

Opposing Colonialism,
Antisemitism,
and
Turbo-Nationalism

Opposing Colonialism, Antisemitism, and Turbo-Nationalism:

*Rethinking the Past
for New Conviviality*

Edited by

Marina Gržinić

Jovita Pristovšek

Sophie Uitz

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Opposing Colonialism, Antisemitism, and Turbo-Nationalism:
Rethinking the Past for New Conviviality

Edited by Marina Gržinić, Jovita Pristovšek, and Sophie Uitz

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Marina Gržinić, Jovita Pristovšek, Sophie Uitz,
and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4184-3

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4184-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	ix
Foreword	xi
<i>Marina Gržinić, Jovita Pristovšek, and Sophie Uitz</i>	
Introduction: Burdened by the Past, Rethinking the Future. Eleven Theses on Memory, History, and Life	1
<i>Marina Gržinić</i>	
PART ONE: In the Aftermath of Colonialism	
The Politics of Memory in Congo: How King Leopold’s Ghost Still Haunts Us	24
<i>Kasereka Kavwahirehi</i>	
Colonial Denial and Mutations of the Colonial Propaganda in Belgium: Struggles, Strategies, and Impacts on Society	40
<i>Geneviève Kaninda, Tony Kokou Sampson, and Calvin Soiresse Njall CMCLD/Collectif Mémoire Coloniale et Lutte contre les Discriminations</i>	
An Attempt at Black Political Subjectivation in a White Institution: The Case of the Royal Museum for Central Africa in Belgium	48
<i>Véronique Clette-Gakuba</i>	
Postcolonial Belgium and Reparatory Justice: The Case of the “Colonial Métis”	67
<i>Nicole Grégoire</i>	
Congocene: The Anthropocene through Congolese Cinema	88
<i>Matthias De Groof</i>	

PART TWO: Nationalism and Antisemitism

Amnesia and Lies in Austrian Reality	112
<i>Elisabeth Brainin</i>	
Stand Together like One Man! Tropes of Unity in Austrian Media Discourse	137
<i>Berthold Molden</i>	
(Re)membering Resistances in the African Diaspora in Post-Nazi Austria as “Counteramnesic” Practices	156
<i>Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur</i>	
Social Amnesia as a Politics of Erasure: Contemporary Austrian Identities and the Traces of past Horrors in Everyday Life	171
<i>Claudia Tazreiter</i>	
The Burden of Proof: How Neglect, Ineptness, and Antisemitism Shaped Art Restitution Policies in Post-War Austria	190
<i>Sophie Lillie</i>	

PART THREE: Turbo-Nationalism and Europe

“New” Fascism: The Aftermath of the Europeanization of the Western Balkans and the Necropolitics of Historical Revisionism	220
<i>Šefik Tatlić</i>	
Rethinking the Past: Slobodan Milošević—Tried to Death.....	237
<i>Sir Geoffrey Nice</i>	
Echoes of Justice: Afterlife of Slobodan Milošević’s Trial.....	259
<i>Nevenka Tromp</i>	
Lest We Forget? Speech and Non-Speech in Post-War Sarajevo.....	276
<i>Nejra Nuna Čengić</i>	
The Mass Atrocities Committed against Bosniak Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina Are Not Something That Happened Just Once	293
<i>Hikmet Karčić in conversation with Marina Gržinić and Šefik Tatlić</i>	

PART FOUR: The Relation between Amnesia, Power, and Archives

Archival Amnesia: A Counter-Forensic Source Anonymization
Methodology for Whistleblower and Leak Archives..... 310
Nikita Mazurov

Archives, Knowledge Production, Politics of In/visibility,
and Bosnian Forensic Reality 326
Adla Isanović

Personal Affects: Going into the Archive and Empire's New Clothes.... 347
Tanya Ury

A Genealogy of Amnesia in Europe..... 367
Gloria Wekker in conversation with Birgit Sauer

PART FIVE: The Relation between History, Memory, and Futurity

A Fluid Code 384
Jamika Ajalon

Expressions of Nostalgia Are Not Necessarily a Glorification of
Colonialism 394
Pedro Monaville in conversation with Marina Gržinić and Šefik Tatlić

The Concentrationary Palimpsest 409
Max Silverman

Contested Narratives about Austrian Identity after World War II:
Denials, Silences, and Appropriations..... 425
Ruth Wodak and Markus Rheindorf

Political Remembrance for the Future: Perspectives and Limits of
Arendt's Re-Framing of Memory and History as Political Concepts..... 445
Sophie Uitz

PART SIX: Conviviality: Obstacles and Antagonisms

Back Up from the Basement?..... 464
Hedvig Turai

Normalizing Nazism: History on Austrian State Television— Political Programmes in Times of Nationalist Government	478
<i>Drehli Robnik and Renée Winter</i>	
There Is No Historical Film. Every Film Speaks Always about the Present Time	498
<i>Ruth Beckermann in conversation with Michael Loebenstein</i>	
From Biopolitical Amnesia toward the Necropolitical Agnosia.....	514
<i>Jovita Pristovšek</i>	
Love for the Dead: Sambo and the Libidinal Economy of “Post-Race” Conviviality	531
<i>Shirley Anne Tate</i>	
Contributor Biographies	549
Index	560

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 5-1. Mineral commodity summaries 2018. Adapted by Matthias De Groof from data issued by U.S. Geological Survey (2018, 51).

Fig. 5-2. Comparison of CO₂-emissions versus the regional distribution of four climate-sensitive health effects (Patz et al. 2007, 400, fig. 1). © 2007 EcoHealth.

Fig. 5-3. Still image from Tétshim (Trésor Tshibangu) and Frank Mukunday's *Machini* (2019). Short animated movie, HD, 16:9, colour, work in progress. Courtesy of Tétshim and Frank Mukunday. Reproduced by permission from Tétshim and Mukunday ©.

Fig. 10-1. Arye Wachsmuth and Sophie Lillie, *Lourié P1061*, from the *Clear-Cut* (2008) series. 1 motif of 7, 29.7 x 42 cm (photographic material courtesy of Federal Monuments Office, Vienna). © Arye Wachsmuth, Sophie Lillie. A carved wooden figure of Saint Florian, from the collection of Arthur Lourié, as recorded by Monuments Officials in 1938. This work was sold at the Mauerbach Benefit Sale, lot 603.

Fig. 10-2. Inscriptions and markings on verso of Mauerbach lot 61. This work, by a follower of Adriaen van Ostade, was sold by Maria Almas Dietrich to Martin Bormann for the Braunes Haus, the Nazi Party Headquarters in Munich. Photograph courtesy of Uli Kohl and Stefan Oláh ©.

Fig. 10-3. Arye Wachsmuth and Sophie Lillie, *Gutmann P787*, from the *Clear-Cut* (2008) series. 1 motif of 7, 29.7 x 42 cm (photographic material courtesy of Federal Monuments Office, Vienna). © Arye Wachsmuth, Sophie Lillie. Abraham Mignon still life, from the collection of Rudolf Gutmann, as recorded by Monuments Officials in 1938. This work was sold at the Mauerbach Benefit Sale, lot 31.

Fig. 10-4a–d. Central Collecting Point Munich, property card nos. 9317 and 9318, relating to Josef Danhauser's companion pieces *Die Weinkost* and *Der Dorfpolitiker*. The former was erroneously restituted to a Hungarian claimant, the latter was sold at the Mauerbach Benefit Sale,

lot 513. Bundesdenkmalamt Archiv Wien, Restitutionsmaterialien, Property Cards. © Bundesdenkmalamt Wien.

Fig. 18-1. *Archive Fever*, 2010. Colour photograph of Juliette Brungs by Tanya Ury ©.

Fig. 22-1. The soup tureen, motif from Akerman's *Jeanne Dielman* (1975). Screenshot by the author.

Fig. 29-1. Sambo's grave located in Sunderland Point, Lancashire, England, UK. Photograph by Stan Pritchard.

FOREWORD

MARINA GRŽINIĆ, JOVITA PRISTOVŠEK,
AND SOPHIE UITZ

The volume *Opposing Colonialism, Antisemitism, and Turbo-Nationalism: Rethinking the Past for New Conviviality* focuses on collective amnesia in regard to traumatic events of the European past, and the ways in which these past events affect the present and future.

It arose from the art- and theory-based research project “Genealogy of Amnesia,” which was awarded funding by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) from 2018 to 2020. As the subtitle of the project, “Rethinking the Past for a New Future of Conviviality,” indicates, ultimately this volume is also about achieving a future conviviality. And so one of the questions we ask is: what do we need to do to reach this point?

The volume proceeds from genocides and the politics of silence that have shaped the constitution of identities, communities, and nations in Europe. Exposing and opposing European genocidal history—namely colonialism, antisemitism and turbo-nationalism—means rethinking the past for a new future rooted in a convivial life together, opening up other forms and conditions for another tomorrow.

In 30 chapters, this publication challenges our ability to imagine another world—one that will not discard its traumatic past, and yet will point to the future. Its objective is to provide an interdisciplinary platform to study the politics of silence and oblivion. Three traumatic research sites are at the centre of the book:

- The construction of a Belgian identity in the aftermath of its colonial past in Congo. Originally called the Congo Free State, the personal colony of King Leopold II remained in his possession from 1885 until 1908 when it was taken over by the Belgian government and renamed the Belgian Congo. Without reflection on past colonialism, in which the case of the Belgian Congo

demonstrated exemplary brutality, the long and vital tradition of postcolonial subjectivities cannot be captured.

- The construction of national identity in Austria after the “Anschluss” (annexation) of Austria into Nazi Germany on 12 March 1938, and the consecutive establishment of the myth that Austria was Hitler’s “first victim.” It was only decades after the foundation of the Second Republic, as a result of the “Waldheim Affair” (1986)—during which the Wehrmacht military activity of the future Austrian president Kurt Waldheim was acknowledged—that a de-tabooisation of the Austrian position on World War II finally began.
- The construction of a new national identity in Serbia and “Republika Srpska” (Serb Republic), along with the negation of war crimes after the dissolution of Yugoslavia (1990–present). It is important to state immediately that, in contrast with Austria and Belgium, “Republika Srpska” is not a state, but rather a territorial entity that declares its “full autonomy” despite being part of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

What connects these three historical situations is not the fact that these crimes occurred within a span of 100 years, but rather that in all three cases—despite available documents, testimonies and analysis—to this very day nation-states, collectives and identities are being built on a practice of silence and oblivion. Three key theses run through the book, which unite the voices and perspectives of scholars, activists and art practitioners:

- 1) The spaces of memory and history must always be critically re-examined, deconstructed, and reconstructed anew.
- 2) The archive is not a passive container, a kind of objective and neutral storage of history—on the contrary, it manages and controls the way history will be read and thus shapes the current political reality.
- 3) The emergent field of memory/history research opens up the possibility of investigating the emancipatory potential of geopolitical events for the production of critical, philosophical and scientific thought.

Finally, this volume seeks to give some answers to the following questions:

1. How can we rethink the constitution of European history and memory in the context of the prevailing discourses of silence, oblivion and amnesia that provoke discrimination, dispossession and differentiation—colonial racism, Holocaust, vicious antisemitism, and European-Balkan turbo-nationalism being the most evident and palpable?
2. What are the specific procedures developed by contemporary societies in Europe and the global capitalist world for not dealing with silenced histories?
3. What connects three seemingly disparate and chronologically distant genocides, which all happened in Europe—in Austria, Belgium and BiH/Croatia/Serbia and “Republika Srpska”?
4. What we can learn from their differences and similarities?
5. What contemporary politics of empowerment and strategies against politics of oblivion can we conceive?
6. How can such processes of emancipatory empowerment be addressed, initiated and facilitated through theoretical and arts-based practices and research?

INTRODUCTION:
BURDENED BY THE PAST,
RETHINKING THE FUTURE.
ELEVEN THESES ON MEMORY,
HISTORY, AND LIFE

MARINA GRŽINIĆ

PROFESSOR, ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS VIENNA, AUSTRIA

This text aims to provide an introduction by putting forward a number of theses, which proceed along three lines:

1. Where do we currently stand with the “Genealogy of Amnesia” research?
2. Amnesia, memory, history, life, and death in the context of neoliberal global necrocapitalism.
3. Violence and death, democracy and freedom.

The structure of this book is displayed at the end of the introduction.

**1. Where do we currently stand with the
“Genealogy of Amnesia” research?**

Taken as a whole, “Genealogy of Amnesia: Rethinking the Past for a New Future of Conviviality” research (2018–2020) seeks to unearth the procedures that silence three genocides: the genocide of the enslaved Black People by Imperial Europe in the colonial era; the Holocaust and genocide of millions of Jews in extermination camps by Nazi Germany and its allies, other Western powers as direct and indirect supporters of Nazi Germany, with Austria, as the research shows, as its very loyal supporter, and not just a helpless (“first”) victim; and, last but not least, the Srebrenica genocide in July 1995, when over 8,000 Muslim Bosniaks,

mainly men and boys, were executed in and around the town of Srebrenica during the Bosnian War.

These last killings were perpetrated by units of the Bosnian Serb Army of “Republika Srpska” (Serb Republic) under the command of Ratko Mladić. In 2017, Serbia is still caught in its own inability to contemplate and reflect on the Balkan war of the 1990s. In the meantime, on 22 November 2017, Mladić was sentenced to life in prison by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) on ten charges: one of genocide, five of crimes against humanity, and four of violations of the laws or customs of war. Taking this as our starting point, in the case of former Yugoslavia, we put forward the analysis of turbo-nationalism that accompanied the 1990s Balkan war, and which is the outcome of that period in the region. It is important to state immediately that, in contrast with Austria and Belgium, “Republika Srpska” is not a state, but instead a self-proclaimed territorial entity that declares “full autonomy” despite being part of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Colonialism, antisemitism and turbo-nationalism relate to three cases beyond this: two address Occidental Imperial Colonial Europe, while the third talks of former Eastern Europe (former Yugoslavia), where it all happened under the watchful but inert eye of the so-called EU core countries before EU enlargement, and under the gaze of the United Nations.

Amnesia seems to be the constant dimension of what we can simply call oblivion, which is connected with a structural repressive and ideological silencing by the majoritarian forces in power who carried out the genocides—over centuries when we are talking about colonialism and antisemitism, and over a few decades in former Yugoslavia. Amnesia is a central topic of this research because it is oblivion, and not memory, that appears to be the dominant theme of contemporary neoliberal culture.

David Garland provides a brief but apt explanation here: “‘Genealogy’ was, for Foucault, a method of writing critical history: a way of using historical materials to bring about a ‘revaluing of values’ in the present day” (Garland 2014, 372). Genealogical analysis traces how contemporary practices and institutions have emerged from specific struggles, conflicts, alliances and exercises of power, many of which are now forgotten.

There are two immediately identifiable approaches to constructing silences: on the one hand, the neoliberal Western empire is presented as

trans-historical; on the other, former Eastern Europe embraces turbo-historicization—turbo meaning a hyper-expedient, fast method of disposing of any other history than the nationalistic majoritarian one. Former Yugoslavia, Bosnia Herzegovina and the “Serb Republic” are all textbook examples of hyper-nationalism.

What is the status of Europe, or the EU? Europe is witnessing radical changes in its social and political spheres—with catastrophic dimensions—as a result of producing citizens on one side, and non-citizens on the other. The refugee crisis in Europe—the EU crisis—is a violent process of dehumanization politics exercised by the EU itself.

Those elaborating on the relationship between Europe and Africa are even more accurate when they state: “Black Europe is still persistently today produced as the Other of Europe.”¹

My **first thesis** argues that what is at play is an expedient and violent regrouping and dehumanizing of postcolonial subjectivities by the EU (the core constituted by Western European, Occidental, states, all colonial states). Further to this, the migrant labour force that came to Occidental Europe after World War II, literally to reconstruct its physiognomy after Western Europe’s Nazi past, is the target of violence today.

Therefore, in articulating *burdened by the past while trying to rethink the future*, a possible path towards resolving the question of how to think Europe, history and the future is offered by the title of an exhibition at Kunsthau Zürich (12 June–6 September 2015) curated by Cathérine Hug and Robert Menasse: “Europe: The Future of History.”

What does this mean? In *Death Beyond Disavowal: The Impossible Politics of Difference*, Grace Kuyngwon Hong maintains that neoliberalism operates as a “structure of disavowal” (2015, 7). Hong asserts that, in this regard, most neoliberal projects function by erasing the very conditions of gendered and racial violence, thus making them look as if they are things only and solely of the past. But they are not! Hong argues that they do this “by affirming certain modes of racialized, gendered, and sexualized life, particularly through invitation into

¹ See the open call of the 11th Annual Summer School on Black Europe, “Interrogating Citizenship, Race and Ethnic Relations” (Center of Study and Investigation for Decolonial Dialogues, n.d.).

reproductive respectability, *so as to* disavow its exacerbated production of premature death” (2015, 7; emphasis in original).

“Europe: The Future of History.” Does this capture the reality of Austria today? It is no coincidence that Austria stands in constant relation to its never fully acknowledged Nazi past. Continuously perpetuating its right-wing politics, the country brought a fully workable right-wing government to power in December 2017. Led by premier Sebastian Kurz, the conservative People’s Party formed a coalition with the Freedom Party, a nationalist group founded by former Nazis. While in the past the Kurt *Waldheim affair*² met with strong protests from the EU, this is no longer the situation today. In its five-year plan, “Together. For our Austria,” the hyper right-wing Austrian government adopted the motto found under the golden dome of the Secession exhibition space: “To every age its art. To every art its freedom.” Having learned of this, the Secession released a statement in December 2017: “When a government does not champion a free society, its promise to respect the freedom of the arts is no more than a rhetorical exercise” (Vienna Secession 2017).

Austria’s own past and its endemic and enduring antisemitism can provide a key for the critical rethinking of today’s Europe (EU). Moreover, one of the largest communities of migrants in Austria comes from the territory of ex-Yugoslavia. The formation of post-socialist identities in former Yugoslavia was a direct result of the Balkan war in the 1990s.

Hence my **second thesis** argues that a goal for the “Genealogy of Amnesia: Rethinking the Past for a New Future of Conviviality” research project and symposium is what Shaunak Mahbubani (2017) envisioned as a possibility for opening up a space for Allies for the Uncertain Futures.

² The “*Waldheim Affair*” refers to the controversy surrounding the exposure of the previously unknown past of Kurt Waldheim (former secretary general of the United Nations) during his campaign for the Austrian presidency in 1986. The evidence made public by Austrian weekly *Profil* suggested on the contrary that the former secretary general had been a member of the Nazi Student Union and that he had also belonged to a mounted riding unit of the Sturmabteilung, or SA (better known as the Brownshirts or Storm Troopers), while attending the Consular Academy in Vienna between 1937 and 1939 (Encyclopaedia Judaica, n.d.).

2. Amnesia, memory, history, life, and death in the context of neoliberal global necrocapitalism

One can ask: Is the relation between memory and history the same today as yesterday, is the archive the same as yesterday? My proposal is that we should think in all three cases about different *apparatuses* that require new concepts. Therefore my **third thesis** argues that if we want to discover different ways of dealing with memory and history currently, we have to think in terms of nothing less than life and death. Hong is clear: “The ongoing legacies of structuralized violence, call attention to the ‘life/death’ binary that functions as the foundation of capitalism and political modernity” (Hong 2015, 11).

What we see all around us in this age of neoliberal global capitalism is our increasing confrontation with a political and social amnesia that results in our living almost without the past, while producing ever more processes of de-historicization and de-politicization. Central to these processes is the logic of (neoliberal) repetition that creates at least two different procedures of (de)historicization. On the one hand, we have the logic of the neoliberal Western world functioning as a purely trans-historical machine; on the other, in regions in the East and South of Europe, we detect a forced technique of embracing historicization as totalization. In both cases, the result is a suspension of history that operates with the primary intention of disposing of any alternative within it! Mbembe suggests that it is necessary to demythologize whiteness; the demythologizing of hegemonic versions of history must go hand-in-hand with *the demythologizing of whiteness*. “This is not because whiteness is the same as history. Human history, by definition, is history beyond whiteness,” Mbembe (n.d.) says, adding that the “human history is about the future.”

Again this links in with Mbembe’s work, published free online and of vital importance, a long text on current South African reality and the archive. What I am developing has two parallel expansions. The first is connected with the digital technologies of the information age and the financialization of the economy, which work hand-in-hand. The second regards the new work of capital, as we are no longer fundamentally different from things. The outcome is a not a liberation, but instead a new racism. As he explains, because the new technologies increasingly entail “profound questions about the nature of species in general, the need to rethink the politics of racialization and the terms under which the struggle

for racial justice unfolds here and elsewhere in the world today has become ever more urgent” (Mbembe, n.d.).

Hence, I should ask: Is it the relation between memory and history the same as that of yesterday? Is it the archive the same as yesterday? I propose that we should think in all three cases about entirely different *apparatuses*, which require new concepts. In other words: a reconceptualization.

This is connected with a thesis that all the notions we use are from the time of neoliberal global capitalism; specifically, because of the intervention of digital media and technologies, we have to rethink anew, and deeply. Thus I want to explain these changes and situate memory and history, amnesia and archive within them.

The main change, the fundamental change, is historical. It concerns two different ways of governing over life, both connected with capitalism. Basically, the post-World War II period in the West entails a new relation between life and politics that we know as biopolitics. This operates through a multiplicity of regulative techniques in people’s everyday lives. As conceptualized by Michel Foucault in the mid-1970s, biopolitics designates the entry of phenomena peculiar to the life of human species into the order of knowledge and power, or simply, into the sphere of political techniques (see Foucault 2010).

Biopolitics is simply: make live and let die. To make a welfare state for the “real” citizens, the nationals, and not for the migrants, etc. and to allow all the others to die, including the East during the Cold War.

With neoliberal global capitalism, however, this biopolitical managing of life changes radically into a dystopian project of necropolitics, the managing of death. NECROPOLITICS: Coined just 15 years ago in 2003 by Achille Mbembe, today the term might seem already historical, but unfortunately this is not the case—it is still working at full power, here and now. Published in 2003 and after 11 September 2001 (9/11), Mbembe’s “Necropolitics” clearly shows the implementation of a military corpus that presents itself not as an administration of life but as a governing over death (*necro* means death in Latin). In a similar way to biopolitics, I defined necropolitics as “let live and make die.” Obviously, to make live was the 1970s welfare state slogan for the first capitalist world, and today you are allowed to live, if you can—can you? They are two radically different modes of life.

What do I want to say? The last few decades have shown that neoliberal global capitalism, historically in order to progress, not only did away with the Berlin Wall (1989) but also intensified a rupture in the modes of its properly established governmentality. Moreover, it is important to state that this shift from biopolitics to necropolitics and their coexistence here and now—rubbing shoulders, so to speak—shows that contemporary biopolitics, through a systematic management of big data, austerity programmes and general immiseration of the biopolitical population, produces a violence once reserved for those seen as unsatisfactory or not fully human. And if biopolitics is a systematic governing of the life of the population, then necropolitics is much more than this—it is attached to the whole system of life that is now subjugated to death, as capitalization, austerity, exploitation of the ecosystem, etc.

The most important element of this shift is that it is not just a division and differentiation but is established along the colonial/racial divide. My thesis is that all that we theorize these days regarding the status of refugees and asylum seekers, including citizenship and conditions for a better life, has to be seen through necropolitical lenses. Moreover, it is important to note that necropolitics functions through measures of an intensified racialization. This is not just the old racism, but instead new forms of exploitation, expropriation and dispossession, of people, states, and histories too, as well as vocabularies and, last but not least, labour, via the constructed category of race that is today a norm.

This fundamental change presents itself in several other passages: from liberalism to neoliberalism, from multiculturalist capitalism to global capitalism, from the administration of life towards the administration of death, and a shift in the first capitalist world from imperial nation-states to militarized war-state powers; finally, that historical colonialism changed into a contemporary colonial matrix of power presenting also a change, or reappearance, of two forms of power: governmentality and sovereignty. In all these radical shifts in forms of power, we also see two different modes of constituting the social bond—on one side, post-socialist ex-second world (former Eastern European states) embarking on turbo-fascist societies; on the other, the old colonial imperialist Occidental states that were once nation-states not only became war-states but also retained a postmodern fascist social structure (of pure individualization, fragmentation and mobilization of individuals, with a persistent rejection of the “other”).

Along with this comes the change in agency from the modernist notion of a political subject toward a citizen. This is why the emancipatory potential is given to an almost old but re-born politics of managing the city, while the State is corrupted, hegemonic and militarized (see Gržinić 2018b). Biopower centred on the body of a single citizen is now shifted to a necropower that does more than just target bodies; it targets the whole space or a scape to the point that we see a switch from biopolitical populations to necropolitical deathscapes.

What is the shortest and more precise statement of necropolitics?

Mbembe (2003, 11) stated that necropolitics defines: Who should live and who must die. Necropolitics means nothing other than the answer to the question: Who should live and who must die. The line of division or entanglement of biopolitics and necropolitics in global capitalism is the racial/colonial divide. Therefore necropolitics is no longer about the sovereign nation-state that protects its borders and is forced to kill in order not to lose its sovereignty or to put its own citizens in danger—this is of course a speculative definition, completely misused historically—rather, it directly decides who should live and who must die.

For all three cases addressed in our “Genealogy of Amnesia” research project, this is precisely what it is about!

The outcome of this coexistence of biopolitics and necropolitics has far-reaching consequences. This also leads to a transformation in the status of the nation-states—old nation-states, colonial and antisemite, all sovereign states are today war-states. They have control of the military and war structures, and are therefore fully necropolitical states that decide who should live and who must die. The old Eastern European states, the former Communist states, are all just nation-states and nationalism is their depoliticized violent ideology.

This is why we can talk about turbo-nationalism. Consequently, the process of turbo-nationalist neoliberalism has applied to Eastern Europe a specific format of fascism that the feminist theoretician Žarana Papić (2002) called *turbo-fascism*. Papić proposed turbo-fascism to conceptualize hegemonic postsocialist nationalisms in the Balkans in the 1990s, specifically in Serbia, i.e. national separatisms, chauvinist and racist exclusion or marginalization of (old and new) minority groups. All these processes were, and are, closely connected with patriarchal, discriminatory and violent politics against women and their civil and

social rights. Papić admits that “it is, of course, known that fascism is a historical term; that the history of Nazi Germany is not the same as that of Milošević’s Serbia. However, in postmodernist and feminist theory we speak of ‘shifting concepts,’ when a new epoch inherits with some additions concepts belonging to an earlier one, like, for instance the feminist notion of *shifting patriarchy*” (Papić 2002, 198–199; emphasis in original). She further argues that “we should not fear the use of ‘big terms’ if they *accurately* describe certain political realities” (199; emphasis in original).

This is when fascism RE-enters clearly as a notion that is not just a description, but a reality.

The turbo-fascist reality of the former space of Yugoslavia can be connected with another process that occurred after 2001. The neoliberal context of the autonomy of individuals foregrounds the neoliberal freedom of having rights as an *individual brand*. For this reason, as proposed by Santiago López Petit, we call it postmodern fascism, which sterilizes the “Other,” evacuates the conflict from public space and neutralizes the political (2009, 84). It is thus logical for us to state consistently that global capitalism is about depoliticization.

As noted by Jordy Rosenberg, when Ernst Bloch was faced with the emergence of fascism in Europe during the 1930s, the German thinker contended that “the stench of this scene is age-old” (quoted in Rosenberg 2018). Refusing to consider Fascism as “the irruption of an unprecedented evil,” Bloch considered fascism as “the expression of a deep-rooted [genocidal] structure in contemporary form” (Rosenberg 2018). Rosenberg explains that it is important to talk about fascism not with the aim of diluting its historical specificity but with the objective of refusing to abstract it in the time of a perpetual state of exception.

My **fourth thesis** is a genealogy of governmentality and sovereignty after World War II. We can identify the following: in Foucault’s work governmentality and sovereignty are separated, in Giorgio Agamben’s they are conflated, the biopolitical and necropolitical. Abandonment was long a status of economic migrants; they were needed for cheap labour but prevented from entering any public discourse in Occidental public space. When economic migrants were outside of the labour-capital relation in the welfare capitalist states, they were in reality abandoned in their needs, subjectivities, and desires and therefore the abandonment soon changed into a ban. The forms of abandonment differ historically. Today,

mandatory integration is also a form of ban. When they are not dismissed as economic migrants or seen as potential threats, asylum seekers and refugees are frequently positioned as “speechless emissaries” (Malkki 1996) whose wounds speak louder than their words.

However, in Achille Mbembe’s work, governmentality and sovereignty are projected onto each other and simultaneously duplicated.

Or, to be even more schematic, the genealogy is as follows: Foucault centres on *governmentality*, Agamben centres on *sovereignty* and Mbembe takes both at once, *sovereignty and governmentality*, though now governmentality is overdetermined by sovereignty but simultaneously present (see Gržinić 2017, 7). The change from biopolitical governmentality of life into necropolitical sovereignty over death decides, as formulated by Mbembe, who should live and who must die. Furthermore, sovereignty is foundational, vertical, militarized and governmentality is de-foundational, apparently horizontal, dispersed and if necessary can be confiscated, seized instantaneously by sovereignty. It can be suspended, social transfers blocked, public access to knowledge and space immediately revoked.

Now, we finally open up the terrain to talk about amnesia, memory and history.

In the 1970s, we see the imposition of what I can term a biopolitical amnesia that is not seen as a racializing process of forgetting, but rather presents itself as a deficit in memory. To perform the archives of amnesia is to make evident precisely these processes of racialization not rationalization, though structural racism is also connected with rationally structured violence.

Moreover, my **fifth thesis** argues that amnesia has two paths:

- a) Postmodern fascism is about pseudo-oblivion! Pseudo-amnesia.
- b) Turbo-fascism—which, as I showed, works hand-in-hand with turbo-nationalism—is not about silencing the genocide but about its GLORIFICATION.

In the 1990s, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and coextensive with Agamben’s notion of abandonment, the suppression of counter-history continues as aphasia. In her “Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France,” Ann Laura Stoler clearly presents the case of France

not being able to connect the French Republic and the Empire. In an abstract for her article, Stoler suggests that the term “colonial aphasia is invoked to supplant the notions of ‘amnesia’ or ‘forgetting,’ to focus rather on three features: an occlusion of knowledge, a difficulty in generating a vocabulary that associates appropriate words and concepts with appropriate things, and a difficulty comprehending the enduring relevancy of what has already been spoken” (Stoler 2011).

In 2017, French theoretician Marie-José Mondzain published a book whose title translates into English as “confiscation of words, images, and time,” with a subtitle that can be read as “for radicality.” She shows that the neoliberal anaesthesia of political action works by delegitimizing “radicality.” Mondzain is clear: economic liberalism has seized our vocabulary. The word radicalism is equated with terrorism, and so we see calls for de-radicalization. But Mondzain does not capitulate before such demands. She insists—to summarize her two main theses in the book—firstly, that de-radicalisation should act like the awakening which leaves the subject of the nightmare and immediately restores it by proposing another dream (that of the return to order and health).

Mondzain is not naïve, and clearly distances herself from those who train for terrorism. Nevertheless, she calls for a different perspective, and therefore: secondly, we must intensify the crisis in its radicality, deploy all creative resources, and mobilize all revolts in order to bring forth the figure of another world (2017).

What is it that we have today? After amnesia and aphasia? The answer is seizure. Seizure, and this is my **sixth thesis**, is co-substantial with necropolitical racializing assemblages—it presents a confiscation and therefore an absolute erasure of counter-culture political histories.

Schematically, the possible trajectory (my **seventh thesis**) is therefore the following:

1970 BIOPOLITICS / Amnesia
 1990 ABANDONMENT / Aphasia
 2003–2017 NECROPOLITICS / Seizure

This is why we have to perform the archives of amnesia in order to counteract the necropolitical seizure of history!

What all this implies is another shift, described by Marc James Léger (2012) as the contemporary displacing, to a great extent, of the cultural politics of representation of postmodern cultural studies for (much needed) radicalized constituent politics. This indicates collective struggle and oppositionality as the basis of a potential democratization of neoliberal necrocapitalist societies.

Of course, in the process of imposed, produced and instituted failed modes of remembering, this proposed genealogy is definitely connected with the perception of time. Necropolitical seizure is the immobilization and fundamental *negation of time*. Mbembe argues that negation of time, i.e. a colonial point of view on time, means being without history. Being “radically located *outside of time*,” or *to connect* with the initial logic of repetition is “*repetition without difference*.” Native time was sheer repetition—not of events as such, but the instantiation of the very law of repetition. Fanon understands decolonisation as precisely a subversion of the law of repetition” (Mbembe, n.d.; emphasis in original).

The way in which history is foreclosed by processes of racialization changes in terms of the changes in capitalism after World War II, reproducing the relation between governmentality and sovereignty.

Thus, through procedures of necrocapitalist racializing assemblages imposed onto counter-histories, we get:

- the 1970s biopolitical amnesia, forgetting;
- the 1990s imposed abandonment and ban as a form of aphasia, “forgetting” as not being able to find the words,
- and currently, we face a necropolitical sovereign seizure or confiscation, a complete privatization of communal counter-histories by those in power, from State repressive apparatuses to all sorts of cultural, artistic, archival, political, economic institutions.

In *Death Beyond Disavowal*, Hong claims that “neoliberalism is foundationally an epistemological formation organized around erasure and disavowal” (2015, 37). Hong argues that this form of disavowal is only made possible by the ways in which post-World War II liberation movements are both co-opted and “misremembered.” The outcome is that (my **eighth thesis**) memory is a question of biopolitics, and history is the main terrain of necropolitics: it is constantly under attack, being erased, rewritten and evacuated.

Therefore, I connect what I call necrocapitalist sovereignty management of the human (my **ninth thesis**) with seizure, the confiscation of counter-cultural, political, social histories. Counter-histories are (like the human is) under harsh processes of racialization. But why is this so important? Because without counter-histories it is not possible to reclaim the present.

Mbembe suggests that is necessary to demythologize whiteness, as the demythologizing of certain versions of history must go hand-in-hand with *the demythologizing of whiteness*. “This is not because whiteness is the same as history. Human history, by definition, is history beyond whiteness,” Mbembe (n.d.) says, adding that the “human history is about the future.”

To talk about amnesia, however, is also paradoxical because we live in a time, at least in the Occident, of hyper-digitalization; digital archives are more than just prosthesis, thus the capacity to remember seems almost outdated as a human function. Digital archives do the job for us. Therefore, we see that amnesia is also part of a vocabulary belonging to a former modernist time and to the archive as well; instead, we have digitally enhanced repositories.

3. Violence and death, democracy and freedom

It is essential to emphasize freedom as a conceptual category and a category for the analysis of global capitalism in the present moment, as this category is central to necrocapitalism and therefore for the condition of those directly targeted by necrocapitalism. What does this mean? If we talk about freedom, we talk about freedom as a category central to necrocapitalism, so not just for capitalism, not only for neoliberal global capitalism, but necrocapitalism. Without freedom, necrocapitalism cannot function.

Who is the target of necrocapitalism, and especially who is in direct relation to freedom?

Definitely the refugees, and when I say this, I also mean that they are unquestionably central, because we are not central to this topic, unfortunately. Why? Because for refugees without citizenship the condition of death, to die, is their primary condition of existence.

We are under pressure, but we are not under the weight of death at this moment, which is the situation for all those who have no citizenship and are refugees. The others, the refugees and many others who are approaching the EU, they are non-citizens. Freedom therefore has to be connected precisely to this category of non-citizenship. Why? Because necrocapitalism operates with this word *necro*, a prefix meaning death. So necrocapitalism works with a politics that governs over death and makes a surplus of profit with the instrumentalization of death. *Necro* is not just *Thanatos* in opposition to *Eros*; the *necro* in necrocapitalism defines the neoliberal global capitalist regime currently implementing the machinery of war and destruction to make a profit.

On the other hand, death is directly connected to freedom. We can only respond with freedom to the situation when we are in direct proximity of this capitalism governing over death. It is essential to consider where we are talking from.

Mbembe states, and I repeat, that necropolitics means nothing other than the answer to the question: who should live and who must die. What is also important in his text from 2003 is that “freedom as a category is crucial in positing death as a political concept” (Chakkour 2015, 29).

This virtually connects freedom to the machinery of killing, because death is not what we know from *Eros* and *Thanatos*—the libidinal economy of biocapitalism. Mbembe tied death centrally to political economy. People are dying, but the money comes from this accumulation. So, he said, this is why death is a political concept and even more, he stated that only when we are talking about death as *necro* inside capitalism, can we answer this with freedom; or in another way, can we see that death is the space in which freedom and negation operate. This being said, we are not in such a situation.

Now the question remains: Where do we stand in Europe?

What is reserved for us? One of the possible answers is first: We have to remember that we haven't lost everything. If we are citizens, we are discriminated against, we can be punished, we can be pursued, transformed into second- and third-class citizens—but we are still not carrying death directly on our shoulders, we are not in the position of being a non-citizen like the refugees. We have a passport, we can travel, maybe we don't have enough money but this is not enough to claim

freedom in this context; because when you are under direct pressure of death then you claim freedom and you also, which is essential for us, try to exercise different elements on how to react to this relation between death and freedom.

For the refugees: those who have nothing to lose have many ways of responding. One of these reactions is immolation, the other can be suicide, and the third may be different strategies of, so to speak, self-harming—for example, erasing your fingerprints so that nobody can find you in the various archives. We can recall how the Arab Spring in Tunis started—with immolation.

So what is reserved for us? For us—because for these second- and third-rate citizens, the precarious etc. there exists the relation in the biopolitical context that is of course pressured by necropolitics, and—this is the link between democracy and violence. So we are subject to violence, and our only possible response to this is a democracy (“you live in a democracy, you have to fight for democracy”...). This is what we do; we fight for democracy.

But what do we have as forms of organization, protest, etc. when we talk about the relation between violence and democracy? From my reading of Latin-American analysis recently, it clearly emerged that you have two options, and they are both pretty tricky. One is a lynching, and the other is the mob. Both are indeed present in the European context as well. Remember the thousands who protested against refugees in Chemnitz in Germany in September 2018. Right-wing citizens took to the streets, thousands of them, lynching people of another colour. Or in Italy. In 2018 they finally imprisoned the person responsible for killing asylum-seekers on the streets (he was sentenced to 12 years, but will probably be set free after a year). This is the new mode of lynching: it’s the violence of the mob.

The paradox is that the most illegal entity is the state itself. What can you expect from the repressive apparatuses of a country? Nothing other than repression. This is something we have to rethink and seriously put into perspective. And we need to continue thinking about, and reflecting on, the positions from which we speak.

Or in summary, my **tenth thesis**, what can we further expect? Because violence and democracy and death and freedom establish relations that can

from day to day become increasingly violent and exchangeable, so to speak. The post-humans, the regime of whiteness, primarily, in the Occident are just a violent mob without the possibility of entering into any substantial social perspective such as alliances and common struggles and forms of conviviality.

In “Border Bodies: Mixedness and Passing in *Prison Break*,” Shirley Anne Tate (2018) explores the runaway hit *Prison Break*, an American TV drama created by Paul Scheuring, broadcast on Fox from 2005 to 2009. The main character, Michael Scofield, played by Wentworth Miller, takes a key place in her analysis. UK-born Miller is black/white mixed race. His father is of African-American and Jamaican descent, already a mixed category because of enslavement histories, while his mother is a white American. Tate explores the positioning of Miller as the lead protagonist in all five series specifically because of his passing as white. The main question is what this might mean for skin colour borders in “post-race” states. His passing as white makes us note that, although whiteness is more than skin colour, recognition as “white” still dictates which agents are allowed to transform injustice and subvert dispossession in the 21st century (Gržinić 2018a, 23–24).

This is what refugees know palpably. Therefore (my last, **eleventh thesis**): if any revolution is to be expected, it will come from those who are at present the most oppressed, subjugated and dehumanized.

The structure

This volume researches the politics of memory essential for contemporary philosophical and critical transdisciplinary reflections on racism, antisemitism, nationalism on the one hand, and empowerment and futurity on the other. The aim is to create a space of conviviality that grows out of research, and which in an accessible and communicable way invites, involves and engages different audiences, social and political actors.

PART ONE: In the Aftermath of Colonialism

We turn to Belgium as an example of the absence of reflection upon the colonial past in contemporary public discourse. Despite the work of many historians on the topic of Belgian involvement in the Congo, this narrative is rarely heard outside of academic circles, and it remains on the margins of the official narrative of a modern European history. This “hidden