



Words, Contention, Memory

19-21 October 2022

Location: Sweelinckzaal, Utrecht University
Drift 21, 3512 BR Utrecht

Wednesday, 19 October

13:30 - 14:00 Coffee and Registration

14:00 - 14:15 Welcome and opening remarks by Ann Rigney

14:15 - 15:15 **Panel 1 Slogans 1**

Steven Schouten (Utrecht University)
No More War! / Nie Wieder Krieg!

Hannah Grimmer (Kassel University)
Somos Más – We are more. Artistic practices as (positive) memory activism in Chile's social uprising

15:15 - 15:45 Coffee break

15:45 - 16:45 **Panel 2 Slogans 2**

Tashina Blom (Utrecht University)
Protest Slogans Through The Centuries: Ideological Morphologies of Memory in 'No Gods No Masters!'

Zoé Carle (University Paris 8 Vincennes – Saint Denis)

The Slogans of May 68 in France: An Ambiguous Heritage".

| | |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16:45 - 17:00 | Coffee break |
| 17:00 - 18:00 | Keynote 1 Mary Lynne Gasaway Hill (St. Mary's University, Texas) <i>Campus Unrest: Memory in the Meso of European Student Newspapers, 1968-1969</i> |
| 19:00 | Dinner for panelists |

Thursday, 20 October

| | |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:00 - 11:00 | Panel 3 Voices 1 Natalie Braber (Nottingham Trent University) Scabs and Pickets: Words and Memories of East Midlands coal miners Michal Kravel-Tovi (Tel Aviv University) The Blessing of Tainted Memories: "HarediMe Too" Discourse-Centered Activism in Israel |
| 11:00 - 11:15 | Coffee break |
| 11:15 - 12:45 | Panel 4 Framing Moritz Neuffer (ZfL Berlin) 'Memory Still Haunts History's Sleep'. Poetics and Politics of Remembering '1956' and '1968' Michiel Bot (Tilburg University) Contested Resonances of Boycott in a Transnational Context Sophie van den Elzen (Utrecht University) The Aftermath of the Rudi Dutschke Attack in the Transnational Newspaper Press |
| 12:45 - 13:45 | Lunch |
| 13:45 - 14:45 | Keynote 2 Tamar Katriel (University of Haifa) <i>Texts of Resistance</i> |
| 14:45 - 15:00 | Coffee break |
| 15:00 - 16:30 | Panel 5 Travelling Words 1 |

Arnab Roy Chowdhury (HSE University)
The Discreet Charm of Satyagraha: Shifting Meanings and Discursive Framing of the Gandhian Repertoire in India (*online*)

Lara Green (Erasmus University)
Террорист/Terrorist: Claiming, Defining, and Restricting the Terminology of Political Violence in the late C19th

Jennifer Adese (University of Toronto)
Aboriginal: What's in a Word? (*online*)

18:30 Dinner for panelists

Friday, 21 October

10:00 - 11:30 **Panel 6 Digital Methods**

Laura Visser-Maessen and Jorrit van den Berk (Radboud University)
“How Racial Discourse Travels: The American Black Freedom Struggle as a Reference Point in the Netherlands” (30 minute joint presentation)

Isabelle Gribomont (UCLouvain)
Modelling the Discursive Propagation and Evolution of 20th-Century Latin American Insurgent Discourse

11:30 - 11:45 Coffee break

11:45 - 12:45 **Panel 7 Voices 2**

Maria Boletsi (Leiden University)
The Futurity of Obsolete Grammars: Middle Voice on Wall-Writings in Greece during the ‘Crisis’

Monica Janssen (Utrecht University)
“Un altro mondo è possibile” (Genoa 2001) to “Un altro mondo non era possibile” to “Un altromondo è necessario” (Genova 2021): Podcasting Genoa 2001’s Memories of Hope

12:45 - 13:45 Closing remarks and lunch

Keynote 1

Campus Unrest: Memory in the Meso of European Student Newspapers, 1968-1969

Mary Lynne Gasaway Hill (St. Mary’s University, Texas)

19 October, 15:45-16:45

We are gathering at 'Words, Contention, Memory', to explore activist language through the lens of cultural memory. Doing this allows us to wrestle with how our words shape our relationships to the past, particularly to canonical events of political activism, and to how we may ethically remember them in the future.

One way to expand our lens of cultural memory, regarding the canonical events of European political activism of 1968 and 1969, is to engage with the words of those present at the time: to listen to how they spoke of the events unfolding around them. This presentation attempts to do just that, by sharing a primary data source, *Campus Unrest (1970)*, generated in those heady days.

In the summers of 1968 and 1969, when Marguerite Duras proclaimed that those on the barricades in Paris were sick with hope, an American academic and champion of student free speech, Arthur Goerdt, S.M., conducted a series of interviews with a range of individuals, from the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, England, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, involved in university student publications. This presentation serves as an introduction and invitation to this collection of interviews, which has never before been shared in such a public manner. The voices of these then-young students, editors, and writers offer us more than a micro-sample of language, but not yet a clear macro-connection to the larger web of events. Instead, they speak to us in the nexus of the meso, that messy middle, between events and reflections on those events, where and when meaning is created retroactively.

Keynote 2

Texts of Resistance

Tamar Katriel (University of Haifa)

20 October, 13:45-14:45

Mission statements by activist organizations and activist personal memoirs are well-established textual genres of activist writing. Addressing the case of Israeli peace activism relating to the Israeli/Palestinian conflict, and building on my analysis of its discursive dimensions in *Defiant Discourse (2021)*, I will explore these very different textual genres as discursive sites for the production of activist identities. Both involve interventions in the field of memory as well as in the field of discourse.

As interventions in the field of memory, they variously blend future-oriented activist imaginaries with grassroots memory work. They draw on activist legacies as resources for future action, and use witnessing accounts to disrupt dominant views of both the past and the present with an eye to the future. Juxtaposed, these two genres bring out the multi-directionality of activist temporalities.

As interventions in the field of discourse, they represent discourse-centered activism, i.e., verbal resistance that works to interrupt hegemonic discourse by producing counter-discourses. This is accomplished through the use of discursive strategies such as agenda-setting, naming, reframing, analogizing, and stance-taking. My analysis will foreground the performative dimension of these counter-discourses as texts laminated with both memory work and future thinking, personal and collective voices.

Panel 1 Slogans 1

No More War! Nie Wieder Krieg

Steven Schouten (Utrecht University)

No More War! was a motto of the pacifist movement in interwar Europe. In Germany it was coined “Never Again War” [*Nie Wieder Krieg!*] by the writer Kurt Tucholsky at the end of World War I, a slogan that became well-known in German society, especially with the publication of the peace movement’s initiative entitled *Nie Wieder Krieg!*, in which famous avant-garde artists and writers, such as Ernst Toller and Käthe Kollwitz, published their works. ‘No More War’/‘Never Again War’ has been adopted by pacifist movements in various countries in Europe and the world. It was aligned to anti-fascist and anti-(extreme-)Rightwing social activism during the interbellum, for example in Ernst Toller’s play *Nie wieder Frieden* (Never Again Peace, 1936), a critique of the pro-war mentality of his age and a direct ‘response’ to the *Nie Wieder Krieg* slogan, as well as after World War II, for example via German political initiatives such as *Nie Wieder Krieg*, *Nie wieder Fascismus!* Moreover, after World War II it was also aligned to anti-nuclear testing activism. Most famously, Linus Pauling, an advocate of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 and winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace in that same year, published an analysis of the implications of nuclear war for humanity under the title *No More War!* (1958). In 1965, “Never Again!” was used by Pope Paul VI in a United Nations (UN) address—he was explicitly referring to the task of the UN to prevent war, thus referring to Never Again War. In pop music, ‘No More war’ has been used by, among other artists, the Bronsky Beat in the 1980s. Bob Marley reframed the motto by combining his two songs *War/No More Trouble* in some of his live performances in the late 1970s. The English writer and photographer Giles Duley has used the motto ‘No More War’ as a theme to create art works that represent the suffering of war created in the aftermath of the 2001 World Trade Center attack, while Massive Attack’s Robert Del Naja decided to provide short anti-war films as part of Duley’s campaign. In his recent book *No More War* (2021), Dan Kovalik uses the motto as a post-colonial ‘reminder’ for the UN not to forget its ‘original’ aim to prevent war and to open the organisation’s critical self-introspection. Most recently, Pope Francis in January 2022 used the words “Please, no more war” and “War never again! Never again War!” in an attempt to prevent war for the Ukraine. In all these ‘usus’, the motto ‘No More War/Never Again War’ proved to be a powerful one to express a desire for peace and opposition to war, although with various (social activist) agenda’s.

In this paper, I would like to explore how the motto ‘No More War!/Never Again War!’ came into being, how it was ‘used’ in all sorts of media (art, literature, music, film) to frame and express all sorts of social activism related to war-opposition since World War I and, by so doing, contributed to a (re)framing of collective memories of the wars and conflicts under attention (World War I, World War II/Holocaust, the Cold War, the War on Terrorism, etc.). Emphasis will lie on Europe and the US, although I will seek to also explore other parts of the world (South America, Australia and Israel). I also wish to take into consideration the way in which the motto was used in relation to ‘Never again!’, which has its own history as a motto—‘Never again!’ is often used in relation to war, yet, in that case, more specifically to the Holocaust and, increasingly, genocide in general.

Somos Más – We are more. Artistic practices as (positive) memory activism in Chile’s social uprising

Hannah Grimmer (Kassel University)

The research focuses on visual arts in the context of social movements and their references to cultural resistance strategies against dictatorships. Chile, with the social uprising from October 2019 and its struggle against the

heritage of the dictatorship (1973-1990), serves as an exemplary case study. Artists take on the task of incorporating the non-integrated and fragmentary into collective memories (Richard2001). By that, the post-dictatorial memory consensus is contradicted through the arts. This generation actively succeeds in changing public memory (Badilla Rajevic 2019) by acting as memory activists (Gutman/Wüstenberg2021). The artistic means to be analysed intervene in the social sphere and range from light installations to graphic representations and performances. The aim is to reflect on the evoked quotations, the traditions in which they are situated and the connections they create(remediation).

By using “No pasarán” before the presidential run-off, activists evoked transnational memory to mobilise against the far-right candidate. For inner-Chilean struggles, “No+” [No more] and “Somos+” [We are more] are central expressions. “No+” goes back to the *Collective of Art Actions* that during the dictatorship appeared to the inhabitants of Santiago to complete the sentence. The women in resistance adopted it for a protest action (1985) and combined it with “Somos+”. They thus created a negation and an affirmation in one: “We don't want more” of this system as a negation and “we are becoming more” as a positive affirmation.

During contemporary protests, the studio for audio-visual design *Delight Lab* took up this slogan. Since the beginning of the protests, they have been projecting inscriptions on the façades in Santiago, such as “Somos+” (on 25.11.2020, the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women). This form of homage and appropriation of the memory of the women’s agency is a form of memory in activism (Rigney 2018). In addition, “A rapist on your way” by the collective *Las Tesis* was projected. In it, they link ongoing violence against women with the anthem of the Chilean police during the dictatorship. Further examples for activist slogans are “Chile has awakened”, “Until dignity becomes custom”, “They took everything away from us, including our fear” or “The joy never came”.

Panel 2 Slogans 2

Protest Slogans Through The Centuries: Ideological Morphologies of Memory in ‘No Gods No Masters!’

Tashina Blom (Utrecht University)

TBD

The Slogans of May 68 in France: An Ambiguous Heritage

Zoé Carle (University Paris 8 Vincennes – Saint Denis)

The slogans of May 68 in France have a special status: they mark a break in the understanding of revolutionary production and the source material for social movements. Perceived as literary or philosophical forms, slogans, graffiti and posters have known an unprecedented patrimonialization and became cultural heritage: edited collections of slogans have multiplied in the last years as well as for the various commemorations of the events, while the posters produced by the “Atelier Populaire des Beaux-Arts” became iconic and made their way towards museum exhibitions and commercial reproduction.

As Kristin Ross has observed, the memorialization process of the events has partly de-politicized May 68, turning it into a cultural movement and the slogans and graffiti have played a crucial part in an ambiguous manner. Appreciated for their formal qualities, they were able to circulate out of their original context of enunciation. On

one hand, they have been a major source of inspiration for many other national and international social movements – especially feminist movements. On the other hand, the slogans remembered were in a certain way the less political of the corpus. This presentation aims to analyze the ambiguous notion of revolutionary slogans inherited from this moment, standing on a crest in between mobilizing tools and modern aphorisms.

Panel 3, Voices 1

Scabs and Pickets: Words and Memories of East Midlands coal miners

Natalie Braber (Nottingham Trent University)

Even after almost forty years, the subject of the 1984-85 coal miners' strike continues to divide people. Particularly the Nottinghamshire region of England is central to this debate and intense and heated exchanges, both verbal and written, still occur in the press, at conferences and via social media. On one side are the striking miners who still see the betrayal by the majority of the Nottinghamshire miners for not joining the year long strike and consider this to be the main reason for the split in the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) and subsequent terminal decline of the deep coalmining industry in Britain. On the other side, the working Nottinghamshire Miners saw the strike as being unconstitutional with the influx of flying pickets who entered the Nottinghamshire coalfield from the start of the strike. They consider that opinions were forced upon them and think of this as being instrumental in the eventual split in the union following the strike. As a result, the Nottinghamshire Miners formed a separate trade union, the Union of Democratic Mineworkers (UDM), in 1985.

In different projects we have engaged with, the subject of the strikes, its repercussions and the anniversaries of the 1984-85 strike were raised by many former miners on both sides. This paper explains how such dangerous histories can be approached by academics and how oral testimonies can be collected from the opposing sides who have not conversed constructively for almost forty years, in addition to widening the scope of the subject to allow other people to become involved.

The Blessing of Tainted Memories: “Haredi Me Too” Discourse-Centered Activism in Israel

Michal Kravel-Tovi (Tel Aviv University)

Across a wide variety of political and cultural contexts, the battle against sexual violence is constructed as a battle against collective silence. Repeated iterations of the globalized “Me-Too” campaign are marked by the popularized motto “breaking the silence”, and the imperative to speak up. Based on a multi-sited and long-term ethnographic fieldwork, I explore how ultra-Orthodox (*Haredi*) Jewish activists in Israel are pursuing this imperative; and how, in turn, this imperative implicates possibilities for aspired and wider engagements with social critique and change. I suggest that by tainting the idealized images and conventional cultural schemes of the *Haredi* community as a virtuous society, sexual violence discourses give *Haredi* activists the opportunity to introduce a new vocabulary, critical narratives and awareness of social problems.

The motto “breaking the silence” has a particular resonance for my interlocutors. Ultra-Orthodox Jewish activists in Israel seek to elevate sexual violence as a recognized social malaise demanding words and actions – and words as action. These activists associate the collective silence that accompanies sexual violence with pathology, immorality, cowardice, and inaction: with knowing much and doing nothing. Relatedly, they engage with discourse-centred activism. Speaking is central to what they do and aspire to achieve. Ultimately, the participants

are all speakers, potential speakers, listeners, and brokers of anti-sexual violence discourses; playing a part in different speech events, including confessional lectures, educational talks, and media interviews.

This linguistic labour makes room for the unbelievable, and gives words to the otherwise unsayable. Survivors, activists and therapists employ language that is typically prohibited in order to discuss things usually considered better left unsaid. They talk about disturbing events and memories which, in aggregate, clash with the exemplary, pious mentality, and the romanticized rhetoric formulas that underpin culturally-anchored ultra-Orthodox imageries. These discourses twist the regular mechanisms of cultural censorship, public secrets, and communicative vigilance around any undesirable issue. By fostering a more realistic or even critical communal climate, this discourse-centered activism around sexual violence helps to dismantle the semblance of a faultless community, and thus lends itself to new prospects of *Haredi* social critique extending beyond the immediate concern with sexual violence.

Panel 4 Framing

Memory Still Haunts History's Sleep'. Poetics and Politics of Remembering '1956' and '1968'

Moritz Neuffer (ZfL Berlin)

Anniversaries create contexts for political generations to engage in self-interpretation and self-historicization. This holds true for the memory of '1968' in France or Germany, but also for the significance of '1956' as the founding year of the so-called New Left in the UK. In both cases, commemorative and autobiographical narratives often tend to explain the motivations of their protagonists by giving the political movements a predominantly cultural, ethical, socio-psychological or demographic meaning. Critical of such interpretations, the '1968ers' Daniel Bensaïd and Alain Krivine repeatedly rejected narratives that would reduce political struggles to purely generational or symbolic struggles. Instead, Bensaïd and Krivine were convinced that "la mémoire hante encore le sommeil de l'histoire" and demanded a political return to the "faits inaccomplis" of '1968' (2008). A similar critique was articulated by literary scholar Kristin Ross in her book "May '68 and Its Afterlives" (2012).

My paper contrasts these critical interventions with autobiographical texts by former participants in the movements. I will highlight the example of Stuart Hall's memoirs in which the author relates generational narratives to political reflections on the actuality of '1956'. Comparing these memoirs with Hall's early writings from the late 1950s, I argue that narratives and metaphors like the "break-up of the political Ice Age" were not only symbolizations of commitment and action in retrospect, but already served as a kind of 'poetics' in the initial self-formation of this political generation. In texts from the 1980s and 2000s, Hall reviewed and reevaluated such metaphors and concepts without discarding the political intentions of himself and his comrades. In autobiographies of '1968ers', the opposite is often the case, when the "faits" are generationalized and dismissed as "accomplis". Following Hall and other contemporaries in their different modes of self-interpretation and self-historicization, I suggest to regard the history of '1956' and '1968' as an interplay of representations of these movements in different layers of time.

Contested Resonances of Boycott in a Transnational Context

Michiel Bot (Tilburg University)

On May 15, 2019, the German Bundestag adopted a resolution designating campaigns for boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) of Israel as anti-Semitic. According to the resolution, "'Don't Buy' stickers of the BDS movement

on Israeli products inevitably awaken associations [*wecken unweigerlich Assoziationen*] with the Nazi slogan, “Don’t buy from Jews!” and similar graffiti’s on storefronts and shop windows.” The Bundestag’s determination [*Feststellung*] that campaigns for BDS “inevitably awaken associations” with the notorious Nazi boycott of Jewish businesses on April 1, 1933 ignores—or disavows—the anticolonial, transnational history of the political practice of boycotting, from the Boston Tea Party and the Irish National Land League’s 1880 campaign against the eponymous land agent Charles Boycott to Gandhi’s boycotts of British taxes, boycotts of white-owned bus companies and businesses during the U.S. Civil Rights Movement, and the global boycott of the South African apartheid regime. Of course, these famous boycotts all took place in (former) British colonies, and anti-Semitism researcher Stefanie Schüler-Springorum has claimed that “historically, [a boycott] has a completely different resonance” in Germany than it does in other countries. Yet the notorious 1933 Nazi boycott of Jewish businesses evoked in the Bundestag resolution was in fact an explicit reaction against a transnational boycott of German merchandise to protest Nazi anti-Semitism, which started in the United States but spread to the U.K., France, Romania, Greece, Latvia, Yugoslavia, Egypt, Palestine, Morocco, and various countries in South America.

My paper takes the Bundestag attempt to legislate the national resonance of a global boycott as an occasion for critical reflection on the contested resonances of this political practice in a transnational context. My focus will be on a comparison of representations of the BDS movement in Germany and the Netherlands with representations of the global boycott of the South African apartheid regime in these countries.

The Aftermath of the Rudi Dutschke Attack in the Transnational Newspaper Press
Sophie van den Elzen (Utrecht University)

TBD

Panel 5 Travelling Words

The Discreet Charm of Satyagraha: Shifting Meanings and Discursive Framing of the Gandhian Repertoire in India (online)
Arnab Roy Chowdhury (HSE University)

In the early 20th century, in the context of anticolonial movements against the British colonisers, Mahatma Gandhi experimented with a set of repertoires for non-violent protest termed "Satyagraha," which means "polite insistence" or "holding firmly to the truth." In its discursive framing, it critiques and questions the dominant powers on moral and spiritual grounds. Initially, it was deployed in colonial South Africa to protect the rights of Indian migrants in 1907. Later, Satyagraha was practiced in India in the Non-cooperation movement against the British in the 1920s, with a considerable degree of success.

Though Gandhi insisted upon some strictly laid down processes and practices for conducting Satyagraha, in a broad sense, the semantic idea of Satyagraha has achieved transferability across space and time. It has been used in different contexts, such as the Civil Rights movement in the USA and the Anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa. Nonetheless, Satyagraha has been criticized for its elitist and gradualist approach to challenging caste hierarchy, and for reflecting conservative Hindu-nationalist, upper-caste symbolism, practices, and ideas. In his lifetime, Gandhi was challenged by a unique interpretation of Satyagraha by Senapati Bapat, the anti-colonial activist who led a movement against the construction of Mulshi Peta dam in Pune by the colonial government because of the immense displacement that it was causing. He borrowed the idea of Satyagraha from Gandhi, but re-worked it to formulate his version of "Shuddha Satyagraha" (pure Satyagraha), whereby a certain degree of "violence" could be permissible, if necessary. Naturally, Gandhi was not pleased with the idea.

Also, in contemporary India, movements that demand social and ecological justice, such as the Narmada Bachao Andolan (Save Narmada Movement), also claim to adhere to the discursive frame of Satyagraha, despite differing and sometimes contradictory interpretations.

By drawing upon movements against hydropower projects in colonial and postcolonial India, I try to explore why and how Satyagraha as a term and discursive frame has continued to have popular appeal. It is deployed, sometimes with contradictory meanings and practices, and is considered a legitimate and strategic frame to critique and challenge the prevailing "regimes of truth and power." I will use Foucault's notion of "speaking truth to power" and Bakhtin's notions of "polyphony" and "dialogic truth" to critically explain the utility and meaning of Satyagraha in changing circumstances.

Террорист/Terrorist: Claiming, Defining, and Restricting the Terminology of Political Violence in the late C19th

Lara Green (Erasmus University)

Contemporary discourse ascribes the term 'terrorist' to those individuals or groups whose actions are deemed illegitimate, placing the terrorist in opposition to the 'freedom fighter'. It is an overused cliché. Though historians may locate the origins of the idea and practice of political terror/ism in the French Revolution, or indeed even centuries before that, viewing past discourses on the terrorist through the lens of our contemporary culture masks many of the subtleties of the use of the term. Instead, this paper seeks to explore the contemporary meanings in a period when terrorism was perceived to be an omnipresent threat across the globe.

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, a war of words erupted over the proper definition of terrorist. It was in these decades that the term began to acquire its contemporary sense of an actor using acts of violence to achieve political goals. However, use of the term remained fluid.

This paper will explore the use of the term terrorist by an influential community of Russian émigrés whose networks centred on London between the 1880s and the outbreak of the First World War. As vocal commentators on the use of terrorism by Russian revolutionaries, they shaped contemporary debates among anglophone audiences and their revolutionary comrades on the future of the tactic. Though they did not openly call for new acts of terrorism, their writing focused on memorialising past acts of terrorism, whether recent or decades past. First, it will argue that these émigrés fashioned a culture in which foreigners could openly support political violence carried out by Russian revolutionaries. Furthermore, it will argue that they contributed to a legitimising narrative of terrorism within the Russian revolutionary movement, which sustained support for the practice even in times of moral crisis.

Aboriginal: What's in a Word? (online)

Jennifer Adese (University of Toronto)

In 1982, s.35 of Canada's Constitution Act embedded the word "aboriginal" in Canada's legal and political foundation. Decades later, on 20 May 2020, the Canadian government's chief/manager of the Library of Parliament, Tonina Simeone, uploaded a new blog post directed towards civil servants, titled "Indigenous peoples: Terminology Guide." In it, Simeone wades into what they refer to as "terminological complexities," and makes a strong statement against the use of the term Aboriginal when referring to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. Simeone's blog is merely a reflection of a growing societal shift within Canada. A few years earlier, in 2017, the Indigenous-led digital agency Animikii published a short online article, wherein the staff at Animikii outlined their preference for the term Indigenous over the term Aboriginal. The term "Aboriginal," they argue, "reflects an archaic

understanding that fails to recognize Indigenous peoples in Canada as distinct, separate Nations.” The authors of the Animikii piece contend that *unlike* the term Aboriginal, the usage of the word Indigenous comes “from within the Indigenous communities themselves.” They thus insist that the term Aboriginal has been imposed on Indigenous peoples by the federal government— and ultimately by non-Indigenous peoples.

By contrast, the word Indigenous is positioned by Animikii as self-selected; Indigenous is thus a term that Indigenous peoples adopt of their own free will and with their own purposes and intent. Such a view, however, disregards the realities in which the term Aboriginal came to be included in Canada’s Constitution as a placeholder for the specific inherent and treaty rights of peoples indigenous to the lands Canada currently claims as its own. As such, this presentation examines the work of Indigenous activists in the struggle for rights recognition, with a specific focus on terminological maneuvering. By contrast to Simeone and Animikii, I argue that a critical study of the term’s introduction to Canadian society and its decline in popular parlance reveal vitally important things about the nature of Indigenous political organizing over the past 40 years – that it was not unilaterally imposed terminology. Rather, Indigenous peoples have rhetorically and indeed powerfully grappled with how to articulate our rights in an ever-changing landscape of settler colonialism.

Panel 6 Digital Methods

How Racial Discourse Travels: The American Black Freedom Struggle as a Reference Point in the Netherlands” (30 minute joint presentation)

Laura Visser-Maessen and Jorrit van den Berk (Radboud University)

How have U.S. understandings of racial diversity and freedom struggles influenced Dutch public debates about identity formation and diversity after the second World War? Racial boundaries and discourses about ethnic identity, racism, and emancipation should in part be understood within a national context, but must also be studied as having emerged from global cultural encounters and constructed or negotiated in a transnational and intercultural dialogue. Especially the United States, as the crucial ‘reference society’ and global culture in the postwar world, has played a pivotal role in this exchange of ideas around race. The civil rights era inspired people living under racial oppression around the world and Black feminism and the emerging field of Black Studies spearheaded redefinitions of categories of difference such as race, class, and gender.

Appropriations of such discourse can also be detected in the Netherlands, where discussions about race often invoke situations and concepts derived from the American context, in the service of contesting, maintaining or defending the status quo alike. The adoption as well as rejection of terms like ‘Black Lives Matter’ and ‘woke’ in Dutch debates present contemporary examples, but are hardly unique. U.S.-derived terms such as intersectionality, institutional racism, White privilege, and blackface had already been adapted to national debates, for instance in relation to discrimination in housing, education, employment, and governmental oversight (such as during the so-called *toeslagenaffaire*) and to the appearance of ‘Black Pete’ (*zwarte piet*).

In our presentation, we will introduce the conceptual and methodological framing of the first phase of our research project “Mapping Transatlantic Routes of Identity” in which we aim to map the prevalence and impact of race-related concepts that originated in the United States in a very large corpus of Dutch newspapers and magazines. By applying both digital humanities tools and traditional close reading methods, we seek to illuminate the ways in which U.S. racial discourse serves as a reference point in Dutch public and scholarly debates on race and emancipation and to develop new insights into the processes by which and networks through which international racial discourse is selectively appropriated in and transferred to local contexts.

Modelling the Discursive Propagation and Evolution of 20th-Century Latin American Insurgent Discourse

Isabelle Gribomont (UCLouvain)

The discourse of 20th century Latin American insurgent movements is traversed by a dense network of genealogical and intertextual relations. Many revolutionary actors of the twentieth century have identified explicitly with past and present activist groups. The Nicaraguan Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional and the Salvadoran Frente Farabundo Martí de Liberación Nacional both adopted the names of earlier insurgent heroes. Colombia's best-known insurgent army of the 1970s and 1980s, M-19, established its identity in 1974 by seizing the sword of Simón Bolívar. In the 1960s and 1970s, urban insurgents in Argentina chose the name Montoneros to link themselves with insurgents of the independence period (Chasteen 1993, 84). The contemporary Mexican Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional takes its names from central American guerrillas from the 1980s as well as Emiliano Zapata, a leader of the Mexican revolution of 1910.

Such choices highlight the “continuity and ubiquity of the discourse of insurgency in Latin America” but say little about the links and relations between the movements (Chasteen 1993, 84). Scholars who studied such relations identify “a pattern of cross-fertilization” which results in various “clusters” and insurgent trajectories throughout the continent (Wickham-Crowley 2014, 222–228).

This paper contributes to tracking these linguistic relationships of influence by modelling semantic relations between key words in the political communiqués available in the digital archive of the Centro de Documentación de los Movimientos Armados (CeDeMA).

First, taking both frequency and dispersion into account (Gries 2021), keywords are identified by comparing the CeDeMA archive with a general language Spanish corpus. Second, a Spanish BERT model is used to create vector representations of these keywords in context. These representations allow for the semantic networks traversing this corpus to be visualised and explored. The changes between and within movements with differing ideologies is manifested as shifting distributional semantic similarities between words. Third, close reading analyses are performed to further explore patterns identified with the vectorised representations.

This approach highlights narrative continuities and ruptures in the 20th century Latin American insurgencies, as well as the ways in which keywords undergo a re-semanticisation process as they emerge and re-emerge in different ideological and historical contexts.

Panel 7 Voices 2

The Futurity of Obsolete Grammars: Middle Voice on Wall-Writings in Greece during the ‘Crisis’

Maria Boletsi (Leiden University)

Binary modes of expression are exacerbated in declared times of crisis. In recent crisis rhetoric—e.g., on the Eurozone crisis, the ‘migration crisis,’ the covid-19 crisis—crisis-stricken subjects are often cast either as passive victims or (threatening) agents, deserving, or responsible for, their plight. This talk will center on wall-writings in Greece during the country's debt crisis (2009-2018) that mobilized the *middle voice* to respond to dominant crisis rhetoric. Can the middle voice offer a conceptual alternative to the distinction between active and passive in crisis-rhetoric? As a distinct grammatical category in which the subject remains inside the action, the middle voice has disappeared in modern languages, including modern Greek, yet middle voice constructions are still functional in

several languages. The middle voice has also been theorized as a discursive mode that unsettles dualisms and creates a zone of indeterminacy between subject and object, with radical implications for subject constitution. Scrutinizing its mobilization in these wall-writings, I show how it can be involved in new grammars of protest and in radical imaginaries that challenge the governmentality of crisis. How can the middle voice help articulate alternative conceptions of subjectivity, agency, and responsibility to those propagated by crisis-rhetoric today? How does its use in some of these wall-writings evoke and recast past languages of protest, tapping into old grammars and vocabularies to articulate contrarian grammars from the present?

“Un altro mondo è possibile” (Genoa 2001) to “Un altro mondo non era possibile” to “Un altromondo è necessario” (Genova 2021): Podcasting Genoa 2001’s Memories of Hope

Monica Janssen (Utrecht University)

“Un altro mondo è possibile” is one of the most iconic slogans adopted by the “movement of movements” who protested against the G8 Summit in Genoa on 19-20-21 July 2001. This slogan unites the “multitude” of protesters composed by many diverse groups of people with different backgrounds in activism, or without any experience in protesting, and of different ages, this being the first international movement which is also truly intergenerational (Proglío 2021). Because of the death of protester Carlo Giuliani who was shot by a policeman on July 20, the brutal use of violence by the police against unarmed demonstrators, the raid of the Scuola Diaz in the night of July 21 and the arrests and tortures in the Bolzaneto station, the anti-G8 summit is also remembered as the “battle of Genoa” and the death of the no-global movement, which had its heydays in Seattle and Porto Alegre, all reasons for which the slogan “Un altro mondo non era possibile” was coined as an expression of indignation and defeat. The 2021 commemorations of 20 years after the facts were inaugurated by a round table in Genoa’s Palazzo Ducale which was entitled “Un altro mondo è necessario”, underlining instead the urgency and truth of the demands of the then wrongly stigmatized “no-global” movement. This contribution aims to focus on the medium of podcast which has found fertile ground in a moment in which the 20 years after Genoa 2001 have come to coincide with the COVID-19 crisis. If the Genoa 2001 protests are among the most mediatized events by mainstream as well as by independent media, and if its cultural memory can count on a vast production of fictional and non-fictional counternarratives in different media, the choice for audio recollection could be explained by sound’s fluidity which enables the merging and enmeshing of distinct historical moments in order to construct new memories of hope (Rigney 2018) and grammars of protests (Boletsi et.al. 2021) for the next generations, including those who were not present at Genoa.

Practical Information

Conference Location: Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21, Utrecht

- Access to Drift 21 is also through the entrance to the university library at Drift 27, 3512 BR Utrecht.

Utrecht City Pass:

If you are planning to do some sight-seeing in and around Utrecht, you could consider getting a Utrecht City Pass, offered by the Utrecht Tourist Office. This pass is linked to your credit card, and can be used for public

transport, bike rentals and museum access. Please visit <https://utrechtregionpass.com/> for more information. Please note: if you are interested in this service, it is best to reserve the card before your arrival and pick it up at Utrecht CS or the Star Lodge reception desk.

WiFi Instructions:

- Eduroam is available in all university buildings.
- You can also use the free visitor WiFi. Click on 'UU-visitor' and a pop up window should appear. Select 'doorgaan'. This service is free of charge and available in all university buildings.

Contact Information

For any practical questions, please contact Tashina Blom, Sophie van den Elzen or Ann Rigney at react@uu.nl.

ReAct has been made possible by an ERC Advanced Grant (2019-2024) awarded to Prof. Ann Rigney, Utrecht University, under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 788572).

