays, almost all original, are interdisciplinary in their theoretical positioning and range of topics. The collection’s contributions come from Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Lebanon and Australia. Its contributors are writers and artists, curators and political theorists, film critics and art theorists. As such, we trust that this book will interest scholars and students studying affect and trauma theory, as well as researchers of trauma in creative practice, cinema, art, literature and philosophy at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels. At “Trauma: Writing, Art, and Affect,” a public symposium we convened in Sydney in April 2011, we were inspired by the enthusiastic engagement of the multi-disciplinary and diverse audience, which included psychotherapists and a refugee caseworker. Judging by the keen interest expressed by these front liners of trauma, we expect that the volume may also prove useful for therapists and others working with traumatized people, particularly those professionals with an interest in trauma in relation to the creative arts. As creative practitioners ourselves, we believe firmly in theory and philosophy having an impact on both life and art. Our passion for this volume arose from the productive possibilities we each encountered in the harnessing of trauma and affect theory in our own creative practice. It is our hope that others might find a similar utility of this collection of essays—some way of bringing the insights of theory to life as artists and perhaps even in creative ways in non-artistic contexts.

Traumatic Affect is an exploration of the impact of trauma upon lives at all strata of society. The following chapters consider the productive and problematic tensions at the nexus of the fields of affect and trauma, and their interest in irreducible experience, embodiment, and events. While trauma and affect continues to independently offer crucial insights into both individual and collective experience, an exploration of the productive tension between these two fields develops new textual analyses and theoretical approaches that are both timely and necessary.
PART I:

SILENCE
CHAPTER ONE

BENJAMIN’S SILENCE

SHOSHANA FELMAN

Nothing more desolating than his acolytes, nothing more godforsaken than his adversaries. No name that would be more fittingly honored by silence.

—Walter Benjamin, “One-Way Street”

“Expect from me no word of my own. Nor should I be capable of saying anything new; for in the room where someone writes the noise is so great. … Let him who has something to say step forward and be silent!”

—Karl Krauss, quoted by Walter Benjamin

Conversation strives toward silence, and the listener is really the silent partner. The speaker receives meaning from him; the silent one is the unappropriated source of meaning.

—Walter Benjamin, “The Metaphysics of Youth”


3 Benjamin, “The Metaphysics of Youth,” trans. Rodney Livingstone, Selected Writings, 6; hereafter abbreviated as “MY.”