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Abstract

In the eight years since its opening, thousands of visitors have made their way to the detention facilities at JTF Guantánamo to inspect the site. Whether journalist, politician, aid worker or senior military staff, these visitors (and the members of the public who access the site through JTF-Guantánamo’s ‘virtual tour’ available on its website) are invited to view the ‘modern’ amenities and ‘humane’ way that detainees are being treated by the US military (Pentagon Channel, 2008). Central to these tours and to communicating this message is a visit to Guantánamo’s ‘Tour Cell’ where detainee uniforms and ‘comfort items’ are neatly laid out, and to the detainee hospital where force feedings take place. In other words, the US military uses these tours and the objects that are showcased within them to help constitute and embody subject positions within the competition over the definition of the site in the wider war on terror discourse. By drawing on theories of material culture and spectacle, the complex processes at Guantánamo that work to constitute identities in the Global War on Terror for those ‘outside the wire’, nationally and internationally, are understood as founded in material practices. Guantánamo cannot be understood without material ‘things’, without a materiality of politics.

Introduction: Expo Guantánamo

In March 2009, Miss Universe 2008, Dayana Mendoza, along with Miss USA 2008, Crystie Stewart, were invited by the United Service Organisations (USO) to visit the US Naval base and Joint Task Force-Guantánamo (the specially constructed detention facilities for prisoners of the Global War on Terror). Since 1941, the USO shows and
celebrities have been entertaining the US military, delivering a ‘special brand of comfort, morale and recreational services to the military’ (USO, 2009) and a ‘touch of home’ for those operating abroad (Coffey, 1991). In keeping with the traditions of this long-standing relationship between the USO and the Miss Universe pageant, Mendoza and Stewart spent their 5-day visit meeting military personnel and signing autographs. During their stay, however, they were also offered a tour of the detention facilities, riding around the camp, encircled as it is by barbed wire fences, a minefield and watchtowers, to see the facilities (Fletcher, 2009). In her blog of the experience, Mendoza recorded her impression of her tour:

This week, Guantánamo!!! It was an incredible experience...It was a looooot of fun!... We also met the Military dogs, and they did a very nice demonstration of their skills. All the guys from the Army were amazing with us. We visited the Detainees camps and we saw the jails, where they shower, how the(y) recreate themselves with movies, classes of art, books... It was very interesting I didn’t want to leave [the base], it was such a relaxing place, so calm and beautiful (Mendoza, March 27 2009).

While Miss Universe’s and Miss USA’s visit renewed a short-lived debate over the rights of the detainees not to be paraded for “public curiosity” under the Geneva Conventions,¹ their visit was nevertheless only one of the dozens of celebrities visits to Guantánamo in 2008 and 2009 alone, and one of hundreds of similar tours that have been organised for visitors since the facility opened in 2002. Encouraged by the US military and the White House as part of the U.S. administration’s public relations campaign associated with the Global War on Terrorism (GWoT), journalists, military analysts, congressional representatives, senior military officers, leading U.S. health care

---

¹ Two days after the story of their visit went international, her blog was pulled by the Miss Universe pageant organisers (MacKey, 2009).
professionals, foreign dignitaries and politicians\(^2\), in addition to celebrities have
tavelled to the site/sight for the opportunity to peer ‘inside the wire’. From
congressional representatives to journalism students (Doran, 2009), the U.S. military has
expended considerable resources and effort to create and manage the tours of JTF-
Guantánamo which begs the question why, and with what implications for our
understandings of the GWoT; why, when and how were spectators - politicians,
journalists, and members of the public, for example - invited to look ‘inside the wire’ of
Guantánamo?

My aim with this paper is therefore to present a better understanding of how
these tourist practices – and specifically the materiality of them – produce meaning in
the contest over Guantánamo, and is part of a wider project which aims to understand
how material practices associated with Guantánamo, as part of a wider discourse,
produce meaning. What I argue is that the efforts of the US military to produce this
simulation and spectacle of detention, which relies on the material, and invite elite
visitors (tourists) to view it, Guantánamo not only has been constructed in a deliberate
way (as ‘safe, humane, legal, transparent’, the motto of JTF-Guantánamo), but that this
materiality has been used to shift the meaning of these construction themselves (to
produce a new reality of what it means to be safe, humane, legal, transparent for
detention). The materiality of the spectacle of detention constructs a new reality with
important consequences for the way that Guantánamo is understood both domestically
and internationally.

In short, aside from Guantánamo being significant politically because of the
violence carried out at the site (Isin and Rygiel, 2007); its ‘exceptional’ status and
justification with regards to international law (Aradau, 2007; Gregory, 2006; Neal, 2006;
Johns, 2005; Michaelsen and Shershov, 2004;); the damage done to the human rights
reputation of the U.S. (Hajjar, 2003); the new developments in U.S. military detention
practices; the vast amounts of money spent and military resources used at the facility;
Guantánamo matters because of the ways in which the material of detention has been
consciously used to support a broader discourse in the GWoT; specifically the
redefinition of detention, as well as of what it means to be safe, humane, legal and
transparent, as well as to torture, has occurred through this materialisation of the
spectacle of detention. Therefore, to explore this materiality I look more closely at the
elements that are central to the tour of Guantánamo and the ways in which these are
articulated to a particular construction of Guantánamo: from the ‘tour cells’ used to the
visit to the disused Camp X-Ray. I turn first, however, to the way in which Guantánamo
represents one of the latest developments in the Bush administration’s ‘infowar’
approach to the GWoT.

\(^2\) On September 20, 2006, UK members of the Foreign Affairs Committee visited Guantánamo (the first
public visit by non-U.S. national parliamentarians) (House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, 2007).
Guantánamo as ‘Message Force Multiplier’

To begin with, Guantánamo has been promoted in an unprecedented way as part of the Bush administration’s management of the information and presentation of the GWoT, with tours used in particular as a key way to ‘set the record straight’ and address criticisms levelled at the U.S. military detention system (JTF-Guantánamo Commander Jay Hood as cited by Sidoti, 2005). In contrast to other detention facilities in the GWoT, such as Camp Bucca in Iraq or Bagram in Afghanistan, Guantánamo maintained a relatively closed visitation programme - families are not permitted to visit under any circumstances, while journalists, International Committee of the Red Cross aid workers and lawyers must go through an elaborate and lengthy application and screening process1 – yet it was simultaneously developed as a national-security tourism hotspot for elite tourists. In the first three years of operation alone, the US military permitted 77 U.S. Representatives, 11 US Senators, 99 congressional staffers and over 1,000 journalists to take part in VIP and media tours of the facilities (JTF-Guantánamo, 2008; Dillon, 2005).

This steady stream of visitors, which began alongside the much publicised opening of Camp X-Ray in January 2002, has continued over the years, such that, by 2009, 100 visitor groups were organised that year alone to tour the facility and meet service personnel, in addition to the hundreds of media who travelled to Guantánamo annually to report on the site (Heusdens, 2009). Specially devised teams were developed to manage these tours, the Joint Visitors Bureau of JTF Guantánamo, along with specific protocols for dealing with tourists. Meanwhile, the tailored tour package expanded to encapsulate new features, including, most recently, the new supermaximum prison facilities of Camps 5 and 6, Camp Justice (the site of the military commissions), as well as to take in the disused Camp X-Ray (JTF-Guantánamo, 2008).4

To that end, from the first day that the facility opened, one after another, Congressional delegations and other official visitors arrived at Guantánamo. Nearly every day, government VIPs, military personnel, journalists, and intelligence officials from the U.S. and abroad arrived for tours of the facility (Greenberg, 2009, p. 90). Their visits were so numerous that staff at Guantánamo “called these official visitors “looky-look,” or “looky-los”” (Greenberg, 2009, p. 90). Moreover, with the numbers of visitors

---

1 Military officials permit families to visit Camp Bucca and Abu Ghraib by appointment, providing access to a specialised visitor centre, while at Bagram a video-linkup between detainees and family is available. For a lawyer’s perspective on the challenges of accessing the site see Gorman, 2009 and Stafford Smith, 2007.

4 A special website was also established for JTF-Guantánamo. Curious members of the public are welcome to tour Joint Task Force Guantánamo (JTF-GTMO) through its new ‘Virtual Visit’ gateway on the JTF-GTMO website. As advertised, “seeing ‘inside the wire’” or taking a look “behind the scenes” (JTF Guantánamo Public Affairs, 2008) is no longer limited to members of the accredited press or congressional representatives, but for all curious eyes tempted to engage in a little light Schadenfreude. As described: This Virtual Visit is designed to give you the viewer a feel for what it is like to be a visiting journalist on a media tour. The camps... are ordered for viewing just as you would proceed in person. At the end of your journey, you will see the original Guantánamo detention facility, Camp X-Ray, which was only in use from January through April 2002, and other highlights of U.S. Naval Station Guantánamo Bay, Cuba (JTF Guantánamo Public Affairs, 2008).
and the decision to require that all visitors be accompanied, ‘shepherding them became a time-consuming occupation, not to say preoccupation, of the staff’ (Greenberg, 2009, p. 90). As U.S. Congressman James Moran described of the tour:

It was a professional tour – a well-conducted tour. But you would expect that, given the number of members of Congress and Senators and reporters that tour Guantánamo... More people go to Guantánamo than they do to most international resorts (Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), cited in Allen, 2005).

By August 2005, at the height of the controversy surrounding Guantánamo, in one summer, 49 congressional representatives ‘accompanied by dozens of staff members’, as part of 14 ‘codels’, had visited Guantánamo, while 6 separate tours were put on for dozens of retired military officers who worked as media military analysts. Guantánamo, on the fringes of the GWoT, became a favourite field trip and required visit for anyone who was anyone.

Explicitly, the tours were justified as part of the obligation of the U.S. military and Bush administration to operate in a transparent manner: ‘Arguably, no detention facility in the history of warfare has been more transparent or received more scrutiny than Guantánamo,’ said Rumsfeld (CNN, 2005).

The situation in Guantanamo Bay has been looked at by literally hundreds of journalists, by hundreds of members of the United States House and Senate, by the International Committee for the Red Cross, which has been there since the outset, and has in fact physically been located there during much of the period. Uniformly people who go there come away saying that it is being handled in a highly professional manner and that the treatment that’s being provided people in Guantanamo Bay is excellent (Rumsfeld as cited in Haxton, 2005).

So, while lawyers struggled over the years to gain access to clients, journalists and human rights organisations (including the UN and Amnesty International) were denied access to detainees, and concerns were expressed over forced feeding of hunger striking detainees and the ‘profound isolation’ of high-value detainees, many amongst key lawmakers, media personalities, and families of 9/11 victims toured the facilities at Guantánamo and declared it transparent and legal, humane and safe (safer than supermaximum prison on U.S. soil at least) based on what was witnessed and reported from these tours. Eight years on these tours are still going on, and have become such a fixture of the site that celebrity visits are commonplace: hence Miss Universe and Miss USA in March 2009.

Guantánamo is therefore an example of how the Bush administration has used Public Relations strategies as message ‘force multipliers’ in its attempts to manage the war both internationally and domestically. As with the control over the photographs of Guantánamo (Van Veeren, forthcoming), these tours are part of a new development in the U.S. military’s approach to war, one that favours greater control over the production and circulation of information about (including imagery of) the war, and therefore over its representation; what James Der Derian has described as an ‘infowar’ approach (Der
Within this infowar, the U.S. state uses technology and its control over information in order to achieve ‘information dominance’ and therefore win ‘the epistemic battle for reality’ in the GWoT in which the meaning of Guantánamo, and by extension of the U.S.’s identity is itself at stake (Der Derian, 2001). From the early days of the GWoT it was understood that Guantánamo, and specifically the tours themselves, would be part of this construction, and where, with regards to detention, after the failings to ‘read the signs’ of Camp X-Ray and anticipate international backlash, the Bush administration and U.S. military began working to shift perceptions of U.S. military detention practices, maintaining that Guantánamo, as the show piece detention facility, was humane and transparent in its dealings with ‘enemy combatants’. The ‘people there are being treated far better than they expected to be treated by any other government on Earth,’ according to Vice President Dick Cheney (Porteus, 2005).

However, while the promotion of the tours and their role in the production of a representation of Guantánamo as transparent was important, the content and practice of these tours was essential in helping to (re)define the meaning of Guantánamo. The material of the tours and the practices associated with them, beyond and in addition to the linguistic articulations, were essential in (re)constituting Guantánamo. In particular, the tours of Guantánamo were designed to redefine several material objects and spaces that have been at the heart of the controversy surrounding the site/sight: including the infamous orange jumpsuit, but also the military commissions system, and the controversies surrounding hunger striking and forced feeding as will be discussed. What the materialities of Guantánamo do, is two-fold: on one level the tourists see their tours as ‘making it real’ through their tourist practice and material encounter; but more importantly, the materiality of Guantánamo as controlled by the state therefore also works to constitute a specific reality of Guantánamo by articulating a discursive constructions with a material counterpart: Guantánamo is not only humane, but this is what humane looks like; Guantánamo is not only legal, this is what legality looks like. The U.S. state has used materialities to call forth these realities; Guantánamo matters in its materiality. It is with this in mind that I turn to a more detailed examination of the tours and their essential components.

The Spectacle: Guantánamo the Tour

Within two weeks of Camp X-Ray opening at Guantánamo, Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld made the journey from Washington to the detention facility as a follow-up ‘public relations maneuver’ (Greenberg, 2009, p. 117). His press conference held on

---

5 ‘In its most basic and material form, infowar is an adjunc of conventional war, in which command and control of the battlefield is augmented by computers, communications, and intelligence. At the next remove, infowar is a supplement of military violence, in which information technologies are used to further the defeat of a foreign opponent and the support of a domestic population. In its purest, most immaterial form, infowar is warring without war, an epistemic battle for reality in which opinions, beliefs, and decisions are created and destroyed by a contest of networked information and communication systems.’ (Der Derian, 2001).
January 22, 2002, days after the release of the first set of images from Camp X-Ray, had not been enough to allay growing concerns that US military forces were treating detainees inhumanely. Rumsfeld’s personal visit on January 27, 2002 would also help counter claims that his information of the site was ‘second-hand’. In other words, his visit would help to add credibility to his claims, both to journalists, and to those within the administration with whom he was still fighting over how to classify detainees. ‘For Rumsfeld, there was political capital to be gained by a well-staged visit to the detention facility’ (Greenberg, 2009, p 120).

Accompanying Rumsfeld was General Myers, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Major General Gary Speer, acting head of SOUTHCOM, as well as a congressional delegation (a ‘codel’) made up of four invited senators, all of whom were members of either the Senate Appropriation Committee or the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and therefore in key decision-making roles for funding the larger and more permanent facilities that were to become Camp Delta (Greenberg, 2009, p. 119; Rumsfeld, 2002a; 2002b): Senators Diane Feinstein (D-CA), Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX), Ted Stevens (R-AK), and Daniel Inouye (D-HI). Over the course of their two-and-a-half hours at the site, Rumsfeld, along with the senators, ‘viewed the cells in which the [158] detainees were sitting or standing and made a general tour of the facilities, including the medical facilities’ (Greenberg, 2009, p. 119). During the press conference following the tour, the third of the day, ‘Rumsfeld and the senators noted that they didn’t speak to the detainees and the detainees didn’t speak to them’ (Gilmore, 2002a). The visit was in essence ‘a political tour of the base, shaking hands with everyone he could, listening, and observing.’ Rumsfeld ‘made it clear that he was essentially there for the photo op, the extension of the press conference from earlier that week’ as a ‘symbolic show of support for Guantánamo’s future’ (Greenberg,
2009, p. 119). He was there less to see, then to be seen, to add to his credibility and therefore shape the narrative of Guantánamo. Back in Washington, Senator Inouye in particular followed up his visit with his own press conference to reinforce the message that the treatment was humane, and in so doing, like all the visitors that day, adding credibility to his own perspective with this first hand touring experience.

Rumsfeld and the senators’ visit on January 27th was not the first ‘codel’ visit however. Two days earlier, 22 congressional representatives and 3 senators, in four separate delegations, made the trip (Rosenberg, January 26, 2002). In tours ranging in length from 20 minutes (Senator James Inhofe (R-OKLA) to 45 minutes, the Congressional delegates and their staff (numbering 60-70) toured inside the wire mesh compound. Representative John Doolittle (R-CA) even ‘sported a pith helmet against the sultry midday heat’ (Rosenberg, 2002a). As they toured, the delegates stared into the cages, at least two members carrying home-style video cameras. Some detainees stared at the visitors, some ‘ignored the tours and were in prayer’, while others appeared to be ‘shielding their faces with military-issue white towels’ (Rosenberg, 2002a). At one point during the tour:

several members said, a commander stood House members in front of a cell and identified an Australian inmate [David Hicks] inside as the one who threatened to kill an American before leaving Guantánamo Bay... ‘He was right there, front and center. We just all gave him the evil eye,’ said Florida Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, one of 21 Republicans.

In separate tours, members of the media would meet dignitaries from the Joint Task Force and get the ‘full treatment as part of a routine reporting delegation -- two stops at Camp X-Ray, an inspection of prisoners being treated at the tented M*A*S*H-style hospital, lunch at McDonalds and a ride-along with a Coast Guard port security unit’ (Rosenberg, February 25, 2002). In the first 42 days of Camp X-Ray, 195 journalists and crews visited the JTF Guantánamo facilities. By October, 600 journalists from 22 countries had visited (Upano, 2002, p. 43).

By the time Guantánamo’s Camp X-Ray was almost full with 300 detainees and was no longer front-page news in the US, the tours from Washington VIPs dropped off

---

6 In the press conference following the visit, Rumsfeld indicated that his visit was to say thank to the troops: ‘I was asked why I was coming down here today. Was I coming down to check and make sure that everything was being done properly? I said no. I wasn’t. That I knew it was being done properly. It had been from the beginning. The men and women here doing this job are people who went to our high schools and our grammar schools who are responsible, they’re properly trained, properly led, and have been doing a first-rate job. I came down to say thank you’ (Rumsfeld, 2002c).

7 In fact, even before the official and media visits were permitted, senior lawyers from DoD, the military and the State Department – ‘the War Council’ – travelled to Guantánamo on January 15, 2002 to see the conditions of detention that they were seeking to justify under the Bush administration (Greenberg, 2009, p 91).
somewhat (Rosenberg, 2002b). Nevertheless the tours continued, some higher profile than others, with an established format.8

Visitors got to see the detainees in their open-air cells, with [various] staffers available to provide a running commentary. They were also allowed to observe the daunting Immediate Reaction Force [guards equipped with riot gear], ready to nip dangerous outbursts or rebellions in the bud... There for all to see were the cages, mute[d] prisoners, open urination and defecation, cement floors, and exotic accoutrements, isomats (foam pads), prayer beads, and truncated toothbrushes, proof of the unfamiliar and less than human nature of the inmates (Greenberg, 2009, p. 91).

With the move to Camp Delta and the transfer of detainees, the tours continued, albeit with less fanfare. Journalists continued to visit the site taking part in tours that ran almost weekly, though reporting greater and greater restrictions on their access - the green tarp encircling Camp Delta now hid detainees from view, while military ‘minders’ (‘tour guides’) increasingly interfered with interviews, ‘coaching’ or restricting the access of journalists to military personnel or civilian contractors working on the base (Upano, 2002, p. 43). The U.S. military began to control these tours more tightly, forbidding any deviation from the tour, adhering more closely to key messages, implementing new media policies and contracts for visiting journalists for example, and excluding those that violated the rules, as Vivian White and the BBC team from Panorama experienced in 2003 (White, 2003).

Most importantly, as criticism of Guantánamo increased both domestically and abroad, the tours of Guantánamo increased: following Amnesty International’s criticism of Guantánamo as the ‘gulag of our times’ in their May 2005 Annual Report on human rights (Norton-Taylor, 2005), increased calls for the establishment of independent commission akin to the 9/11 Commission (Allen, 2005), international riots of alleged abuses of the Qur’an by Guantánamo guards, and coinciding with the largest hunger strike yet to be carried out by detainees, President Bush responded with an invitation to Congress and journalists to ‘take a firsthand look’ at the site. Within days ‘weekly pilgrimages’ by ‘first-time’ congressional visitors bringing staff members and select reporters on specially arranged military aircraft from Andrews Air Force Base near Washington’ began. By August 2005, 49 congressional representatives ‘accompanied by dozens of staff members’, as part of 14 ‘codels’, had visited Guantánamo over the summer, not to mention a visit by the Miami Chief of Police (Rosenberg, 2005b).9

---

8 For example, Air Force Lt. Gen. John Campbell, Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Military Support at the CIA arrived on February 21, and on March 16, 2002, nine members of the House subcommittee on military construction visited to view plans for the construction of the $16 million Camp Delta with space to hold 2,040 detainees (Ottey, 2002), but neither groups choose to speak to the media.

9 Miami Police Chief John Timoney joined the Southern Command chief, Army Gen. Bantz Craddock, as he escorted GOP Sens. Chuck Hagel and Pat Roberts on a July 9 tour. His deputy, Frank Fernandez, joined Craddock a few weeks later, when the general went to Cuba for a Senate Armed Services Committee tour. Timoney and Fernandez each got a round-trip ride from Miami to the base aboard the general’s executive
Throughout all this, the tour format of Guantánamo had been established and a routine for elite visitors had developed. Through the numerous accounts of visits to Guantánamo over the years (see for example Rosenberg, 2005b), the tours were often similarly constructed with the explicit message that it was ‘safe, humane, legal and transparent’. The tours therefore came to include:

- a slide-show pre-briefing by the JTF commander, which serves to frame the visit and the sights/sites;
- a drive by the tutelary architecture which helped to communicate safety;
- a visits to Camp Justice, to communicate its legality;
- a ‘windshield tour’ of the base and the Camps aboard an air-conditioned minibus;
- a longer stop at the showcase Camp 4 where conditions are closer to POW camp conditions at specified by the Geneva Conventions;
- an opportunity to step into the specially designated tour cells;
- in some cases, a glimpse of an interrogation through a closed-circuit video monitor;
- a taste of food provided to detainees during lunch at the Cafe Caribe mess hall;
- a view of the sterility of the medical facilities, even a view of the force feeding equipment, for an understanding of Guantánamo’s humane-ness;
- a visit to the abandoned Camp X-Ray to reinforce the message that the reality of Guantánamo is a more modern facility;
- and finally, each important visitor received ‘complimentary Guantánamo Bay ball caps; a flag that flew over the base, folded triangularly and packed in a special case; and a souvenir DVD film of his or her visit’, the cost of which was not disclosed by the military (Rosenberg, 2005b).

These elements of the tour, as discussed in greater detail next, and their materiality were central to the U.S. military’s message, along with the ways in which they were used to support the (re)constitution of Guantánamo.

A briefing with JTF Guantánamo personnel.

To start with, before going ‘inside the wire’, visitors were briefed by JTF Guantánamo staff. In the case of VIPs, these briefings were often conducted by very senior personnel from the facility, including by the serving commander of JTF-Guantánamo (Greenberg, 2007), or by senior officers such as four-star General, Army Gen. Bantz J. Craddock, commander of the U.S. Southern Command responsible for military operations in the Caribbean and in Central and South America, who was reported to have ‘cleared his calendar and flew down from Miami to show the lawmakers around for six hours’ (Allen, 2005). These briefs often included a short description of the history of the detention facility (Levant, 2007) and an overview of the

jet, their first-ever visits there, then Timoney went on national television to vouch for prisoners’ conditions’ (Rosenberg, August 16, 2005).
mission, and were described as surprisingly ‘open’ and with a willingness to answer all questions (House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, 2007, p. 10). As Dr. Pedro Ruiz, the President of the American Psychiatric Association, described of his initial briefing:

‘the briefers told us that all detainees had been arrested while committing terrorist acts against the United States and that the detainees were accused of being terrorist trainers, bomb makers, Osama bin Laden bodyguards, would-be suicide bombers, and terrorist financiers. Military briefers told us that two of the terrorism financiers contributed nearly $200 million to the preparation and execution of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Military officials also said that some of the detainees who were released from Camp Delta have returned to their terrorist activities (Ruiz, 2007).

The emphasis of these briefings was therefore that Guantánamo contained ‘the worst of the worst’ but that it was a professionally run facility, that Guantánamo bore ‘no resemblance’ to how it is portrayed in the press, that Guantánamo was a continuing source of vital information, that there was no torture at Guantánamo, and, most importantly, that the guards were dedicated and doing ‘an extremely tough job’ with the dangerous detainees who continually abuse guards. At the heart of this briefing was the message that all detainees are dangerous terrorists and their guilt, and therefore their danger, is not in question.

Visiting journalists in the first few weeks of Guantánamo in particular were also introduced to Navy Chaplain Abuhena Saifulislam, or Saif, an American of Bangladeshi origin and one of only two Muslim chaplains in the U.S. Navy. ‘As soon as they could, the JTF command staff introduced the chaplain to the press.’ Saif ‘lent more credibility to our claims of … doing the right thing’ (Steve Cox, former Public Affairs Officer JTF 160, as cited by Karen Greenberg, 2009, p. 140). ‘The press would often repeat his press conferences and interviews verbatim … the press did not call these accounts into question’ (Greenberg, 2009, p. 141).

In other cases during these briefings, visitors were presented with confidential briefings on the evidence being used to hold certain detainees as proof of the danger that detainees pose: ‘We had FBI interviews, I actually sat down and examined the evidence they’re going to use at trial with prosecutors. It was very detailed’ reported retired Judge and Fox News commentator Andrew Napolitano (Napolitano, 2006; Stimson, 2006). These briefings with members of staff were an essential part of establishing the credibility of the site as they provided an important linguistic interpretative frame through which to later view the sight/site, always articulated through its key messages and motto that Guantánamo was ‘safe, humane, legal, and transparent’.
Safe: A view of the ‘tutelary architecture’ of detention

As U.S. Naval Base Guantánamo occupies territory on both sides of the bay, new arrivals must fly in, take a short ferry ride, and then be driven to JTF-Guantánamo. In the short ride from the ferry terminal to the detention facilities, visitors – whether ‘tourist’ or on business at the facility as lawyers or interrogators - were not only offered the views of the Caribbean Sea and the sparse terrain, but were driven past a number of everyday, but important, sights/sites: the disused buildings from a busier times in the base’s history, the McDonalds and Starbuck’s and other stores that provide for the wider base community, and by a cliff face carved out of the rock to make way for the road when the base was first established. In the 1990s this rock face was covered by the graffiti of soldiers, sailors and marines frustrated with their posting. Today, as Clive Stafford Smith describes (2007), the first impression of the rock face as visitors pass by is that it appears to be clean, as if the graffiti had never been there. On closer examination however the rock has been painted over in the same colour, camouflaging and concealing the graffiti beneath.10 The disused buildings, the McDonald’s, and the painted cliff face, unremarked by most in their accounts of their visit, are nonetheless hall-marks of what they are going to witness: the fraying edges of a defunct map, signs of ‘progress’, and the sterilisation of violence all in the construction of JTF Guantánamo as ‘safe, humane, legal and transparent’.

As visitors are driven closer to the detention facility, they bear witness however to a more ‘spectacular’ site, that of the detention facility itself and its ‘tutelary architecture’ (Pugliese, 2008). With its ‘structurally imposing, threatening and absolutist [in its] sense of enclosure, these prisons draw upon an iconography of Supermax penal architecture (Pugliese, 2008, p. 219). As Ronald Levant, the President of the American Psychological Association (APA) wrote of his visit: ‘When we arrived at Camp Delta, we saw what I had imagined we would see: A very scary looking place, with guard towers and dark green canvas covering the chain link fence, which was topped by concertina wire’ (Levant, 2007. p. 3). Or as Karen Greenberg described: ‘The multi-storied, maximum security complexes, rimmed in concertina wire, set off from the road by high wire-mesh fences, and the armed tower guards at Camp Delta, present[ed] a daunting sight’ (Greenberg, 2007).

Indeed, in its latest incarnation, and as added to the weekly tour from 2005 onwards, Guantánamo is a supermaximum prison that bears closer relation to the civilian equivalents than to the history of military detention.11 The more recently constructed facilities of Camps 5 and 6 within Camp Delta are modelled inside and outside specifically on the supermaximum prisons in Miami, Terre Haute, Indiana and in Lenawee, Michigan. Guantánamo, with its continuities with the civilian supermaximum

10 JTF-GTMO, like many military spaces, is an exercise in navigating the complex politics and the practices that involve soiling, cleansing, and concealing that cleansing. See the forthcoming work of Aaron Belkin.
11 These continuities extend beyond the architectural. The guards who staff the detention facilities are often members of the military Reserve or various State National Guards who may in their civilian lives work in corrections. Camp 5 was designed in consultation with an Indiana prison superintendent, John Van Natta, during his reserve Army duty at Guantánamo.
prison system, therefore works with the sign system of the supermax to accomplish a
gentrification and sterilization of violence, as well as to allow viewers to forget that
those detained are have not been convicted as mass murderers.

As visitors were ferried through Camp Delta for their tour of the facilities, they
were driven past Camps 1-3 as part of the ‘windshield’ component of the tour\(^\text{12}\):

Opaque green cloth was stretched across the chain link, obstructing our view
of the buildings beyond. As we rolled slowly past Camps 3, 2, and 1, adjoining
compounds with similar layouts, we caught an occasional glimpse of the
military guards who sit in open doorways at the rear of each cell block, keeping
a constant eye on the detainees within. (Okie 2005)

However, once they arrived at Camp 4, the least restrictive of the Camps where
the ‘compliant’ detainees reside in conditions closer to those outlined for Prisoners of
War in the Geneva Conventions, visitors were able to see more. Camp 4, for the
purposes of the tour, is the show camp. As described in JTF Guantánamo’s own
Standard Operating Procedures from both 2003 and 2004, guards were instructed that
as Camp 4 ‘receives numerous visitors and tours’, it is ‘a high visibility area and draws a
lot of attention. Therefore, Camp 4 must remain clean and ready for inspection at any
given time of the day or night.’ Guards working at Camp 4 must also carry a
USOUTHCOM Human Rights Standing Orders card as part of their uniform (JTF

Safe and Humane: Experiencing Life in a Cell

Essential to these tours was the showcasing of the cells and objects associated
with detention.\(^\text{13}\) In the absence of interactions with detainees, and in support of the
claims being made by Bush Administration officials in Washington and U.S. military
personnel ‘inside the wire’ such as Chaplain Saif, visitors to JTF Guantánamo were
provided with opportunity to ‘experience’ a ‘tour cell’ in Camp Delta with comfort items
laid out for viewing. These ‘comfort items’ were the material objects that detainees
were permitted (a mattress, sheet, blanket, clothing, flip-flop shoes, wash cloth and
towel, a packet of salt, and in some cases a game of backgammon or dominoes), and the
religious items (Qur’an, prayer beads, prayer mats and caps) as a way of expressing their
humane treatment. In tension with this was the use of material objects to continue to
reinforce the ‘safe’ message: visitors could see the shackles used to transport them as
well as the riot gear used by guards lined up and disembodied in the hallways beyond

\(^{12}\) Several areas of Guantánamo still remain off-limits even as part of the ‘windshield’ part of the tour,
including Camp 7 (‘the platinum camp’ which is where the ‘high-value’ detainees are kept), Camp Echo
which was the isolation unit before Camps 5 and 6 were built, as well as Camp Iguana which was where
juvenile detainees were held.

\(^{13}\) The importance of these items and the tour cell for the shifting of the visual frame and therefore the
debate over Guantánamo was discussed in Van Veeren, forthcoming.
the cells. This use of tour cells became enough of a fixture on the tour that once the Camp 5 and 6 cells were open at Camp Delta, at least two ‘tour cells’ were set aside for visitors to enter and ‘experience’ detention as marked by ‘Tour Cell’ signs on the doors (Allen, 2005).

![Image of a man pointing to a cell](image)

*Inside Gitmo author and retired U.S. Military Lieutenant Colonel Gordon Cucullu visits the ‘tour cell’ and points out ‘the Holy Koran in the window of a detainee’s cell in the ultra-modern Camp V’ (Source: www.insidegitmo.com, emphasis added).*

![Image of Judge Andrew Napolitano](image)

*Fox News analyst Judge Andrew Napolitano visits Guantánamo in June 2006 and pauses in ‘tour cell’. [Source: ]*

In some cases, VIPs and journalists were also offered a chance to view an interrogation in progress through mirrored glass (Associated Press, 2004; Sidoti, 2005; Allen, 2005). Later on, visitors were offered the opportunity to step into an empty interrogation room and see ‘the gentler images of the prison - there are a coffee pot and mini-fridge in the interrogation room’ (Rosenberg, February 20, 2006) along with lazy-by chairs in order to counter the reports of detainee interrogations as centring around humiliation and pain techniques.
These visits to the ‘tour cells’ and interrogation rooms, as with the tours more widely, are therefore important for presenting the opportunity for visitors to touch, to feel that they are closer to the ‘reality’ of detention, to help bring forth its ‘reality, through stepping into a space and being near the materials of detention.

The people come to touch, they look as if they were touching, their gaze is only an aspect of tactile manipulation. It is certainly a question of a tactile universe, no longer a visual or discursive one, and the people are directly implicated in a process: to manipulate/to be manipulated...to circulate/to make circulate. (Baudrillard 1994 p. 70).

Therefore, as studies of material culture explain, objects, along with bodies and spaces that make up the material, are sites of social formation and transformation. They can be markers of value or identity and signal relations of power. However, the material also do ‘social work’ as they move through ‘social landscapes’ by shaping social interactions and affecting the way in which ‘networks of power’ operate (Woodward 2007, p. 6). ‘Objects [along with bodies and spaces] are constructed by particular power relations, and in turn also actively construct such relations’ (Woodward, 2007 p. 13; Foucault, 1991[1977]). Objects such as the uniform, the prayer mat, or spaces such as razor wire enclosures, ‘are important material tools in the establishment of’ networks of power, rather than mere ‘props’ or environmental fillers’ (Woodward, 2007, p. 5; Coward, 2009). Moreover, the material works performatively to constitute reality. Its meaning is not natural, but comes into being and shapes understandings through reiteration and practices. In this sense meaning emerges both materially and figuratively (Loizidou, 2008; Butler, 2000; 2001). Politics, like culture, is therefore something created and lived through the material, alongside the linguistic, and in studying the material, we can better understand how meaning is produced in competing discourses.

**Humane: A Tour of the Medical Facilities at Camp Delta.**

From the start of visits to Guantánamo a stop at the medical facility was a central component for VIPs and journalists alike (Greenberg, 2009). However, once pressure mounted in 2005, the Department of Defense, specifically the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Dr. William Winkenwerder, Jr., extended a special invitation to health and medical professionals, as well as medical ethicists, including Dr. Ronald F. Levant, the President of the American Psychological Association (APA), American Psychiatric Association President Steven S. Sharfstein, and a number of other key

---

14 Martin Coward refers to the tendency within IR to privilege human actions over their surroundings as anthropocentrism, ‘as an implicit or explicit assumption ‘that human reason and sentience places the human being on a higher ground’. This assumption is the ground for a conceptual division between human beings and nature, or, more broadly, between human beings and all the other non-human elements that comprise the world and which, whether living or non-living, are seen merely as the context within which human lives are lived’ (Coward, 2009, p. 420).
Department of Defense (DoD) officials and leaders from national health and mental health organizations to visit on October 19, 2005 (Levant, 2007; Soldz, 2006; Okie, 2005). They were described as the first ‘civilians’ (aside, of course, from contractors, intelligence, diplomatic and political personnel from the U.S. and other countries, media and ICRC personnel) to be permitted this access. Their visit was
to learn more about the work of physicians and psychologists currently serving as part of the Joint Task Force–Guantánamo and to enter into a dialogue with U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) officials and the rest of the visiting group about appropriate and effective roles for health and mental health professionals in detainee operations (Levant, 2007, p. 1).

Though they did not visit the detention facilities, they spent six hours meeting with JTF-Guantánamo personnel, including receiving a power-point briefing from General Hood who ‘seemed quite transparent’ (Levant, 2007, p. 3), spoke with base medical personnel such as members of the Behavioral Science Consultation team (BSCT, pronounced ‘biscuit’), two of whom stayed with the team at all time, and toured the medical facilities. The key message from the visits coordinated for these medical professionals was that Guantánamo was a modern and humane facility. As Susan Okie, a medical journalist, describes, there were numerous ‘confident assertions by Hood and other officers that all treatment of detainees is humane’ (Okie, 2005). But in particular, three elements have been used to reinforce this message: that Guantánamo provides state of the art medical care and facilities despite its ‘expeditionary’ (read warzone) nature; that there were (until 2006) no deaths in custody (Okie 2005); and that hunger striking was managed. Above all, the discussion and visits to the medical facilities, including the mental health provisions, have been used to support the construction of Guantánamo as a humane and modern facility. This was also significant in the attempts to construct

15 A note on the different stances by the different organisations and the debate within these professions – and others like anthropology – on their involvement with military. Cite any literature on Human Terrain System programme. See Soldz 2007 and his blog. Okie 2005
16 On November 13, 2006, Pedro Ruiz participated in a similar tour. Along with a number of senior officers from the Navy, Air Force, and Army, the tour group of 20 included ‘Dr. Gerald Koocher, president of the American Psychological Association; Rebecca Patton, M.S.N., R.N., president of the American Nurses Association; Dr. Stephen Behnke, an attorney and psychologist who is in charge of ethics issues at the American Psychological Association; Dr. Eric Zillmer, the Carl R. Pacifco Professor of Neuropsychology at Drexel University; and Dr. Robert Frank, Dean of the College of Public Health and Health Professions at the University of Florida’ (Ruiz, 2007). On their way ‘to Camp Delta, we toured the housing, schools, and sport facilities used by military personnel and their families’.
17 Again, there was some controversy around Guantánamo when the Pentagon proposed immunising detainees against HINI in November 2009. According to a JTF Guantánamo spokesperson, ‘JTF Guantanamo conducts safe, humane, legal and transparent care and custody of detainees. As such, we must provide detainees the medical care necessary to maintain their health’ (Maj. Diana R. Haynie as cited in Mount, 2009). Critics such as Representative Bart Stupack pointed to the shortage of vaccine available in certain parts of the U.S. and argued that suspected terrorists should not be given preference (Rosenberg, 3 December 2009).
the detainees as mentally unstable and irrational when it comes to managing their care (Howell, 2007).

In particular, the tours of the medical facilities, the resultant images that are circulated, and the accompanying rhetoric were used to address concerns over hunger striking and debates surrounding the ongoing forced-feeding (or ‘assisted feeding’ according military personnel) of hunger-striking detainees. Since the start of detention, hunger striking was a significant part of the resistance offered by detainees against detention, with some detainees remaining for years on hunger strike. However, in order to attempt to manage and (re)construct these actions, the U.S. military responded by including hunger-striking management first into their policies and then into their tours. Visitors were offered a tour of the medical facilities with the suggestion that this is where force-feeding took place, including, starting in 2009, a view of the selection of liquid food that detainees were fed, and the assertion that butter pecan was their favourite flavour.

![](image)

‘A Navy nurse, who declined to have her face photographed, and likewise declined to give her name, briefed European media Oct. 13, 2009 that butter pecan is the favorite flavor among hunger-striking detainees being tube-fed at the U.S. Navy base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in this image approved for release by a Pentagon contractor’ (Rosenberg, Oct 15, 2009).

The visits to the modern and clean medical facilities, as with the visits to the tour cells and interrogation rooms, are therefore the material equivalent of ‘the empty cell’ series of images produced and circulated by the U.S. military of Guantánamo (Van Veeren, forthcoming) to counter the repeated remediation of the Camp X-Ray photos. These disembodied tours work to help present a ‘reality’ of Guantánamo that is clean and modern, and therefore progressive and humane. As with the cliff face that was painted over in the approach to JTF Guantánamo, this ‘reality’ of U.S. military detention has been sterilised. Violence, rather than being on display, is present in the disappearance of power. Any violence of aggression, oppression or of spoiling has been erased or sterilised (Baudrillard, 2003). Signs of the aggressive form of violence, such as associated with Camp X-Ray, like the orange suit, are removed to favour the production

---

18 A discussion of the ethics over force feeding (Okie) and the absence of a view of the forced feeding chair.
of a new reality of U.S. detention. JTF-Guantánamo, like many military spaces, therefore participates in a politics of soiling, cleansing, and concealing that plays an important part in the construction of identities. As Aaron Belkin argues (2008), the politics of purity and contamination are inextricably linked to the U.S. military and the tours of Guantánamo (re)produce this.

Humane: Dining In

As a part of their Guantánamo package tour, VIPs are also offered a chance to dine with JTF personnel and sample the food provided to detainees. This became important as the controversy over Guantánamo once again resurfaced in 2005. The food served at the facility became one of the main ways in which the Department of Defense and officials that supported the ongoing detention defended it as humane. The ‘dining-in’ experience, as well as a briefing on the menus offered to detainees (which was also made publicly available and provided on the JTF Guantánamo website), was central to this. When invited to ‘dine in’ with JTF Guantánamo personnel, Congressional delegates were offered Styrofoam-packaged food to sample as the equivalent of what detainees were eating.19 As Dr. Ruiz described:

On the day of our visit, we had a lunch that consisted of pasta and chicken, a salad, an orange, two toasted bread portions, two glasses of grapefruit juice, a diet soda, a bottle of water, and two pieces of baklava. As we were having our lunch, we were told that this was the lunch that all detainees at GTMO had that day (Ruiz, 2007).

Touring visitors were briefed of the number of calories detainees were offered numerous, by 2006, ‘4,200 of Halal food daily’ (House of Congress, 2007). Military briefers on one news media tour of Camp 4, informed the visitors that detainees were ‘not eating bad. They get Pepsi, ice cream, Hershey’s kisses, fruit salad’ (Rosenberg, 2006b).20

19 There is of course controversy surrounding this presentation as some detainees report the food as bland and inappropriate. Lawyers representing detainees and Amnesty International George Brent Mickum IV, a Washington lawyer who represents several Guantánamo inmates, said Congress has been sold a bill of goods about the typical menu in the camps. "Lemon chicken and rice pilaf?" Mickum said. "That’s baloney"(Allen 2005). This again speaks to the Potenkin-like aspects of the tour, though what matters here is how this materiality is used to produce a ‘double reality’ of Guantánamo.

20 Moreover, in 2006, the JTF Guantánamo spokesman, Navy Commander Robert Durand, announced that detainees are now ‘normal to mildly overweight or mildly obese’, with one detainees doubling in weight from his arrival in 2002 (Melia, 2006). Durand explained to journalists that the weight gain was the result of a policy that permitted detainees choice over their food intake: ‘detainees are advised that they are offered more food than necessary to provide choice and variety, and that consuming all the food they are offered will result in weight gain’ (Melia, 2006). Like the tutelary architecture or the modern medical facilities, being overweight can be read as a sign of both humane and progressive treatment and of irrationality: given the amount of ‘choice’ they have it is their responsibility to control themselves. Along with the varied menus, access to Pepsi and Hershey’s kisses, and rewards of McDonald’s hamburgers or
Furthermore, following visits, many elite tourists chose to speak publicly about their visits, and bring with them, in addition to photographs or video footage, objects to represent the sight/site. Representative Duncan Hunter (R-CA), upon returning to Washington following a visit to Guantánamo in June 2005, notoriously held a press conference at which he distributed copies of daily menus and brandished a chicken to demonstrate the high quality diet that detainees were receiving:

So the point is that the inmates in Guantánamo have never eaten better, they've never been treated better and they've never been more comfortable in their lives... [ignoring for a moment that detainees may come from wealthy families] ...the idea that we are somehow torturing people in Guantánamo is absolutely not true, unless you consider eating chicken three days a week is torture (Hunter, 2005; see also Kreisher & Eckert, 2005).

---

hot-fudge sundaes for good behaviour (Associated Press, 2004), overweight detainees are used as a sign of humane treatment. But, just as weight loss has been used to criticise treatment of detainees, this use of obesity, which mimics the weight problem in the U.S. population more generally, weight gain could be used to call into question what is meant by humane treatment given the health problems associated with obesity.
Indeed, the campaign to present this reality of Guantánamo as humane using this materiality, which emphasised the state of the art medical facilities, the variety of food and exercise, as well as access to items like DVDs and laptops, was so successful that supporters of Guantánamo, including Congressional delegates, constructed a narrative of Guantánamo as ‘Club Gitmo’, a ‘holiday camp for terrorists’ (Limbaugh, 2008). According to Vice President Cheney, speaking on CNN, the detainees are well treated, well fed and ‘living in the tropics’ (Sidoti, 2005), and former Governor of Arkansas and Presidential Candidate Mike Huckabee, ‘most of our prisoners would love to be in a facility more like Guantánamo.’ ‘The inmates there were getting a whole lot better treatment than my prisoners in Arkansas. In fact, we left saying, I hope our guys don't see this. They'll all want to be transferred to Guantamano. If anything, it's too nice’ (Chaggaris, 2007). For Senator John Ensign (R-Nev), Guantánamo facilities are nicer than prisons in the United States, the food was better than what travelling lawmakers ate, and ‘They get better health care than the average American citizen does’ (Mascaro, 2009). After touring the facility, Senator Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, found it completely acceptable, ‘They wouldn't be treated any better in the United States, and they wouldn't have the tropical breezes blowing through’ (Kane, 2009). According to House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-OH), ‘I don't know that there's a terrorist treated better anywhere in the world than what has happened at Guantamano. It is - we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to build a facility that has more comforts than a lot of Americans get’ (Powers, 2009). Following a visit to Guantánamo, FOX News military analyst and retired Command Sergeant Major Steven Greer described Guantánamo detainees who have ‘checked-in’ as ‘reaping the pleasures and comforts associated with Camp Delta. Perks such as ice cream, air-conditioned cells, prayer rugs, checker board games, volleyball, and state of the art medical care. Detainees – political correctness for extremists who wish to kill us – eat three squares a day, peruse Martha Stewart Living, and play soccer. Sound like torture? (Greer, 2006). Finally, on Fox News’s ‘Hannity’s America’, former Judge Advocate General (JAG) Kyndra Miller Rotunda, who served at Guantánamo from August 2002 to March of 2003 as the legal adviser to the camp commander suggested that Guantánamo was ‘really more like a Boy Scout camp than it is a prison camp. […] They get up to 12-
hours of exercise time a day and they have all kinds of activities. They can play ping-pong, basketball, soccer. They have their own garden. They can check out library books. They have 5,000 titles. Their favorite is the Harry Potter series. They can even take classes — you know all kinds of privileges’ (Rotunda, 2008).

[Source: www.coxandforkum.com/archives/000951.html]

In particular, it is the way in which these objects, and the materiality of detention more generally, interact with the linguistic articulations to support this broader discourse of Guantánamo being ‘too good’ for terrorists that is the most interesting. It is not that the material or the linguistic operate in isolation from one another, where one is more significant in its effects, but that they interact to produce a compelling reality. As Judith Butler explains, it is the way these two domains interact that offers insight into the operations of power:

the theory of construction immediately raises the fear of a complete linguisticism, ie that the object is nothing but the language by which it is construed. But this kind of linguistic reduction must be resisted. The second problem with the claim that language represents power relations which, in turn, back or support linguistic practice, is that we fail to understand the way that power works through discourse, especially discourses that naturalize and occlude power itself. Again, this is not to claim that power is nothing but discourse, but it is to claim that the one cannot be thought without the other ... But to focus on linguistic practice here and non-linguistic practice there, and to claim that both are important is still not to focus on the relation between them. It is that relation that I think we still do not know how to think (Butler, 2000, p. 9).
Humane: A visit to the site of the former Camp X-Ray

In 2005, another feature was added to the Guantánamo experience. Visitors taking part in the package tour were brought to the site of the former Camp X-Ray to be shown the weeds growing. The U.S. military at Guantánamo wanted ‘to underscore the message that the once iconic Camp X-Ray is now history... with all the aplomb of a package-tour guide... the military escort led a dozen visiting Canadian and U.S. reporters through the weed-choked warren of the now abandoned lock-up for suspected terrorists (Rosenberg, 2006a). For a time, the Army escorts invited reporters to ‘help themselves to souvenir locks’ from X-Ray (Rosenberg, 2009c). According to the Pentagon press service, which decried the continued use of orange series’ imagery from Camp X-Ray:

Today the formerly occupied Camp X-Ray looks like a ghost town. Weeds and brush have overgrown the enclosures. Heavy rains spawned by three hurricanes at the island base this year have spurred growth of lush greenery throughout the defunct camp. Now the camp looks like it’s been swallowed by a jungle (Rhem, 2005).

So, while the tent-city, ‘Freedom Heights’, that provided rudimentary accommodation for guards in the early days was removed as new ‘more appropriate’ accommodation was constructed, the remnants of Camp X-Ray remained in place as if
to provide visual and tangible support to the claims that X-Ray was no longer in and that Camp Delta represented the new more humane standard of care at Guantánamo. The remnants of X-Ray (like the remnants of other conflicts that continue litter the landscape of USNB Guantánamo in the form of abandoned buildings) are therefore fraying edges of the map of the desert of the real. In a merger of the metaphorical with the literal, the ‘desert’ in the form of the deserted, empty, forgotten place merges with the literally overgrown and real desert landscape of Camp X-Ray. X-Ray now remains as remnants of the territory created in imitation of an original map of what detention was supposed to be – the original simulation – around which visitors used to gather. Now X-Ray remains as a museum of the hyper-real, and like museum, relies on the material with the aim of constructing meaning around the sight/site (Luke, 1996).

Legal: A Visit to the Expeditionary Legal Facilities

While the ‘safe’ and ‘humane’ components of the message of Guantánamo were communicated primarily through other parts of the tour, the ‘legal’ aspect of its operations as a message became more important. This was particularly noticeable as the legality of indefinite detention was increasingly challenged in U.S. courts, beginning with the Supreme Court ruling in Rasul vs. Bush on June 28, 2004, which ruled that detainees could challenge their detention in federal court. In response, the Pentagon developed a new system for justifying detention, which included the Combatant Status Review Tribunals (CSRTs) and the Annual Review Boards (ARBs) to establish each detainee as an "enemy combatant", and the military commissions, the ‘trials’, which were introduced by July 7, 2004.

To cover the proceedings, journalists were first allowed into the CSRT and ARB courtroom (a trailer fitted with tables and chairs for the participants and spectators) in late March 2005 (Brookes, 2005; Rosenberg, 2005a). According to Rosenberg, the U.S. government

wanted us there. They went out of their way to bring in flights and sponsor trips for reporters to come in and sit at a table and watch these things. You had to sign some ground rules, and the most difficult one was if the man uttered his name in the course of the proceeding or you found out his name, you were forbidden to report it... What they were saying was we have a process, and we are going to show this process to reporters (Rosenberg, 2007, emphasis added).

The Pentagon continued to invite both U.S. national and international press to witness the trials. In the latter days of Guantánamo, these were held in the newly constructed ‘expeditionary legal facilities’ of Camp Justice, a ‘prefabricated but very high-tech court building surrounded by trailers, moveable cells, concertina wire and a tent city — all of which has been shipped here in pieces that could be unplugged, disassembled and put back together somewhere else’ and which cost $10 million
(Glaberson, 2007). When ‘court’ was in session, selected journalists were invited to observe - only 8 journalists (with 1 pen each) were permitted to be in the room at one time - while the remainder could watch over CCTV. All participants (including detainees) were given a script to read from (Stafford Smith, 2007). For a period of time, the court sketch artist was not permitted to draw the faces of the detainees (Saeed, 2009), and at no time were photographs permitted. These trials, again, were therefore manifestations of a particular type of spectacle in which the message, produced linguistically and materially, was tightly controlled.

![A courtroom artist's sketch, cleared by the U.S. Military, shows four of the Sept. 11 terrorist attack suspects at their arraignment before a military commission in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, on Thursday. Khaled Sheikh Mohammed is at top left. (Brennan Linsley/Associated Press/Pool)](image)

Though the press were allowed access to these trials, they were initially forbidden from reporting names of the detainees, and were prevented from hearing information deemed confidential (either by being excluded from the trial or, once the technology was introduced, media monitors would use white noise to blank out the testimony) (Rosenberg, 2008). In the case of the commissions held for ‘high-value’ detainees in 2007, such as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the press were excluded altogether (Rosenberg, 2007). Nevertheless, visits to the ‘expeditionary legal facilities’ where included in the tours of Guantánamo, along with a briefing on what the processes entailed. Congressional delegates and military analysts, for example, who had never witnessed a proceeding or seen the process in operation, were then able, based largely on the materiality of the tour, to comment on the legality and appropriateness of the military commission system.21 In short, tours to the facility were used to support the message that Guantánamo was legal because a ‘process’ was in place. Visitors could witness the empty rooms where the CSRTs, ARBs, or military commissions took place and be briefed on the sequence of events that occurred as part of these proceedings in order to be assured that it was legal.

21 In 2009, the Pentagon announced that visiting journalists would be restricted to either touring the facility or attending the commissions due to personnel shortages. Concerns however were expressed as this was seen as a way of discouraging attendance at the trials...
Humane Minus the Human

However, while Guantánamo tourists visited the site/sight, taking in a meal, stopping in at the tour cell or the medical facilities, what is above else absent were the detainees themselves. Tourists were above all else prevented from interacting with detainees. For the majority of the tour, visitors were kept in areas that are detainee-free. As Susan Okie describes of her visit of the medical facilities in 2005:

The patients — nine in all, we were told — were invisible. They lay behind floor-to-ceiling curtains covering the bays of the 30-bed hospital. Guards standing before the curtains came to attention the moment I tried to edge closer. I had been told before the trip that we would probably be permitted to speak with patients, and I received various explanations for the change of heart: officials didn't want to give hunger-striking patients a forum for media attention; they feared that a patient who had assaulted a nurse the previous night might again become disruptive or violent; they were concerned about detainees' privacy. Had I known that I would not have access to prisoners, I might have declined the invitation to visit Guantánamo, as United Nations representatives have since done (Okie 2005).

Detainees are therefore not part of the tour, except at a distance and in the most compliant area of the camp.

If there is one opportunity to see detainees, it is through attending the military commissions, as it is one of the few opportunities detainees have to challenge their detention in front of spectators from ‘outside the wire’. In a limited way, these trials are one of the rare opportunities to ‘humanise’ detainees. The personal stories of detainees and how they came to be in detention are told in these spaces. ‘These proceedings gave us a window into the lives of these human beings’ (Rosenberg, 2007). If one goes down for a tour as a journalist, or as a VIP, one does not get the same access to the human aspects of Guantánamo (Rosenberg, 2006d) because as ‘humane’ as the U.S. military, Pentagon, Department of Defense or Bush administration may argue Guantánamo is, the human side has been eliminated as much as possible from the tour.

Circulating Signs of Guantánamo

Finally, before leaving Guantánamo, visitors (as well as guards) had the opportunity to stop by the local Naval Exchange store to acquire a souvenir to take away with them, including T-shirts declaring Guantánamo Bay the ‘Taliban Towers: the Caribbean’s newest 5-star resort’ or ‘BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION INSTRUCTOR, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba’ retailed for US$9.99 (Rosenberg, 2006b; Rosenberg, 2006c; Levin, 2008; Pashman, 2009). For visitors not lucky enough to be offered the souvenir ball cap, flag and video by the U.S. military, or for those who missed out on the opportunity to take home a piece of Camp X-Ray (‘We are going to come over into the adjoining cellblocks and grab you guys some souvenir locks’ a ‘military minder’ offered
to visiting journalists), they may have to make do with one of these items from gift shop or a photograph (posing in the ‘tour cell’ or with the Camp Commander (Allen, 2005)).

A selection of souvenirs available for sale at the USN Guantánamo Naval Exchange Store [Source: www.dailymail.co.uk, 8 May 2008]

Like the opportunity to take away a piece of the Berlin wall, these objects (many I suspect are made abroad) are the embodiment of the circulation and commodification of the signs of Guantánamo. As Baudrillard explained, ‘the only possible response to the absurd challenge of the transparency and democracy of culture—each person taking away a fetishized bolt of this culture itself fetishized’ (Baudrillard 1994, p. 70). Guantánamo, like the Baubourg shopping centre, is ‘the perfect circulatory operator’ an opportunity for ‘an accelerated’ circulation of itself and its signs (Baudrillard 1994, p. 68). The materiality of Guantánamo therefore not only captures the signs of Guantánamo, and by extension the GWoT, but also helps to circulate and support it.

Conclusion: Guantánamo Matters

As Martin Coward suggested, ‘[t]he subject of international politics is always already embodied and exists in the context of a multitude of material objects. The discipline of international relations has overlooked this materiality despite often speaking of the role things – from communiqués to missiles – play in international politics’ (Coward, 2009). The materiality of Guantánamo whether object, body or space, communicated through these tourist practices, has been essential to its (re)constitution by the U.S. military. As JTF Guantánamo Commander Hood explained:

The photos that came out of Abu Ghraib were so terrible that I think it causes people to stop and wonder," said Hood, who assumed command in March 2004. "It's a challenge every day ... the only way to overcome it is to invite people here and to have them look for themselves (Associated Press 2004).
So what are the U.S. military and administration aiming to communicate with these tours? Overall, these tours were designed and implemented as a way to construct the site/sight and communicate Guantánamo as ‘secure, legal, humane, transparent’, not only through linguistic articulations but also through the material. Whether touring the medical facilities or sampling the food, elite tourists to the sight/site were shown the material of detention, particularly its spaces and objects, to counteract the negative press that has been circulating since its opening, and the growing resistance which has been particularly strong and which I discuss elsewhere. But underlying these messages was also the aim to support the broader discourse of the GWoT and construct detainees as dangerous while (re)articulating an identity of the US State-as-entity as ‘good’.

The tours of Guantánamo, which from its inception have been built into its programme, have become ritualised, with the same content delivered in the same sequence to the thousands of visitors who have passed ‘inside the wire’. The result is an attempt by the U.S. State to not only control the representations of U.S. military detention, but to adapt to challenges to those representations, as exemplified by the evolution of the tour. Over the years the tour has grown to include and emphasise the supermaximum camps, the ‘compliant’ camp, the deserted Camp X-Ray, the symbols of religious tolerance, the ‘high-quality’ food served, as well as the forced-feeding procedures, all in an effort to construct the sight/site as professionally run and consistent with its motto, but also to respond to specific criticisms. The result is a Guantánamo that is a sterilised representation of violence, and one that seeks to redirect the flow of signs of X-Ray to a flow of signs of Camp Delta. The tours of the detention facilities therefore allow U.S. authorities to produce their own representations of detention; to demonstrate to their domestic audience, as well as international audiences, the effectiveness of the U.S. military and state by proving the existence of terrorists (that they can be identified and captured), but more importantly in the case of these tours, to constitute itself as a humane agent. These tours are the official effort to construct, control and manage the visual and material record and therefore to produce the reality of Guantánamo and U.S. military detention.

Moreover, the repetitions and reiterations of the themes working through the linguistic and the material helped to produce this reality of detention, to performatively constitute it. The echoing of these messages and signs by a variety of elite tourists (from congressional delegates to prominent health and military experts to Miss Universe) - and therefore the everyday-ness of this spectacle - has worked such that the U.S. State’s representations become common sense. This is evidenced by the extent to which a portion of the U.S. population continues to consider Guantánamo as important in the GWoT and oppose its closure or its relocation to a site on U.S. soil.22

Overall, these tours therefore also serve as a reminder of the extent of power at work at Guantánamo, not only power exerted to restrain and interrogate the prisoners, but more importantly the power expressed through the material: to create a public

---

22 As recently as January 2010, an estimated 55% of Americans favoured keeping the camp open (‘Most Americans Say Keep Gitmo Open,’ 2010).
spectacle of these captive ‘terrorists’ and the means used to detain them. Guantánamo matters because its materiality in relation with the linguistic has been central to the production of a new reality of what it means to be safe, humane, legal and transparent.
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