



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

multiethnica

38

December 2018

INNEHÅLL

3 *The entanglement of racism and Individualism: The U.S. National Defence Education Act of 1958 and the individualization of "intelligence" and educational policy*
– JIM WYNTER PORTER

Fokus romer

18 *"Is Professionalism the Same as Inhumanity?" Social Criticism in the Literary Work of Kiba Lumberg*
– VIOLA PARENTE-ČAPKOVÁ

28 *Essä: Kampen om 'människan'. Några nedslag i skildringen av romer i svensk litteratur efter 1880*
– ANN-SOFIE LÖNNGREN

33 *Essä: The dilemma of writing minorities into national historiographies: reflections on the History of the Finnish Roma*
– MIIKA TERVONEN

36 konferensrapporter • **42** nya projekt vid HVC • **48** medverkande



Hugo Valentin-centrum

Uppsala universitet

Minoriteter i fokus

Politik, historia, kultur och identitetens skiftande villkor

De två huvudartiklarna i årets Multiethnica fokuserar på aktuella teman: statlig policy och praxis mot minoriteter. Viola Parente-Čapkovás analys av den romska författaren Kiba Lumbers produktions fokuserar på välfärdssamhällets oförmåga att hantera etniska minoriteters villkor, lika väl som villkor för personer med funktionsnedsättning. Jim Porter diskuterar i sin tur den amerikanska utbildningspolitiken och dess försök att med "The National Education Act" från 1954 som vapen försöka åstadkomma en integration av det amerikanska utbildningssystemet. Författarens historiska analys visar att den nya skolpolitiken och uppfattningar om rasbunden respektive individuell "intelligens" i själva verket länkade samman ideologier som resulterade i diskriminering även efter att skolsegregationen hade förbjudits i lag. Såväl Parente-Čapkovás som Porters artiklar visar att den liberala rättsstatsideologin, som har tilldelat samma värde och samma rättigheter till alla medborgare, ofta har kunnat kringgå i kategoriseringens namn. Vissa grupper har helt enkelt utslutits från samhällsgemenskapen genom att tillskrivas "annorlunda" eller icke önskvärda egenskaper.

Även Ann-Sofie Lönngréns essä tangerar denna problemställning; skildringen av romer i svensk litteratur visar hur denna grupp avgränsats inte bara från samhällsgemenskapen, utan också från det 'mänskliga'. Miika Tervonen behandlar å sin sida hur rasismens arv än idag påverkar förhållandet mellan forskarsamhället och minoriteter, samt hur viktigt

det är att forskningen positionerar sig i förhållande till forskningsobjektet. Särskilt tack riktas till medredaktör Ida Ohlsson Al Fakir och Satu Gröndahl för arbetet med detta nummer.

Hugo Valentin-centrum har under det gångna året också sett en väsentlig expansion av verksamheten, vilket kanske främst manifesteras i det faktum att vi har kunnat anställa fyra nya postdoktorer. Projekten som presenteras närmare i slutet av detta nummer kretsar kring ett av de områden som har präglat verksamheten under lång tid, nämligen relationer mellan folkgrupper i vid bemärkelse. De spänner från Sylwia Szymańska-Smolkins närstudie av livet i ghetton under andra världskriget och Michelle Gordons analys av kolonialmakternas krigföring mot de underkuvade, till Theresa Johnssons "underifrån-perspektiv" på romskt liv i nordnord och John Hennesseys kommande studie av ainu-folket i Japan. Till dessa viktiga forskningsinsatser skall också läggas det av Vetenskapsrådet finansierade projektet *Parallella narrativ, konfliktfylld historia: historiebruk om andra världskriget på Västra Balkan, 1989–2018*, som rör den högaktuella frågan om relationen mellan akademisk kunskapsproduktion, media och undervisningspraktiker i ett sydösteuropa där nationalismen har fått ny näring på senare år.

Till övriga framgångar hör publicerandet av fyra böcker, varav två monografier och två antologier. Pontus Rudbergs bok om judiska flyktingar till Sverige i slutet på och direkt efter andra världskriget utgör ett viktigt bidrag till svensk forsk-

ning om och kring svensk invandrings- och flyktingpolitik vid krigsslutet. Goran Miljans studie av den kroatiska ustasja-organisationen och hur den under andra världskriget försökte arbeta med skapandet av en "ny kroatisk människa" i enlighet med fascismens ideal genom indoktrinering av den nya generationen bryter helt ny mark inom sitt fält. Till monografierna skall läggas två antologier. Satu Gröndahl har med Eila Rantonen arbetat fram en jämförande och transnationell antologi om migrationslitteraturen och dess villkor i Sverige och Finland, medan Leena Huss tillsammans Leanne Hinton och HVC:s förre medarbetare Gerald Roche har givit ut en omfattande antologi kring språklig revitalisering inom ramen för Routledges serie *Hanbooks in Applied Linguistics*.

Till redan planerade insatser för 2019 hör att vi i slutet av januari kommer att gästas av Deborah Lipstadt, mest känd för att i början av 2000-talet ha ha vunnit förtalsmålet mot Förintelsenförnekaren David Irving. Därefter kommer Doris Bergen från University of Toronto att hålla årets Hugo Valentin-föreläsare den 10 april. Den 25–27 september kommer HVC att stå som värd för International Association for Comparative Fascist Studies andra konvent med temat "Fascism och våld". Vi ser fram emot dessa och många andra aktiviteter med en önskan trevlig läsning.

Tomislav Dulić

The entanglement of racism and Individualism: The U.S. National Defence Education Act of 1958 and the individualization of "intelligence" and educational policy

JIM WYNTER PORTER

While primarily concerned with developments in the 1950s, this analysis begins by reexamining the historiography of IQ and intelligence testing in the first half of the 20th century, indicating as it does so an emergent emphasis on the individualization of "intelligence" in the Stanford/Iowa IQ debates of the 1930s. Given the character and tendency of the trend that emerges, I propose a model for understanding these developments: one which situates conceptions of racial and individual "intelligence" as entangled and co-evolving ideologies. With this historiographical model in place I turn to evidence from National Defense Education Act (NDEA) hearings and related NDEA-era texts. These documents demonstrate that NDEA reforms attempted to rehabilitate testing as fair and "race"-neutral, and were further structured around the logics of individual "ability." While NDEA reforms asserted that such individualization of educational opportunity was a scientifically objective, "race"-neutral process, discourse analysis reveals that it was instead profoundly entangled with the logics of "race" and a history — indeed a present — from which it imagined it had cut itself loose.

Just as a serpent, when it sheds its skin
casts off old age and is resplendent in
its glittering scales and now, made new again,
rejoices...

— Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (Mandelbaum, 2017)

Overview: *Brown v. Board* and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA)

The 1950s have been historicized as a period of upheaval and transformation in US public education. The decade witnessed, notably, two monumental and unprecedented federal interventions in the nation's schools: the *Brown v. Board* Supreme Court decision and the passage of the National Defense Education Act

(NDEA). With its unanimous 1954 ruling, *Brown v. Board of Education* rendered unconstitutional any and all state laws maintaining separate schooling for Blacks and Whites. *Brown* thereby ended the legality of segregation in US schools (upheld to that point by the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision) and compelled what had been all-White public schools and school systems to open their doors to African Americans "with all deliberate speed." Though the legal impetus of *Brown* was directed primarily at Southern (i.e. former slave-holding, Jim Crow) states where state-level laws still enforced segregation, the moral mandate of *Brown* was nonetheless felt nationwide, North and South. School districts across the country characterized by longstanding patterns of de facto residential (as opposed to explicitly de jure) segregation soon also felt increasing pressure to integrate following the Supreme Court ruling. Richard Kluger has written of the Supreme Court decision that "probably no case ever to come before the nation's highest tribunal affected more directly the minds, hearts and daily lives of so many Americans" (Kluger 2011, xii). Yet, while hailed by many as an unmitigated Civil Rights advance, *Brown's* actual implementation over the decades following its ruling has often been characterized by foot-dragging and lapse, and a variety of other forms of resistance, some of which will be recovered and explored below. *Brown's* promise to this day remains largely unfulfilled (Hannah-Jones 2014a, 2014b; Rosenberg 2008, 42–71).

The other landmark midcentury educational reform, The National Defense Education Act (passed in 1958, just four years after *Brown*) marked a precedent-setting expansion of federal funding of US public schools. While widely understood as a bill for the improvement of mathematics and science education in the wake of the 1957 Sputnik Crisis, a notable, though underexamined aspect of NDEA legislation was its incentives for curricular stratification by "ability."² About 50%

of its total spending was for increased “intelligence” testing, and guidance and placement strategies, which worked hand in hand with independently voiced calls for strengthening of curriculum (particularly math and science) and grouping by “ability” in schools across the nation (Porter 2017a; Urban 2010, 172-173; National Defense Education Act 1958, 1592). Whereas *Brown’s* implementation was resisted, and in many regions



George Hayes, Thurgood Marshall, and James Nabrit on the steps of the US Supreme Court following the 1954 *Brown v. Board* ruling. Photo courtesy of Getty Images.

reversed by the early the 21st century, the NDEA quickly became foundational to post-WWII US educational policy. As the first major, non-categorical federal spending bill for US public education, the NDEA was the progenitor of and blueprint for subsequent presidential administrations’ education legislation. It also marked the arrival and institutionalization of mass-testing in US public education.

Brown v. Board and the National Defense Education Act are often historicized separately as part of compartmentalized Civil Rights and Cold War trajectories. Yet drawing them into historiographic relation reveals a mid-century tug-of-war over the structure of educational opportunity. This was a struggle moreover which played out on top of a longer-running shift in expert discourses about group and individual difference. *Brown’s* mandate to desegregate, for example, sought to broaden and equalize access to public education in the interest of racial justice. It thus worked at the level of the group in an attempt to unmake institutional logics of group difference. The NDEA, as I will argue below, can be seen conversely as a subsequent program for educational selection and stratifi-

cation, and one predicated on claims of natural *individual* difference. As such these rapid mid-century transformations in public education mark an opportune place to engage in historical analysis of arguments about groups and individuals in educational policy-making and the social sciences. To this end, this article examines — in the NDEA moment — a reintensified emphasis in an educational context on identifying and sorting by what were alleged to be natural *individual* differences. In demonstrating the preponderance of “individualization” here, this analysis further suggests the historiographical implications of a broader, longer shift in claims about the “intelligence” (or educability) of groups and individuals through the interwar and into the post-Second World War eras. Such claims are, I argue, entangled and historically co-evolving.

One demonstrable manifestation of this entanglement is that these NDEA-related discourses pressing the common sense of grouping by “individual ability” worked to *justify* durable structural changes that remade or maintained divisions by “race” (and so “race” itself) *via* racialized tracking. Educational sociologists have documented both a black-white achievement gap and nation-wide patterns of racialized tracking, beginning in the 1960s and carrying on into the 21st century (Clotfelter 2011, 126-147; Coleman 1966; Oakes 2005; Tyson 2011, 60-67). Indeed, sociologist Karolyn Tyson situates racialized tracking in historical proximity to *Brown* and desegregation. She finds moreover that the overrepresentation of white students and the underrepresentation of students of color in honors, advanced and college preparatory classes — reproduces educational structures that can lead to the implicit association of whiteness with “smarts” or academic achievement. Tyson maintains on these points that, “students’ tendency to link achievement with whiteness emerged after desegregation and is a consequence of racialized tracking...” (2011, 6, 15).

This article’s examination of interwar debates on “race” and “individual intelligence,” and of ensuing NDEA policy-making related to the individualization of “ability” then begins to fill in the historical linkages that Tyson and others have suggested. This analysis reconstructs how “schools within schools” (Meister, 114) — segregating intramurally by individual “ability” as they were compelled to integrate by “race” — were justified as a model for US public education in the

years following the passage of the National Defense Education Act. This was a moment when some of the boundaries and markers of “race” could have been unmade — at least in part and in these particular contexts — in an earnest fulfillment of the promise of *Brown*. Instead they were remade here as “individual ability” through the systematic reintensification of testing and grouping.

This article begins (sec. II) by reexamining a well-established historiography of IQ and intelligence testing in the first half of the 20th century, indicating as it does so, an emergent emphasis on the individualization of “intelligence” in the Stanford/Iowa IQ debates of the 1930s. I then follow this discourse into educational policy prescriptions under Truman in the late 1940s. Given the character and tendency of this trend, I propose a model (sec. III) for understanding these developments, one which situates “race”-group and individual “intelligence” as entangled and co-evolving ideologies. Such an interpretive framework makes possible the historicization of both “race” and individual “intelligence” as social constructs and — in their overlapping and reinforcing applications — as instruments of differentiation and oppression.³

With this historiographical model in place I turn (secs. IV-VI) to evidence from three important and wide-reaching sets of sources in the post-*Brown*/NDEA-era: 1) pre-NDEA Congressional speech-making 2) hearings for the National Defense Education Act (1958), itself, and 3) planning documents related to James Bryant Conant’s NDEA-affiliated *The American High School Today* (1959). Here I demonstrate that these arguments for reform were structured around the logics of individual “ability,” the assumption that the proper positioning of such natural individual differences lay at the bedrock of liberal democracy, and the belief that individualized testing and placement were fair and “race”-neutral. Yet despite assertions of race-neutral individuality, this discourse analysis reveals nonetheless that the NDEA-era reform effort was profoundly entangled with the logics of “race” and a history — indeed a present — from which it imagined it had cut itself loose. Indeed, these entanglements between racism and individualism often manifested themselves in the affective registers of discursive exchange. In this regard, I am in sympathy with recent applications of the “emerging ‘emotional turn’ in history” to the study of the Cold War/Civil Rights era, an approach which opens new interpretive horizons by revealing “how policy recommendations, traditionally explained in rational terms, can be decoded by looking at the emotions surrounding them” (Costigliola 2016, 1076).

Background: Shifting the Difference from “Race” to Individual in Interwar Expert Discourses

This analysis builds on a history of IQ and intelligence testing for the First World War and interwar periods in the US (Carson 2007; Cravens 1993; Gould, 1996; Zenderland 2001). This historiography documents how mainstream psychometricians, such as Henry Goddard, Carl Brigham, Robert Yerkes and Lewis Terman, widely popularized the conception that differences in measured intelligence (IQ) were predominantly hereditary and moreover could be understood not only as a rankable distribution of individuals but also as a hierarchy of races (Brigham 1923; Cravens 1993, 23; Gould, 1996; 176-263; Yoakum and Yerkes, 1920).

While such claims about “intelligence” became a normative discourse over ensuing decades, durable lines of criticism also emerged from anthropology, sociology, and from within psychology itself (Carson 2007, 252). These social scientists produced a body of research through the twenties and thirties that actively sought to explode hereditarian assumptions about perceived or measured “race”-group differences in intelligence. They accomplished this largely through experimental refutations exposing fundamental flaws in the methods and analysis of First World War Army testing, and by actively exploring cultural and environmental influences on development and performance (Degler 1992, 67, 84-104, 167-178). By the early 1930s the “racial” verities of the World War I intelligence testers had been vigorously challenged and the cultural school now stood viably on its own impressive redoubt of scientific literature. Mainstream psychometricians had begun to quietly withdraw once-confident claims concerning the heredity of *group* differences (Gould 1996, 221-222). Yet, historians are in agreement that these withdrawals signaled for these actors not the positive refutation or disproof of biological theories of racial IQ but rather a stalemate between these scientific camps (Degler 1992, 184-185; Gould 1996, 221). This interwar shift in the social sciences can perhaps then be best described not as an overturning of the race-science of intelligence but a movement from racial dogma to doubt. “Race” had been thwarted — and in just precisely these terms — but certainly not undone.

In contrast, assumptions about the biological heritability and fixity of *individual* differences in measured intelligence would become — following its own set of debates and controversies — more deeply ensconced and widely accepted over the next several decades. The widely publicized debates between Iowa Child Welfare Research Center and Stanford psychometricians in

the late 1930s bear this dynamic out (Whipple 1940). Iowa researchers had consistently demonstrated significant changes in mean IQ in relatively small sample sizes of individuals over time and across often abrupt transitions in social environment, i.e. from orphanage to adoptive home (Cravens 1993, 185-216; Hilgard 1987, 481-482; Wellman 1934, 59-83). They concluded that individual IQ was a far more labile than had been previously believed. Stanford psychometricians, led by Lewis Terman and representing the normative center of the field, rejected the Iowa approach as methodologically flawed, and appealed instead to the long-established stability of individual IQ correlates within large statistical aggregates and across comparatively continuous social environments. Observing the heated rhetoric attending the debate, one commentator noted in 1940 that the IQ issue was now even more controversial than it had been in 1928, at the height of the “race”-group intelligence controversy (Whipple 1940, xvii). Indeed a great deal was at stake. If the validity and stability of IQ could also be questioned at the level of individual, then what good was it *at all* as a measure of natural difference?

In his careful reconstruction, historian Hamilton Cravens observes the Iowa research group’s challenge failed, and ultimately served to reify normative assumptions regarding the fixity of *individual* IQ. Cravens notes that the preponderance of studies assembled for a synopsis of the debate aligned with the Stanford position. Cravens also indicates that the Iowa research program as a whole — along with the scientific reputations of particular Iowa Child Welfare Centre researchers — declined noticeably following the controversy. Interest in the malleability hypothesis disappeared and did not reemerge as a coherent research approach until the mid to late-1960s, in the wake of the Johnson administration’s “compensatory education” programs such as Project Headstart (Cravens 1993, 202-216; Vinovskis 2008, 9-11). And though it became commonplace following the Iowa-Stanford controversy to avow the (albeit imprecisely defined) roles of both nature and nurture in individual development, here again Terman’s earlier assertion of a 4:1 weighting (nature to nurture) was still generally accepted as a kind of rule of thumb (Burks in Whipple 1928, 219-316; Cravens 1993, 200-201; Terman 1916, 115; Terman 1928, 362-369).

The Terman orthodoxy had prevailed. Moreover, the Iowa-Stanford controversy, coming as it did on the heels of the “race”-group IQ controversy, served to draw debate and attention more intensively toward the locus of *individual* difference, and to harden and reanneal the position that such individual differences

were preponderantly hereditary in nature and certainly largely fixed by early childhood (Cravens 1993, 132-134, 173-174). Cravens (1993, 257) describes this shift thus:

[The] individual could now be thought of as a person whose group membership was no fatalistic identity, and whose membership in a particular group could be questioned, if for no other reason than the individual’s perceived distinctiveness, idiosyncrasy and asymmetry.

The individual-as-individual — specifically in terms of his or her measured “intelligence” — was emerging from and standing more clearly distinguishable next to his or her circumstantial group identities.

Furthermore, this kind of individuality, narrowly defined within the technical parameters of a psychometric dispute, aligned itself in the post-Second World War era with broader and longer-running processes of individualization across other disciplines and moreover within US culture itself. The foregrounding of psychometric individuality occurred, for example, contemporaneously with emergent psychological and social science models arguing for the individual-temperamental origins of racism and authoritarianism, and in tandem with models for economic analysis that favored rational-choice individualism (Adorno et al. 1950; Gordon 2015; Herman 1996, 2, 310-315). It was also matched by atomizing political and economic trends themselves: namely the rise of consumer individualism, and a growing tendency in Cold War public and political rhetoric to position American-style governance — in direct contrast to the image of the authoritarian collective — as a democratic assemblage of free rights-bearing individuals (Cohen 2008, 124-33, 146-47, 189; Cravens in Solovey and Cravens 2012, 127, 132). Of course, too, overt indications of racist or “race”-driven institutional policies at the heart of US democracy were increasingly a political liability — especially in the aftermath of Nazi atrocities — in both a national civil rights and international Cold War context (Degler 1993, 203-204; Dudziak 2011, 3-17; Roman 2012, 1). Thus this claim to see only individuals in these political discourses was also driven by the need for these discourses to levitate above racism, to deny its existence in the present, and relegate it to an American past.

It is then no surprise that the language and logics of individualism also found expression after the Second World War in emergent educational policy prescriptions. In 1947, President Truman’s Commission on Higher Education published a report asserting a “race”-free definition of equal educational opportu-

nity that foreshadowed the language of post-Brown v. Board educational policy: “The time has come to make public education at all levels equally accessible to all, without regard to race, creed, sex or national origin” (Zook 1947, 38). Such a confident, explicit “race”-free nondiscrimination policy vision — if we take it at face value as a sincere and actionable prescription and not a pleasing political mirage — would remove social and institutional prejudices directed at an array of groups, leaving only what were held to be the natural internal limits of the individual learner. The report promised that no “qualified individual in any part of the country will encounter an insuperable economic barrier to the kind of education suited to his aptitudes and interests” (Zook 1947, 36, my italics). Here was the assertion of a new post-Second World War meritocratic definition of equal educational opportunity, one tailored to individual differences in aptitude or ability.

This discourse of educational individualism obviously did not arise de novo out of the ashes of World War II, but it was resumed — and carried into the 1950s — with an intensity that suggests a great deal of new weight was placed on it. This way of reasoning about the social order seemed to have exorcised itself of all the perils and *bête noires* of group determinacy that had haunted interwar and wartime US: Soviet Communism, totalitarianism writ large, Nazi racism, even and perhaps especially, Jim Crow racism. All of these anathema were problems of the group, group-think, and/or prejudice directed against a particular group. This new kind of policy vision — with the individual as the primary and politically explicit locus of difference — then opened the way in the 1950s for a redoubled, and unprecedentedly systematic school-place search for and sorting by that most important of differences within a meritocratically structured social order: individual educability or “intelligence.”

Extrapolating a Model for Interpretation

Given these particular historical exchanges between group and individual as modes of social analysis, I hold that beliefs about “race” and individual “intelligence” need to be scrutinized together within the same framework for their ideological continuities. There we will find intriguing symmetries and points of attachment. Consider, for example, this pair of statements made within a few years of each other: one from geneticist L.C. Dunn on “race,” the other from chemist, educator and testing proponent, James Bryant Conant, on individual difference in “intelligence.”

Though Dunn was a progressive critic of interwar scientific racism, he felt compelled nonetheless in the early 1950s to reassert the alleged biological reality of

“race” itself in the face of constructivist critique from cultural anthropology.⁴ Dunn noted:

The physical anthropologist and the man in the street both know that races exist; the former from the scientifically recognizable and measurable congeries of traits which he uses in classifying the varieties of man, the latter from the immediate evidence of his senses. (Dunn 1951 quoted in Brattain 2007, 1401)

All “races” might be equal, but “race,” Dunn averred, was more than social construction; it was a manifest reality, both scientifically knowable and self-evident.

Consider then sympathies between Dunn’s comments and those of James Bryant Conant, but now regarding *individual differences* in an educational context. Prodding Henry Chauncey, president of ETS, to develop more tests of purported natural “ability”, and to more clearly demarcate “aptitude” from “achievement,” Conant (1958) wrote:

You ought to be able to devise tests that are essentially tests of aptitude and others that are tests of achievement. Having done so, you should be prepared to explain this to the layman. All the professionals admit there are two types of tests...and... most laymen recognize that there are bright and dull pupils.

The whorl that has frozen across both panes — Dunn’s and Conant’s — is compelling. Conant’s *individual differences* in intelligence has assumed the properties of Dunn’s “race,” knowable through science, yet also manifestly evident to the man on the street, and to teachers and students in the classroom. Everyone could simply see with their own eyes what psychologists measured with their tests. Both statements amount to attempts to reinscribe a kind of common sense in relation to alleged natural difference: how was it organized or compartmentalized in the world, where could we look for it, how could we know it, and where was it allowable to attach value to it? Dunn, in step with a new critical awareness of racism, now suspended (justly) the matter of value — inferiority or superiority — in relation to perceived difference. Conant felt obliged toward no such compunction.

A symmetrical approach to “intelligence” and “race” is perhaps especially pertinent given long-durée ideological connections between “race” and “intelligence.” I refer here to historical assertions — voiced unabashedly in 18th and 19th century race sciences, and as we have seen, gradually muted in the expert discourses of the 20th century — that the ultimate or most salient difference between “races” amounted to rankable differences in the mental and moral characteristics of these alleged groups (Gould

1996, 62-141; Painter 2011, 59-90, 190-200). "Intelligence" has long been the soul of "race." If "race" and "race" difference — once promulgated as natural hierarchies — have come to be widely understood within the field of history as a socio-historical construction, then a similar discourse analysis can and should be extended to "intelligence" and its typical organization as a rankable spectrum of allegedly natural, hereditary individual differences. In this sense, and in the context of an emergent post-Second World War meritocracy, I argue that "intelligence" (even as an alleged hereditary *individual* difference) should be viewed as a culturally constructed category in its own right, and one that increasingly functioned with some degree of independence but also in dynamic relation to other highly salient categories of cultural analysis like race, class, or gender. Moreover, a symmetrical approach here gains us a great deal of analytical scope and depth. Namely, it illuminates the continuity and fluidity of an underlying reservoir of hereditarianism, and examines how across time this reservoir could shift its investment between categories of group and individual.

In this regard a more fully historicized analysis of "intelligence" in relation to both "race"-groups and individuals reveals insufficiently explored entanglements between racism and individualism. Specifically, this article illuminates an exchange between racism and individualism across the interwar and into the post-Second World War era that allowed for the refurbishment of intelligence testing as an apparently objective and race-neutral practice. In expert discourses, claims about race-group intelligence receded — challenged but undisproved, quiescently operant — into the background. The *politically explicit* focal point for discrimination (or discerning worth) then came instead to fall, with more weight yet also seemingly more precision, onto measured *individual* differences. Consequently, a hereditarianism that had been more strongly associated with *racial* intelligence shifted toward the locus of the *individual*.

This is not in any way to suggest that racism went away, even attenuated, or that it was exchanged for a more fair objective science of individual difference. Indeed racism is a constantly proliferating discourse comprising many strains and currents. Look only to white protestors in Little Rock, Arkansas after *Brown* to see its full-throated, unapologetic expressions, running continuous and unreconstructed from post-Civil War to well past mid-20th century US.⁵ Rather, I examine here but one aspect of the discourse of "race" (and "natural" difference) — those fascicles produced by and shared among educational psychology and educational policy on "race" and "intelligence." Precisely

here, I wish to examine how the language and some of the discriminatory power of "race" difference, by a kind of capillary action, came to more fully saturate the discourse of individual difference.

But of course this symmetrical approach does not only tell us about changes in the discourse of "intelligence," individual or otherwise. In fact, one of the arguments of this article is that tracing ideologies of "intelligence" over time also illuminates aspects of the concurrent and underlying historical evolution of racism and ideologies of "race." Indeed, as Michelle Brattain notes, critical race theorists are frequently calling for historians to "move beyond the insight — and some lament, now largely ceremonial observation — that race is a social construction, to [actually] do the neglected work of historicizing race and racism" (2007, 1388). In this vein, Karen Fields and Barbara Fields introduce the concept "racecraft" to help make visible the incessant and subtle mediations by which "race" is made and re-made — processes in motion — out of racism.

Playing on thaumaturgic double-entendres in their term ("racecraft"-*witchcraft*), Fields and Fields refer to the making of "race" *via* racecraft as a "conjurer's trick" (2012, 19-20, 25, 30). Indeed there is a kind of religious magic at work in the particular historical transformation I aim to document. It is the metamorphosis of some part of "race" difference into individual difference *via* the mediating property of "intelligence" from a quality allegedly inherent in both groups and individuals to a quality allegedly inherent *only* in individuals. The science of "intelligence" could be ostensibly purified in this process, freed for the time being of its negative history of associations with eugenics and scientific racism. "Race" could then be quietly remade — at least in part — out of disparities in educational opportunity codified and institutionalized in practices of testing and grouping. Consider how important such measured 'gaps' in standardized test performance have been to those — like Arthur Jensen — who have periodically reasserted differential racial "intelligence" (*cf.* Herrenstein and Murray 1994; Jensen 1969; Wade 2014). Neo-hereditarian individual difference was now the ideological repository out of which racial IQ could be made again and again at moments when the political climate was amenable.

Educational Opportunity by Individual "Ability" in NDEA and Pre-NDEA Testimony

More systematic standardized testing of "ability" or "aptitude" was reintroduced in the mid to late 1950s (after a depression-era and wartime lull) as the best, fairest means available for "individualizing education,"

a catchphrase among many who lobbied for educational reform at this NDEA moment (e.g. Chauncey 1958a, 1102). While "individualized education" might sound to our contemporary ear like an instructional program that was flexibly modifiable to a student's unique palate of interests and competencies, instead, it actually in this period most often delineated a three-track stratification — "bright," "medium" and "dull" — based on measured individual "ability" (Conant 1959, 24-26, 46-47, 93, 106, 111; Anonymous 1958, 120-121). These calls for individualized education were also often advanced along with the supposition that education had been in recent decades somehow de-individualized, collectivized, or otherwise driven by a leveling tendency favoring the average or mediocre — and the needs of the group as a whole — in preference to the needs of the 'bright.'

In "The Undertow in Modern Education," a pre-Sputnik speech to President Eisenhower and the Senate, Vermont Senator Ralph Flanders drew together these very themes to mount a call for individualized education which situated individual ability as a cornerstone of American democracy and safeguard against international communism. Flanders described, with no small amount of concern, the efforts of the "nation-wide monopoly of the National Education Association [NEA] and of... [the] Teacher's College at Columbia [TCCU]" to push into "every nook and corner of the United States" a new-wave of collectivism under the banner of progressive education. While naming the NEA and TCCU as its current prime disseminators, Flanders traced the provenance of progressive education back to John Dewey, who in Flanders' estimation should be reckoned as one of "four horsemen of the educational apocalypse." Flanders argued that Dewey's 'child-centric' approach to teaching and learning might at first blush seem individualistic. Yet by stressing "learning by doing and doing together" it actually underemphasized the formal academic and disciplinary aspects of curriculum in favor of the social, contextual and pragmatic. This Deweyism had been cultivated over the years by the NEA and Teacher's College "educationists" and translated into a kind of socialistic educational doctrine: "man is a social animal and nothing else." By this stroke the "individual pupil...was swept under the rug" (Flanders 1957, 3-5, 7). Flanders (1957, 4) held that:

by acting on this principle, it is possible to discharge a very limited responsibility for the individual pupil by concentrating on the progress of his 'group.' In too large a measure your child ceases to be trained to the limit of his own powers and he progresses only as the group progresses.

So the *bête noire* of group-think, with both its anonymizing powers and its invitation to prejudice, threatened even and perhaps especially here, in the classroom. Further, such a school-place dynamic "results in standards of scholarship which are low enough to give everybody a chance" and which preserved the "self-respect of those whose abilities lie in lines other than those of true scholarship" (1957, 4). This was for Flanders the error at the heart of progressive education: an unwillingness to acknowledge individual differences in ability or capacity.

Flanders further noted that ignoring natural individual differences would not only push the American school place toward mediocrity but also toward a culture of collective anonymity, the antithesis of liberal democratic individuality. Flanders (1957, 7) claimed:

The educationist's (not educator's) ideal is the anthill. The American ideal is to train every American child to the best and highest use of his faculties and character...This is not the natural occupation of the anthill, whose citizens busy themselves with little routines.

And if education could be socialized, collectivized, then government and all of civic life were as a consequence at similar risk. He concluded his speech with a call to arms in the pitch and register of a revolutionaire:

Unless we are successful we will lose our democratic form of Government for one imposed on children by indoctrination; we will lose the services for society of the most gifted among us in favor of the leveled-down, nonprogressive life of the anthill. "*Aux armes, citoyens*". (Flanders 1957, 8)

The relevance of Flanders' message to this NDEA policy moment did not go unnoticed. It caught Eisenhower's ear and Flanders was soon encouraged by White House staff to send the speech to James Bryant Conant who then was in the middle of his *The American High School Today* study (Cutler 1957).

The 1958 NDEA hearings themselves were overstaffed with argumentation for individualized education. Expert witness Frederick Hovde, chemical engineer and president of Purdue University took a lead in establishing the theme in bold, broad strokes: "This is a big job. Education is an individualistic job in the last analysis because all of us are separate individual entities" (Hovde 1958, 95). There was, in direct connection with this sentiment, a general agreement between witnesses and committee members that this individualization now entailed a meritocratic reconfiguration of the meaning of "educational opportunity": 'equal education for all' into 'equal for all according to ability' (e.g. Chauncey 1958b, 1639).

William Carr, the executive secretary of the NEA, had been well known in the very recent past for broad unqualified universalistic statements of educational equality (*vis.* “Education for all”). But testifying before the Senate on behalf of the NDEA, he was now obliged to make cautiously formed stipulations:

Now, the American commitment to universal education, available at public expenses, has a second fundamental reason. If equal opportunity, which we seek to provide through education, is to be a reality, all individuals must not only have education, but they must have an education appropriate to them. (1958, 477)

Senate committee member Gordon Allott interrupted here to help Carr cement his point: “You mean to them, individually?”

Carr replied, “Yes, sir, to them as individuals. Thank you for the clarification.”

Allott excused his interruption (“I just wanted to be sure I understood your meaning”) and Carr continued on the Senator’s lead:

Yes, sir. In other words, merely to provide a fixed educational program...is not quite good enough. We have to consider the adaptation of the educational program within its broad purpose to the needs and abilities and capacities of each person. (1958, 477)

If this feels like the pertinacious heeling of a slightly errant expert, the specific language of “individualization” was nonetheless freely, unambiguously asserted by countless other expert witnesses throughout the bulk of the testimony.

Moreover, this selective matter of just which individuals got what kinds of opportunities — could be captured in other phraseology as well, such as in the juxtapositions of “quality” versus “quantity” that were often a part of discussions about “manpower” in this Cold War moment. Stewart Udall, Congressman from Arizona framed it bluntly, “...there is no great shortage today in numbers; there is a shortage in quality” (Udall in Chauncey 1958a; 1644). Senator Flanders was likewise convinced that the “quantity of such students and graduates is not our problem” (1958, 1155). Paul Elicker, executive secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals set the same theme against a broader historical and demographic perspective, noting that compared with high schools in 1920, there was now enrolled a “growing army of youth” with a much greater range of “interests, aptitudes and capacities for learning” (Elicker 1958, 753). And in case his meaning might be misunderstood, he stressed: “I think you must realize

that more students go through the high school and try to gain admissions to college, with a lower level of intelligence now than 25 years ago” (1958, 794).

If the quality/quantity tradeoff was often positioned as a domestic matter, it could be set against an international backdrop as well. Mounting an argument for selective education that positioned a talented American minority against international communist “masses,” Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences held:

We cannot compete with Russia and China...in terms of numbers of men and women. Because of that, it is very important to have a very high level of education in our country in order to compete against greater numbers with men and women of greater competency. (Bronk 1958, 5)

But of course not everyone was capable of such a “high level of education,” and again, if Bronk’s statement was not quite explicit enough in this regard, Wayne Morse, Senate Committee Member from Oregon stepped in to grind the argument to a point, adding:

It is not difficult now with our educational tests to find these uncut jewels...When we find one...we cannot waste that brainpower. You...said we cannot keep ahead of Russia and Asia in numbers or in manpower, but we had better keep ahead of them in brainpower. I care not where God gave birth to that child, because these births, after all, are but by the grace of God. (Morse in Bronk, 1958, 28)

Likewise, most of these calls for selection and individualization carried, as in Morse’s statement — at turns both explicit and implicit — assumptions about the organic (or even divine) basis of the individual differences they sought to sort by. Elicker for example anchored his claims with references to an individual’s “inherent potentialities and aptitudes” (1958, 782). Psychometricians Roger Russel and Lee Cronbach claimed that individual differences in intelligence and educability were a “basic reality of mankind” objectively knowable through science (1958, 757). Bronx High School for Science principal Morris Meister noted, “some of us are born to be plowhorses and some of us are born to get out on the track...and win the Belmont sweepstakes.⁶ This applies mentally as well as physically” (1958, 116). Often simply avowing the sacred geometry of the bell curve distribution could imply that a stable social pattern must be rooted in nature, simply by virtue of its stability. Hovde offered:

When you deal with people one of the first things you learn is that every individual is a different and separate and distinct

entity. If you look at the distribution of any type...of attribute, you get a standard distribution curve of all your people...What is easy for one student is very, very difficult for another...The problem is to select and differentiate...and then provide the educational experience and opportunity which the individual has capability of mastering or learning effectively. (1958, 94-95)

If tests were a technology that allowed us to sort by such distributions of natural individual difference then *the need to do so* was more pressing than ever. There was widespread concern that with the Sputnik satellites above us, the Soviets had taken a definitive lead in the “space race,” and that Soviet science moreover propelled the vanguard of global communism and the Soviet way of life. Just as Senator Flanders worried about the spread of collectivistic ideologies and the soulless anonymity of life in the ant hill, countless other NDEA expert testifiers signaled the dangers of Soviet communism. Many noted in fact that totalitarian ideologies were inimical to liberal democratic individuality, and in fact arose from conditions where unnatural limits were placed on such natural individuality (e.g. Lister Hill in Carr, 1958, 506).

Principal of The Bronx High School for Science, Dr. Morris Meister, testifying before the Senate Committee, versified on this very theme noting in particular the dangers to democracy posed by the heterogeneous mixed-“ability” classroom:

The essence of democracy in this country is to give every individual an opportunity to attain his potential, his God-given potential, and you cannot do so if you place our able children in a heterogeneous group where excellence and intelligence are dragged down toward mediocrity (106).

If as Meister held, democracy and social equality could be both realized and safeguarded through the proper organization of individual difference, such democratic process perhaps achieved its apotheosis in a high school like his.

The Entanglement of Racism and Individualism: from Segregation by “Race” to Integration by “Ability”

Though a public school, Meister’s Bronx High School for Science, a magnet, had a highly selective admissions process governed by an I.Q. test. By accepting only 20% of their applicants, Meister argued they could give their students “a curriculum...worthy of their ability” (1958, 107). The school claimed a median IQ of 137 among its student body (“probably the highest of any high school in the United States”) and Meister boasted, as if talking about zoological or meteorological phenomena, “we’ve had them up to I.Q. 208 at Science”

(126). Meister further explained how a school like his worked as an engine of democratic process within the city or region it operated:

[A]ny child anywhere in the city, whether he lives in a slum, or...a swanky residential neighborhood, can come and take an examination.

If he is found to be able, or potentially able, he is admitted to the school. It is an essentially democratic procedure where in great concentrations of population, slum areas develop, and neighborhood high schools in a given area might tend to segregate pupils of one type. Here...there are five special schools to which any child in the city can go by demonstrating ability and interest in the purpose for which the particular school is organized. It makes this procedure essentially a democratic one (107).

The “examination” (here explicitly an I.Q. test) and what it allegedly measured became the objective standard of worth and fairness, applied across the whole city: Brooklyn, Queens, the Bronx, Staten Island, and Manhattan, all with their segregated and racially-coded geographies, “slums and swanky neighborhoods.” Selection based on “ability” then naturally allowed — and most importantly — *structured* the comingling and coeducation of students of all “type[s]”, from all walks of life. Moreover, precisely because it was in his estimation fair, objective and democratic, Meister posited selection by individual “ability” as the antidote to *de facto* segregation, one of the few explicit — albeit fleeting — mentions of “segregation” in NDEA hearings. Thus without explicitly referencing *Brown*, Meister nonetheless presented a model for *integration*, one predicated on natural individual differences in “intelligence.”

While Meister allowed that *his* public school — a well-resourced urban magnet with selective admissions — was a special case, nonetheless regular public school systems across the country could achieve, he insisted, a “great deal of improvement” by “identifying children of different abilities and giving each level [of] ability the best possible education we can” (116). By such measures, he allowed, “schools within schools” could be developed. For example, in a smaller, less-resourced school of 500 students, “one hundred or two hundred children are given a special program, a special track” (114). Indeed this was the very model of individualization (grouping by measured individual “ability”) that Conant advocated as well.

Though Meister’s evocation of integration (specifically integration-by-“ability”) might have been fleeting, it was more than enough to draw a challenge from entrenched segregationist and Senate Commit-

tee Member from South Carolina, Strom Thurmond. Tellingly, Thurmond began by assuming a basic consensus between himself and Meister on the matter of individual differences: "I presume you would consider it unfair to mix children with inferior preparation or inferior minds...with children who are well-prepared or have bright minds?" (Meister, 118). Thurmond's line of argumentation then questioned not Meister's alliance with NDEA plans for "ability" testing or curricular stratification, but instead disputed Meister's vision at the level of integration, the new law of the land, itself. In so doing, Thurmond sought to depict desegregation as at best impracticable — involving cumbersome transportation logistics — and at worst as dangerous.

To make his point, Thurmond shifted to the subject of discipline in schools and, by such excursions, on to crime and delinquency, producing at length, and even reading out loud from, a sad and readily sensationalizable news item ripped from the headlines that very morning: "Head of School Beset by Crime, Leaps to Death." This *New York Times* story reported the suicide of a Brooklyn junior high school principal following the criminal investigation of an alleged sexual assault — of a 13 year old by a 15 year old — within his school. While no information about the ethnicity of either party was reported the article noted that this had occurred in a school that "was almost equally divided between white and Negro pupils" (Perlmutter, 1958; Meister, 120). Stoking this insinuation, Thurmond finally proposed, "It is also true that since they began bringing about the forced integration in the schools in New York, that you have more delinquency and crime, have you not?" (Meister, 122). Though Meister quickly disagreed, the point had now been aired as a serious question on the Senate floor. Thurmond had spuriously linked a reported crime, and crime in schools in general, with integration and thus also specifically with African American students.

Senate Committee member Allott stepped in here to restore order, and reset the frame around which new policy would form. Allott reminded the assembly that all Meister's students were "drawn solely on ability without regard to race, religion, color, or creed." Then speaking directly to Meister, Allott asked the high school principal, "And you accept them as human beings?" (Meister, 123). Meister of course answered in the affirmative. But who is Allott talking about? *Them? Human beings?* Who might not otherwise have been accepted as a human being? What is the subtext here? It is of course that selected African American students, who before might have been treated as somehow less than a person were now, based on their measu-

red intelligence, accorded full humanity as members of the Bronx High School for Science community. Ah, how "intelligence" resolved and equalized, united, even integrated. Now everyone would be treated as a "human being," provided of course they had measured up on the test.

Thus given the right phraseology — Meister's specific use of "segregation" — and the right arrangement of historical actors — Thurmond with his segregationist challenge, and Allott with his ham-fisted mediation — discussion of testing and grouping around *individual* ability could light a jagged through-line from one level of discourse to another. The matter of integration was often well-masked in these hearings, but always close to the surface. These debates in the chambers of Congress were, of course, just 4 years after the *Brown v. Board* decision. Thus what really is being considered in these NDEA hearings — though often unexpressed or in elliptical terms — is the matter of desegregation and the question of 'just how will we integrate?' The vision that Meister and many others conjured was the sorting of individuals by their measured "ability" as the most objective way of achieving integration and maintaining democracy. Thus curriculum stratified by individual "ability" had come (or was readily coming) to stand in this new policy making context for integration, or what was envisioned as integration in its practicable, realizable form. This was — these policy makers suggested — *how* the mandate of *Brown v. Board* could in part be carried out, whether through schools like Meister's magnet, or in the main, and more commonly, through more systematized testing and grouping across US public comprehensive schools, creating in the process and in (Meister's words) "schools within schools."

Planning Documents for The American High School Today: Conant, Integration and Individual "Ability"

The same entanglements of "race," integration and school place grouping by individual differences in "intelligence" was occurring in other texts, discourses and systems of correspondence outside of, but closely related to these NDEA proceedings (Porter, 2017b). While these NDEA hearings were underway, James Bryant Conant was busy finalizing *The American High School Today*, a report — intended for wide public circulation — of the results of a large-scale school study he had conducted from 1956-1958. The purpose of Conant's study from its inception had been to demonstrate that "it was possible to provide a satisfactory orthodox academic training for students of high IQ...in schools where there was a wide spread of intellectual

ability" (Conant 1957a). Such a possibility (as it had been framed here) could be achieved through selective "ability"-based grouping or in (the parlance of the day) "individualized education" (Conant 1959, 24-26, 46-47, 58-59).

Like his contemporaries in NDEA proceedings, Conant similarly avoided any open discussion of desegregation or a long US history of educational disparity by "race" in the published version of the *The American High School Today*. Yet planning documents for the study, shared among collaborators, reveal that shifts around these issues — desegregation and the problem of "race" — were central to the design of the study itself. This is particularly apparent in the analytic language Conant developed to talk about degrees and kinds of difference or diversity within the framework of his study.

In very early planning documents Conant used the terms "homogeneity" and "heterogeneity" to refer somewhat loosely, at this point, to three potential variables of interest: a school population's range of measured IQ along with its socio-economic and its racial composition (Conant 1956). Soon though William Carr of the NEA, offering early criticism of Conant's study plan, raised concerns about the ambivalence and polysemy of "homo/heterogeneity" across these contexts (Carr 1957)⁷. Conant immediately understood the import of Carr's critique. He relayed to other collaborators that Carr had warned him to avoid talking imprecisely about "homogeneity or heterogeneity as mentioned in my memo. For he said you will find yourself landed in the segregation issue if you don't look out!" (Conant 1957b). Away from the "segregation issue" seems to be precisely where Conant wanted to steer his study.

From this point on in planning documents, Conant tightened and systematized the meaning of "hetero/homogeneity," using these descriptors now to refer exclusively to the range (or lack thereof) of "*academic talent*" — by measured individual IQ — within the student body: the central variable of interest to his study in the first place (Conant 1957c). Disparity by "race" (and socio-economic status) had been removed from consideration. Carr's warning helped Conant clarify his terms, sharpen the framework of his analysis, and retrain his focus exclusively on individual differences in "ability." Yet, of course, this maneuver reveals to historical analysis the hidden role of "race" in structuring Conant's study of "individual difference" in the American public school.

Conant also, in his planning documents and published report — subtly repurposed the term "integration," altering the meaning and usage of the word

from its widespread post-*Brown v. Board* understanding as specifically by "*race*." An unqualified advocate of curricular differentiation, Conant nonetheless had expressed concern that, if mishandled, stratification of curriculum by intellect could contribute to a decline in the social climate of the school. The remedy for this potential fragmentation would be to offer a handful of non-ability grouped courses. Here Conant recommended specifically "homeroom" (student governance) and "American Problems" (civics/current events) (Conant 1959, 34-35, 41), noting that 'heterogeneous' courses like these would function as "instruments for social *integration*" (Conant 1957d; Conant 1959, 74).

Thus Conant was, through numerous instances of usage like this, attempting to resituate "integration" as a process that resolved not *racial* segregation but rather potential fragmentation by individual "ability." He was arguably then, on the heels of *Brown v. Board*, already attempting to reimagine the diverse school — the integrated and democratically functioning school — as one that achieved social harmony despite a necessary (yet "race"-neutral) stratification by "*intelligence*." Measured "individual ability" was now for Conant, and these many other leading educational policy makers, the only and precisely the kind of difference that mattered.

All this flux, slippage and relocation of terms — Conant's adjustments to Carr's warnings about "the segregation issue," the context-specific modifications of "integration" — indicate a concerted attempt to transcend "race" through the language of individual difference. Yet, by the same stroke they reveal the hidden organizing power of "race" over these very discussions. The dark matter against which Conant hammered out his meanings, and which in turn stamped its contours into his framework in relief, were his and his collaborator's anxieties about "race," and desegregation, and their difficulties over how to make policy in this post-*Brown v. Board* context that would both restabilize the educational order and ostensibly leave the problem of "race" to the past.

Conclusion: Body and Spirit, Theater and Routine

This labor was of course not Conant's alone, but part of a more widely adopted strategy in educational policy discourses whereby conversations about "individual difference" could be substituted for considerations of "race," racism or racial disparity in educational opportunity. We have seen here in this regard a bricolage of texts — pre-NDEA speech-making, a range of NDEA expert testimony, and planning documents for Conant's *The American High School Study* — that tessellate together

to suggest a discursive whole and with it the formation of consensus. In many of these instances the symmetries in these texts were, at least in part, the product of active communication through networks of individuals and institutions: here *via* the Eisenhower Administration, Conant, Flanders, Chauncey, and Carr for example (see Porter 2017b, 8-13, 223-239, 290-333).

And while individual differences were presented as commonsensical and *natural* — “a basic condition of humankind” — forging consensus around this alleged fact was indeed a labor. It takes a lot of social work to make a natural fact. The NDEA hearings themselves enacted in many places a kind of laborious political theater replete with a chorus of obligatory avowals, rehearsals, and refrains on the theme of individual differences in educability.

One such refrain took up the problems of the group and group-think. This concern manifested itself in animated gestures toward the communist or totalitarian other and the threat these collectives posed to democracy, indeed to the nature of individuality itself. Meister, Bronk, and others’ concerns about mediocrity and wasted potential in the heterogeneous classroom — unstratified by “ability” — was like life on Flander’s anthill. Here was the *bête noire* of the group, the spectre of the anonymizing collective. This is where people wasted their potential even lost their individuality, that unique spark that made them them, and instead became drones in service of the group. Sorting students by their natural differences into different places in a stratified curriculum would restore their humanity, their individuality.

But here of course, too, this cataract of alarm over international communism had downstream carved out a languid pool of meaning in which many possible senses and shades of difference might luxuriate and swap for one another. What other sorts of groups animated the anxieties of these policy makers? Anathemizing the political group abroad — the Communist ‘masses’ — and avowing individualism as its antidote could serve to short-circuit discussions of disparity by (and inclusion of) ethnic groups at home. NDEA testimonies were thus like a kind of dress rehearsal with a new script for a new post-Second World War order: we did not think that way — in the terms or logics of groups — anymore. And precisely here, in educational policy, this denial of any kind of ‘group’ as a framework for discussion afforded a way to de-politicize (*viz.* “individualize”) the educational landscape. This occurred in this particular educational context even as — in Omi and Winant’s assessment — other realms of the social were becoming increasingly politicized around ethnic identity and the politics of “race” (2015, 150-154).

Thus, disaggregating individuals-as-individuals from the social groups of which they were a part could work to undercut the power of those groups to mobilize — in an educational context — on their own behalf.

These Congressional-hearings-as-political-theater could also serve as stage for the dramatic clash of new versus old: that often superficial morality play about what was our past and what was our future. Witnesses like Meister who stood for the way forward (pro-integration, pro-NDEA, pro-science, pro-science-of-“intelligence” and individualized education) parried with the likes of Strom Thurmond who stood for the explicitly racist, repressive Jim Crow past and who resisted the NDEA because it compelled integration even as it limited educational opportunity by “ability.” But if the audience of this theater — which included of course the actors themselves — failed to stop and more carefully consider the shifting language of discrimination at this pivotal moment, then they were more likely to receive the play at face value. There is no moral universe in which Thurmond could be construed as on the right side of history (or justice or equality), but paired *next* to Thurmond the problems with Meister’s position appear to fall away. Meister’s way forward (or Conant’s, Chauncey’s or Carr’s for that matter) becomes more clear and more self-evident to its contemporary audience as the only way forward in relief.

And if this NDEA testimony was in some sense dramaturgy it was also a kind of thaumaturgy, too. It was through this theater that the metamorphosis of some part of “race” difference to individual difference in “ability” was conjured. Of course, as I have argued here and elsewhere, such a constructed individualism — through its very appeals to natural difference via neo-hereditarianism — was entangled in numerous ways with a racism from which it supposed it had freed itself. Indeed as we have seen, at key junctures conversations about individual differences in ability could readily summon an older legacy of “race” and segregation.

And the new psychometric individualism could still accomplish the work of “race” not only because of the neo-hereditarian principles around which it was structured, but also because “race” was embedded latently in the tests, in the structures of schooling itself, and indeed in the broader knowledge production practices and social matrix that surrounded them. Others have argued at turns that both “smartness” and “race” can function — in their inclusions and exclusions — *like* or *in tandem with* property regimes (Ladson-Billings and Tate 1995; Leonardo and Broderick 2011). This history then demonstrates just how — at this time, in this particular context — these property rights were institutio-

nalized: as permission to inhabit certain spaces within a rapidly stratifying public school curriculum. It was precisely in this way — in the post-*Brown*, post-NDEA classroom — that the ideational qualities of “race” and “intelligence” were married with institutional practice and routine.

This analysis has necessarily focused on “race” because of the salience of *Brown v. Board* to this moment. Yet it is also important to note that this policy shift did not exercise its effects along lines of “race” alone, but was part of a more general (if modified) reassertion of hereditarianism (*i.e.* neo-hereditarianism) that could work to explain and naturalize difference across other social categories like class and gender. So, while this new testing regime might have worked with especial intensity by “race” within desegregating school systems in the years following *Brown*, post-NDEA reforms left everyone not identified as “academically talented” — regardless of “race” and across differences better characterized by class, sex, color, creed, ‘dis’-ability (or in Swedish, *funktionsvariation*), life-history, language, place of origin, or affective orientation — to *varying degrees* in the shadows of this new policy. Consider, on this point, the growing gap in measured achievement by class or socioeconomic status over the last half century since the NDEA (Duncan and Murnane 2011; Tavernise 2012).

If *Brown* and the NDEA were a tug-of-war over the structure of educational opportunity, they also represented a shift in the contest over the locus of difference: from group to individual. In this mode, the expansion of rights accorded by group (*Brown*) was then quickly converted and redefined as privileges awarded by differential individual ability (NDEA). This new policy, of course, technically promised to transcend categories of “race” preserving a spot for high achieving members of any group. But the long legacy of structural inequality in educational opportunity — by “race” group — would be carried through into the new test-driven meritocracy based on individual “ability.” Thus, some of the gains of *Brown* began to erode along these very lines even as the Civil Rights movement gained momentum.

Endnotes

¹ “Jim Crow” refers to a racial regime in the Southern United States supported by an intertwined complex of state-level laws and customs. Jim Crow practices extended from the end of the Civil War through the mid-20th century and were intended to enforce the segregation and inequality of Blacks and Whites across a range of social institutions, including public education.

² The “Sputnik Crisis” refers to the alarmed reaction in the US following the Soviet launch of the two Sputnik satellites—the first-ever human-made earth-orbiting satellites—in October

and November of 1957. The Sputnik launches contributed to the impression among many US commentators that the Soviet Union had surpassed the United States in its scientific and military development. For an excellent account of the effect of the Sputnik Crisis on education debates in the US, see Clowse, 1981.

³ For a similar conceptualization of “intelligence” or “smartness” but in the field of critical pedagogy see Leonardo and Broderick 2011, 2215-2217.

⁴ On Dunn’s progressivism see (Gormley 2009).

⁵ The 1957 protests in Little Rock, Arkansas were an attempt by vocal White segregationists to prevent newly enrolled African American students from entering and attending Little Rock Central High School. These protests quickly attracted international attention when a militarized standoff between state and federal armed forces ensued. In flagrant disobedience of the recent *Brown v. Board* decision, Orval Faubus, the Arkansas Governor, summoned the Arkansas National Guard to the high school to support the segregationist blockade. Faubus’ defiance of federal authority provoked President Eisenhower to deploy the 101st Airborne Division of the US Army to Little Rock where it assumed command over and dispersed the Arkansas Guard, effectively reopening Little Rock Central to its African American students. An excellent account of this event as it unfolded for both domestic and international observers can be found in Dudziak, 115-151.

⁶ The Belmont sweepsakes are a major US horse-racing event. Meister’s metaphor here carries strong hereditarian connotations as it recalls animal breeding (*i.e.* purebred/thoroughbred racing horses and mixed/wild-type stock) and the different kinds of work or performance for which these animals are allegedly suited based on their breeding.

⁷ This document is unsigned but by triangulating with other known participants, we can infer with a high degree of probability Carr’s authorship

References

- Adorno, Theodor *et al.* 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Anonymous. 1958. “Crisis in Education, Pt IV: Famous Educator’s Plan for a School That Will Advance Students According to Ability.” *LIFE Magazine, Time Inc.*
- Brattain, Michelle. 2007. “Race, Racism, and Antiracism: UNESCO and the Politics of Presenting Science to the Postwar Public.” *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 5: 1386-1413.
- Brigham, Carl Campbell. 1923. *A Study of American Intelligence*. Princeton: University Press.
- Bronk, Detlev. 1958. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Jan. 21st, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Science and Education for National Defense.
- Burks, Barbara. 1928. “The Relative Influence of Nature and Nurture upon Mental Development: A Comparative Study of Foster Parent-Foster Child Resemblance and True Parent-True Child Resemblance.” In *National Society for the Study of Education, Twenty-Seventh Yearbook, Pt. 1, Nature and Nurture, Their Influence upon Intelligence*, edited by Guy Whipple, 219-316. Public School Publishing Co. (Oxford, England).
- Carr, William. 1957. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987,

- James Bryant. "Observations on the Conant Study," n.d. UAI 15.898, High School March - June 1957, Box 42. Harvard University Archives.
- Carr, William. 1958. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Feb. 20th, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Science and Education for National Defense.
- Carson, John. 2007. *The Measure of Merit: Talents, Intelligence, and Inequality in the French and American Republics, 1750-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chauncey, Henry. 1958a. Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on Feb. 26th, U S House of Representatives 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Scholarship and Loan Program, § Committee on Education and Labor.
- Chauncey, Henry. 1958b. Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on March 26th, U S House of Representatives 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Scholarship and Loan Program, § Committee on Education and Labor.
- Clotfelter, Charles T. 2011. *After "Brown": The Rise and Retreat of School Desegregation*. Princeton University Press.
- Clowse, Barbara Barksdale. 1981. *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Greenwood Press.
- Cohen, Lizabeth. 2008. *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Coleman, James. 1966. "Equality of Educational Opportunity Study." Ann Arbor: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1956. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, James Bryant. "Proposed Study of Certain Problems Connected with The American Comprehensive High School: Confidential Memorandum Prepared by James B. Conant for Mr. John Gardner," December 21st. UAI 15.898, High School March - June 1957, Box 42. Harvard University Archives.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1957a. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, James Bryant. "Revised Memorandum on the Project for Studying the Education of Gifted Students in American Comprehensive High Schools," March 11th. UAI 15.898, High School March - June 1957, Box 42. Harvard University Archives.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1957b. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, James Bryant. "Correspondence: John Gardner to J. B. Conant," January 30th. UAI 15.898, High School June 57-March 1958, Box 42. Harvard University Archives.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1957c. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, James Bryant. "Correspondence with John Gardner," January 2nd. UAI 15.898, High School March - June 1957, Box 42. Harvard University Archives.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1957d. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, James Bryant. "J.B. Conant's First Thoughts on Criteria for a Satisfactory Public High School (Confidential)," November 11th. UAI 15.898, High School March - June 1957, Box 42. Harvard University Archives.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1958. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, "Correspondence with Henry Chauncey, Aptitude and Achievement Tests," July 25th. UAI 15.898, Tests and Testing, Box 117. Harvard University Archives.
- Conant, James Bryant. 1959. *The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens*. 1st ed. Carnegie Series in American Education 1. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Costigliola, Frank. 2016. "'I React Intensely to Everything': Russia and the Frustrated Emotions of George F. Kennan, 1933-1958." *Journal of American History* 102, no. 4 (March 1st): 1075-1101.
- Cravens, Hamilton. 1993. *Before Head Start: The Iowa Station & America's Children*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Cravens, Hamilton. 2012. "Column Right, March! Nationalism, Scientific Positivism, and the Conservative Turn of the American Social Sciences in the Cold War Era." In *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, edited by M. Solovey and H. Cravens. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cutler, Robert. 1957. "Correspondence: Robert Cutler (Special Assistant to President Eisenhower) to Conant Nov. 1st, 1957," in Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, UAI 15.898, F Correspondence, Box 128. Harvard University Archives.
- Degler, Carl. 1992. *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Dudziak, Mary 2011. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, N.J.; Woodstock: Princeton University Press.
- Duncan, Greg, and Richard Murnane. 2011. *Whither Opportunity?: Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dunn, L. 1951. "Report on Meeting of Physical Anthropologists and Geneticists for a Definition of the Concept of Race." Paris: UNESCO, June 4th. UNESCO Papers.
- Elicker, Paul. 1958. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on March 3rd, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Science and Education for National Defense, § Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
- Fields, Karen, and Barbara Fields. 2012. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. Verso Books.
- Flanders, Ralph. 1957. Papers of James Bryant Conant, 1862-1987, James Bryant. "The Undertow in Modern Education: Speech of the Hon. Ralph Flanders of Vermont in the Senate of the United States, June 17th, 1957," June 17th. UAI 15.898, F Correspondence, Box 128. Harvard University Archives.
- Gould, Stephen. 1996. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gordon, Leah. 2015. *From Power to Prejudice: The Rise of Racial Individualism in Midcentury America*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gormley, Melinda. 2009. "Scientific Discrimination and the Activist Scientist: L.C. Dunn and the Professionalization of Genetics and Human Genetics in the United States." *Journal of the History of Biology* 42, no. 1 (February 1st): 33-72.
- Hannah-Jones, Nikole. 2014a. "Segregation Now." *ProPublica* (April 16th). <https://www.propublica.org/article/segregation-now-full-text>.
- Hannah-Jones, Nikole. 2014b, May 2nd. "School Districts Still Face Fights—and Confusion—on Integration." *The Atlantic*. May 2nd. <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2014/05/lack-of-order-the-erosion-of-a-once-great-force-for-integration/361563/>
- Herman, Ellen. 1996. *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts*. University of California Press.
- Herrnstein, Richard, and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. Simon and Schuster.
- Hilgard, Ernest. 1987. *Psychology in America: A Historical Survey*.

- Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hovde, Frederick. 1958. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Jan. 28th, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Science and Education for National Defense.
- Jensen, Arthur. 1969. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement." *Harvard Educational Review* Vol. 39, no. 1.
- Kluger, Richard. 2011. *Simple Justice: The History of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's Struggle for Equality*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria, and William Tate. 1995. "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education." *Teachers College Record* 97, no. 1.
- Leonardo, Zeus, and Alicia Broderick. 2011. "Smartness as Property: A Critical Exploration of Intersections between Whiteness and Disability Studies." *Teachers College Record* 113, no. 10: 2206-32.
- Mandelbaum, Allen, trans. 2017. *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Meister, Morris. 1958. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Jan. 29th, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Science and Education for National Defense, § Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
- National Defense Education Act. 1958. Public Law 85-864 in United States Statutes at Large Vol. 72, 85th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Oakes, Jeannie. 2005. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. Yale University Press.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 2015. *Racial Formation in the United States*. Routledge.
- Painter, Nell. 2011. *The History of White People*. Reprint. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Porter, Jim. 2017a. "A 'Precious Minority': Constructing the 'Gifted' and 'Academically Talented' Student in the Era of Brown v. Board of Education and the National Defense Education Act." *Isis* 108, no. 3: 581-605.
- Porter, Jim. 2017b. "Constructing the 'Gifted' and 'Academically Talented' Student: 'Intelligence,' Intelligence Testing, and Educational Opportunity in the Era of Brown v. Board and the National Defense Education Act" (Doctoral Dissertation). Michigan State University.
- Roman, Meredith 2012. *Opposing Jim Crow: African Americans and the Soviet Indictment of U.S. Racism, 1928-1937*. U of Nebraska Press.
- Rosenberg, Gerald N. 2008. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change? Second Edition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Russell, Roger and Lee Cronbach. 1958. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Feb. 27th, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2nd sess. on Science and Education for National Defense.
- Tavernise, Sabrina. 2012. "Education Gap Grows Between Rich and Poor, Studies Show." *The New York Times*, February 9th.
- Terman, Lewis. 1916. *The Measurement of Intelligence: An Explanation of and a Complete Guide for the Use of the Stanford Revision and Extension of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Scale*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Terman, Lewis. 1928. "The Influence of Nature and Nurture upon Intelligence Scores: An Evaluation of the Evidence in Part I of the 1928 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 19: 362-69.
- Tyson, Karolyn. 2011. *Integration Interrupted: Tracking, Black Students, and Acting White after Brown*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Urban, Wayne. 2010. *More Than Science and Sputnik: The National Defense Education Act of 1958*. University of Alabama Press.
- Vinovskis, Maris. 2008. *The Birth of Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*. University of Chicago Press.
- Wade, Nicholas. 2014. *A Troublesome Inheritance: Genes, Race and Human History*. New York: Penguin Press HC.
- Wellman, Beth. 1934. "Growth in Intelligence under Differing School Environments." *Journal of Experimental Education* 3: 59-83.
- Whipple, Guy. 1940. *The Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture*. Public School.
- Yoakum, Clarence, and Robert Yerkes. 1920. *Army Mental Tests*. H. Holt and company.
- Zenderland, Leila. 2001. *Measuring Minds: Henry Herbert Goddard and the Origins of American Intelligence Testing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zook, George. 1947. *The Truman Commission Report: Higher Education for American Democracy*. Washington.

“Is Professionalism the Same as Inhumanity?” Social Criticism in the Literary Work of Kiba Lumberg

VIOLA PARENTE-ČAPKOVÁ

This article introduces Lumberg’s major literary work, the *Memesa* trilogy, composed of the novels *Musta perhonen* (Black Butterfly, 2004), *Repalaiset siivet* (Tattered Wings, 2006) and *Samettiyö* (Velvet Night, 2008), and discusses some of the features of the reception for Lumberg’s novels, especially the debate on “literary quality”. It then looks at some of the formal and generic aspects of the novel, which I suggest should be read in the context of Lumberg’s activist background. Finally, I analyse the multiple aspects of social criticism and criticism of the welfare state in Lumberg’s *Memesa* trilogy, by focusing on the section “Kärsimysten huoneet” (Rooms of Suffering) in *Samettiyö*. Throughout the article, I comment on the viability of using the theorico-methodological tools of postcolonial studies. In the final analysis, I employ concepts from disability studies and, briefly, juxtapose the heroine of Lumberg’s novels with earlier representations of Romani women.

On the other side of the street, not far from the kiosk in Old Church Park, there is a place where gypsies sell booze. When I have to pass it, I avoid going too close. I walk to the city centre with my heart in my mouth, on the other side of the park and down the hill, so that I will not run into the Kale. My heart beats like a drum when I think what could happen if my people see me. (Lumberg 2011, 192)¹

I begin to understand that a gypsy is not a Finn, even though she lives in Finland, but she is one of “those others” who are not considered human. And I am able to tell, from tiny nuances, how the white people relate to me. Those who see me as a human being encounter me in an easy, natural way. But they are few in number. (Lumberg 2011, 414)²

Like her other artworks, the literary texts of the Finnish Romani author, Kiba Lumberg, take a critical stance on various issues. In the *Memesa* trilogy (published in Finland in 2004–2008), the descriptions of Lumberg’s narrator far from romanticizing life in the Roma community, are directly and harshly critical. The protagonist in the trilogy – a girl, and later a woman, named Memesa – feels that she must escape from home at the age of 13 because she does not want to put up with the sexual harassment she would be subjected to in

the Roma community, “provoking” the Romani men by the mere fact of her (female) bodily existence. As the first quote indicates, having escaped from home and been confined to a children’s home, Memesa feels that she must hide from the Roma community. She believes that the Roma men would identify her as a renegade and fears their retribution. She feels lonely and experiences various forms of individual and institutionalized racism. As the second quote shows, sometimes these are just “tiny nuances” in “the way the white people relate” to “others”. Here, the narrator casts her critical glance on the majority population of Finland, and its othering behaviour towards the Roma and other minority groups. Lumberg shows the dark sides of the Finnish welfare state and the drawbacks in the way in which its institutions function – or fail to function. In the quoted passages, Memesa expresses a fear of violence against women in the Roma community, especially against women who do not comply with traditional roles. At the same time, she realizes that she will always be the “other” in majority Finnish society or, in other words, the other in the Finnish state and nation. She does not belong anywhere.

Kiba Lumberg’s work thematizes the issues of otherness and multiple marginalization on many levels. Like other women Romani writers, she expresses what Paola Toninato (2014, 106) has called a sort of “‘multiple consciousness’, that is, an awareness of Romani women’s marginalization and exclusion from the dominant group as well as from their own ethnic group”. The marginalization and otherness discussed in Lumberg’s literary work is multiple in many respects. It concerns gender and ethnicity/“race”/“colour”, but also sexuality, age and disability. Moreover, it does not just concern the protagonist herself. Memesa’s relationship with the majority population and with state institutions is complex. On the one hand, the Roma heroine is sceptical about anything that comes from the state or institutional level. On the other hand, the Finnish welfare state raises expectations of tolerance and a positive approach to various kinds of otherness, even in her.

This article introduces Lumberg’s major literary work, the *Memesa* trilogy, composed of the novels *Musta perhonen* (Black Butterfly, 2004), *Repalaiset siivet* (Tattered Wings, 2006) and *Samettiyö* (Velvet Night, 2008), and discusses some of the features of the reception for Lumberg’s novels, especially the debate on “literary quality”. It then looks at some of the formal and generic aspects of the novel, which I suggest should be read in the context of Lumberg’s activist background. Finally, I analyse the multiple aspects of social criticism and criticism of the welfare state in Lumberg’s *Memesa* trilogy, by focusing on the section “Kärsimysten huoneet” [Rooms of Suffering] in *Samettiyö*. Throughout the article, I comment on the viability of using the theorico-methodological tools of postcolonial studies. In the final analysis, I employ concepts from disability studies.

The versatile artist-activist Kiba Lumberg, her *Memesa* trilogy and its reception

Kiba Lumberg is a versatile artist and activist of Finnish Kale descent. She was born in Lappeenranta, eastern Finland, in 1956. Her work comprises visual art, video art, performance art, comic books, a screenplay for a television series, a children’s picture book and the aforementioned trilogy; her last book *Irtiottoxxx* (2018) is being published when this article is going to print. Her art has always been politically committed. She founded the art group *Tulikaste* (Baptism of Fire) as well as the art gallery/publishing house, *Aurinkogalleria* (Solar Gallery), which also serves as a place to meet, discuss and promote alternative forms of art. Lumberg has given, led or curated various socially committed performances, courses, workshops and art exhibitions in Finland and around the world, acting as exhibition curator and producer, for example, in the case of the international exhibition of contemporary art by Roma women. Among the highlights are her participation in the Venice Biennale at the first Roma Pavilion in 2007 and at the Roma Pavilion project “Call the Witness” in 2011. Lumberg’s activism includes standing as a candidate for the Left Alliance, a left-wing Finnish political party, in the parliamentary elections of 2007 and as a candidate for the European Parliament in 2009. In this way, she has functioned as a minority group artist-activist, in a similar way to the many-sided Sámi author Nils Aslak Valkeapää and many others elsewhere in the world, from Native Americans to Aborigines.

Lumberg published her trilogy as independent works, but the second and the third volumes are each a kind of a sequel to the first. In 2011, the three novels were published in a single volume as *Memesa-trilogia*

(*The Memesa Trilogy*). The novels follow the heroine, Memesa, from early childhood, about the age of four or five, to adulthood, as a middle-aged renowned artist. The time span of the narrative covers the 1960s to the 2000s. The trilogy is clearly partly autobiographical, and can thus be characterized as autofiction – a form of fictionalized autobiography often found in combination with other genres that is frequently used to discuss trauma. As such, it has often been used in postcolonial contexts (see e.g. Jordan 2013) or to recover indigenous narratives, drawing inspiration from the genre of feminist ethno-autobiography. As a kind of narrative, ethno-autobiography involves:

oral and/or written descriptions of self with an Indigenous sense of ‘ethnic’, including place, seasonal cycles (time), history, nature, gender, ancestry, spirit, community, and so on. Ethno-autobiography includes a variety of practices that encourage and support decolonization and the breaking down of the well-boundaried, masterful, individualistic, Eurocentred, modern, and weird selves in (post)modern societies. (Kremer & Jackson-Paton 2014, 422–23)

Ethno-autobiography provides an interesting framework in which to read Lumberg’s trilogy. It is possible to find traces of it but since the protagonist leaves the Romani community at an early age out of her own volition, a generic reading creates a fruitful tension, highlighting the author’s “double-edged criticism” – the above-mentioned critical look at both the Romani community and the majority population.

In the first book of the trilogy, *Musta perhonen*, we get acquainted with Memesa’s family in Lappeenranta, eastern Finland, and see the life of the Roma community from within, defamiliarized by the use of a child narrator. Memesa describes her courageous mother and the need to know how to defend oneself. Memesa is surrounded by violence, mostly against women and children. Around her, she sees submissive battered wives but also women who rebel against the order – some successfully, others less so. Feeling different from other girls, she is repelled both by the traditional female role that is expected of her in the Romani community and by the hypocrisy of the majority population in Finland. *Musta perhonen* ends with Memesa’s escape to Helsinki.

In *Repalaiset siivet*, the police bring Memesa back to Lappeenranta, and she ends up in a children’s institution, where she experiences further violence. She rebels against racial bullying at school and is sent to a reform school for girls. In one episode, Memesa’s family “kidnaps” their daughter from the children’s home, but she manages to escape, refusing, once again, the prospect of

living the life of a traditional Roma woman. She somehow succeeds in making friends with the local youth, and experiments with drugs and sex, but heterosexual activity repels her and she comes to understand more and more that she is attracted to women. She discovers the power of music and art, which allows her to feel free. When Memesa gets out of the detention centre, she finds her first job and reconciles with her family. She finds her first girlfriend and follows her to Helsinki, even though the relationship appears doomed from the very beginning.

Much of the third novel, *Samettiyö*, deals with Memesa's creativity. She is helped by her godmother, the unconventional and strong-willed dancer, Zaida. Before being recognized as an artist, Memesa works in various institutions as a nurse. She experiences racial and gender prejudice, as well as harassment. At times, as a Roma, she cannot even find a place to live. The book also depicts Memesa's – mostly unhappy – relationships with women. She becomes more and more dedicated to art, and takes dancing and singing lessons. She is accepted into the School of Decorative Arts to study Roma handicraft, as well as design, art history, painting and ceramics. She is criticized by the Roma community for wearing trousers and being outspoken about Romani habits; after one television interview she is threatened by angry Roma. She broadens her horizons, begins to travel abroad, organizes exhibitions and is granted scholarships. Memesa's father dies and she cannot find happiness in love. However, she gains recognition as an artist, receiving, at the very end of the novel, a prize for "versatile and creative work" and for defending human rights.

With the exception of the beginning of *Samettiyö*, the narrative is mostly chronological. Memesa returns to her hometown as a renowned artist in order to install an exhibition of her works, but the town feels alien and she returns to Helsinki. Otherwise the whole trilogy is a sequence of episodes. Scenes consist mostly of dialogues, each of which sheds light on some aspect of Memesa's search for identity and the world around her. This structure affected the reception for Lumberg's trilogy. Critics emphasized the fact that the author is a Roma woman describing the Roma community from within. In her review of *Samettiyö*, the Finnish literary scholar Päivi Koivisto (2008) criticizes the style of the novel, which "does not offer [the reader] very much pleasure". Too many terse, truncated sentences one after another; the colloquial language spoken by the Romani characters does not sound authentic, apart from dialogue in Karelian dialect. Koivisto also asks how the reader should react to Lumberg's way of describing the Roma, using all the stereotypes inter-

nalized by the majority population, and expresses an interest in finding a Romani woman writer who has not severed her ties with the Roma community. She adds, however, that according to Lumberg's interviews, this is unlikely to happen since, in the Romani community, women are forced to keep quiet.

For a literary critic trained in the European/Western way of approaching literature, it is difficult not to agree, at least in part, with Koivisto's criticism. Lumberg's style and the composition of her novels (especially *Samettiyö*) do feel uneven. All this demonstrates the typical embarrassment of literary critics vis-à-vis the issue of the "literary quality" of Romani writing (see also Scheinostová 2011), a problem that is well known from the many debates within postcolonial literary studies and indigenous studies, and the debate around ethnic literature.

Issues of literary quality and convention

According to Karolína Ryvolová (2017), a Czech expert on Romani writing, "The texts of Roma authors do not resemble the output of the majority population, which confuses the reader who sees it as a sign of amateurism [but] this [the different qualities of Romani writing] is precisely why this young literature is so strong and attractive". Ryvolová continues:

Romani literary output is "different" at first sight. It preserves some oral elements, which are not usually associated with literary expression. The narrative is usually linear, with frequent use of dialogue, simple sentences are used and compound sentences preferred to complex sentences. An important element is that of allusion and ellipsis. [...] We cannot generalize, by any means – no text by a Romani writer exhibits all these features; and what is very important, of course, is the language of the original. But because literary writing has few precedents among the Roma, and all authors are autodidacts, they can at times take new and completely unexpected turns [my translation].

Ryvolová's depiction is in tune with studies of writers from indigenous communities who often fail to meet Western aesthetic criteria and the expectations of a Western reader. Again, there are echoes of the debates about indigenous methodology vis-à-vis Sámi culture (Kuokkanen 2000; Jernsletten 2011). Paola Toninato (2014, 115) sees Roma literature as part of the "ethnic paradigm", that is, "written by, about or for persons who perceive themselves, or were perceived by others, as members of ethnic groups".³ In this respect, some of the stylistic aspects of the novel can be explained with the help of the above-mentioned generic features of

ethno-autobiography. Ethno-autobiography, as a kind of writing about the self, also exhibits the generic features of Bildungsroman or a "coming-of-age story". Päivi Lappalainen has developed a careful generic analysis of Lumberg's trilogy with an emphasis on a subgenre of the coming-of-age story, Künstlerroman or the artist's novel (Lappalainen 2012, 179). The Memesa trilogy is indeed a feminist version of the artist's novel or, more precisely, an artist's novel with a female heroine who rebels against an oppressive society. Moreover, the heroine is a lesbian who is critical of the Romani community, which – with only very rare exceptions that seem to confirm the norm – functions on the basis of the heterosexual matrix (see Gröndahl 2010). In her insightful intersectional analysis of the Memesa trilogy, Satu Gröndahl (2010) has shown how central the lesbian identity is in Lumberg's books. Hence, Memesa's concrete and metaphorical journey can be read also as a kind of the lesbian/queer picaresque (see Felski 2003, 111), although it is far from the colourful road trips of Erica Lopez or the postmodern versions of the Baudelairean flâneur (cf. Felski 112–113; Ganser 1994, 281).

As Lappalainen has observed, the first two novels pursue many strategies typical of children's literature, young adult fiction and literature for girls. Memesa is a kind of tomboy, a frequent heroine type in these genres. She escapes from home and grows up partly in a children's home. She is precocious and lonely, and creates a fantasy friend, her grandmother Emilia, who gives her advice, supports her at difficult moments and thus helps Memesa to develop her artistic talent (cf. Lappalainen 2012, 179–181). These moments create associations with magical realism, a mode typical of much postcolonial writing, and, together with Memesa's admiration for her mother's strength, are among the occasions when the matrilineal Romani tradition is viewed in a positive way.

Both Koivisto (2008) and Lappalainen (2012) mention the fact that Lumberg criticizes both the Roma community and Finnish society, mentioning Memesa's work in hospitals and care homes, where she nurses children, psychiatric patients and the elderly, who are neglected by their relatives. Koivisto (2008) appreciates the fact that Lumberg does not use this as an opportunity to romanticize the Romani's respectful approach to the elderly. Lumberg is clearly opposed to any form of cultural relativism. As Lappalainen (2012, 185–186) suggests, instead of wondering why Lumberg does not offer us a "less stereotypical" view of the Romani community, we should accept her agenda of fighting every form of oppression, regardless of its origin.

Indeed, Lumberg's case belongs to the more complex: the author's lively and, for a literary scholar,

sometimes bewildering way of using various literary devices, linguistic and other, does not involve much use of Romani folklore. The heroine can be seen as a hybrid subject,⁴ living between the Roma community and the majority society in Finland. In a way, her hybridity is that of a *nousukas*,⁵ a social climber, and the novel can be read as part of the long tradition of Finland's *nousukas* novels (often *Bildungsromans*) about literary figures who rise by means of education and, often, their artistic abilities. A *nousukas* is an eternal hybrid who does not belong anywhere, and deconstructs by her or his very existence any idea of authenticity and "pure" identity. In the case of ethnic and racial otherness—and also in migrant literature—the *nousukas* figures face different challenges to those marginalized "only" by class, which confirms the need for an intersectional approach (cf. Gröndahl 2010, esp. 108).

Hence, a carefully contextualized generic analysis would seem to be more fruitful than speculating about the literary qualities of Lumberg's work or looking for traces of indigenous poetics in it, although the latter is definitely more relevant than the former. The way Lumberg uses the stereotypes of Romani representation would merit an analysis of its own (cf. Parente-Čapková 2015, 119–120). In addition, even though we may agree that the narrative techniques can provoke bewilderment, the trilogy evokes a sense of immediacy and even urgency. Therefore, while acknowledging the possible specificity of Romani writing, I would argue that the key to Lumberg's texts is to approach them as texts written by an activist. Indeed, some parts of the trilogy exhibit the features of a literary pamphlet, an important genre in literature that belongs to the (post)colonial world (see e.g. Wehrs 1998, 105). In the Nordic context, it should be recalled that one of the first works of Nils Aslak Valkeapää, *Terveisiä Lapista* [Greetings from Lapland] (1971, engl. transl. 1983), was a pamphlet.

The following section takes a closer look at the Memesa trilogy and discusses episodes from all the novels, with a focus on sections of the third volume. The trilogy contains powerful criticism of the Finnish welfare state and deals with themes of multiple oppression from the point of view of a specific version of a hybrid subject.

Perpetual others of the welfare state

Lumberg's approach to the misfits of Finnish society while depicting her heroine's life from the 1960s to the 1980s sheds a critical light on the Nordic welfare state, which has traditionally been one of the hallmarks of the Nordic countries. The rhetoric of Nor-

dic exceptionalism, which highlights the idea of the Nordic countries as “global good citizens” engaged “in anti-racist and anti-imperial activities since the 1970s without questioning their own involvement in colonial and racist activities” (Loftsdóttir and Jensen 2012, 2), has been thoroughly questioned and deconstructed in recent decades. One analytical tool has been the concept of colonial complicity (Keskinen et al. 2009), and the various forms of othering of certain groups within Nordic societies have sometimes been referred to as inner colonization, for example with regard to the way in which Nordic societies historically related to the Sámi population. In a similar way, the theoretical approach inspired by the postcolonial framework can be adapted to research on the Roma and Roma literature.

The viability of using the postcolonial methodology to study Roma culture has been discussed many times (e.g. Ashton-Smith 2010). In case of the Roma, scholars have highlighted the difficulties of working with the concepts of postcolonial and decolonial, given the Roma’s lack of a home country or collective past (e.g. Ashton-Smith 2010, 73–75). As Alan Ashton-Smith points out, the question is “a colonization of people, rather than land” (ibid., 82). Some notions inspired by postcolonial studies have been theorized vis-à-vis the Romani community and its representation. Representation of the Roma in Finnish culture has been analysed with the help of Jonathan Boyarin’s (1994) notion of the domestic other/the other within (Parente-Čapková 2011). Boyarin analyses the representation of the Jews, but juxtaposes this with representation of the Roma. This technique was used by Deborah Epstein Nord (2006) in her studies of depictions of the Roma in Western European literature. The oppression of these “domestic” ethnic others shares certain features with the oppression of the subjugated ethnic groups in the colonies, but it is also specific in a number of ways. The proximity of these others makes the majority population fear them in different ways to the others in distant colonies. One manifestation of this fear was the infamous undertakings of Nordic eugenics, which led to the sterilization of women with the intention of preventing “hereditary feeble-mindedness” by restricting the birth rate of groups such as the Roma, but also of the various other groups in the population such as the learning disabled (see e.g. Ahlbeck 2015). Camilla Nordberg (2010, 256) has used the term “perpetual other” in connection with the Finnish Roma.

Although the situation and position of every group in society is specific and requires context-bound approaches, in many respects the ethnic “others within” are subjected to similar oppression to other groups that have been characterized as the “welfare state’s

others” (Mulinari et al. 2009, 10). Lumberg’s trilogy can be seen as deconstructing the concept of Finland as an “innocent outsider” vis-à-vis the colonial mentality (cf. Vuorela 2009, 21), in that the Nordic (here, Finnish) welfare state is racialized, sexualized (ibid., 11), gendered and based on the tradition and politics of rationality, which is inextricably intertwined with colonialism (cf. Quijano 2007, 171) and with colonial complicity.

The narrator of Lumberg’s trilogy systematically demystifies the reputations of various Finnish institutions such as the school, the children’s home, the hospital and the nursing home – and even the police. In other words, institutions that exercise power over marginalized human beings such as ethnic minorities, but also children, the sick, the disabled and the elderly are debunked. Lumberg’s narrator tries to present a fair picture of people working in these institutions, who belong to the majority population. The heroine, Memesa, faces bullying and problems in various institutions, but she also has various positive encounters, such as the encouragement from her teacher in *Musta perhonen*.

Throughout her “journey”, Memesa gains insights into the way the welfare state treats its others both as “clients” and as employees. While in the childcare institution, Memesa experiences violence from an employee named Rantanen/Ranskis, who sexually abuses boys and repeatedly attacks Memesa verbally, calling her ‘gypsy’. Memesa seeks help from the director, nicknamed “Mamuska” (“Mum” in Russian), who seems at first to be kind and friendly. However, the nickname begins to sound ironic when Mamuska refuses to call the police after Rantanen attacks Memesa so brutally that the young girl has to be hospitalized. Mamuska rebukes Rantanen privately but takes her side, explaining to the shocked Memesa that Rantanen is a victim of cruel abuse by her father. This violence in the family resulted in Rantanen murdering her mother and her subsequent imprisonment. Now, Mamuska wants to give Rantanen another chance. The character of Mamuska remains enigmatic. As indicated above, she feels sympathetic towards the children, and the fact that she tries to help a person as stigmatized as Rantanen puts her in a positive light. However, she obviously does not want any problems in her institution and ends up siding with a violent, abusive employee and betraying a vulnerable child. From Memesa’s point of view, Mamuska represents the failing welfare state, which sides with the employees of its institutions rather than with their clients or patients.

After the episode, Memesa is bitterly disappointed, concluding: “... we are all afraid. Ranskis killed her

mother. Why didn’t she kill her fucking bastard of a father? When she killed her mother, she killed herself as well” (Lumberg 2011, 181).⁶ When Memesa cannot sleep because of her aching wounds, she has a vision of her fantasy grandmother, Emilia, who warns her about trusting any institutions and admonishes her to rely only on herself:

Look here, now you see that no institution will bring you safety; nor can the people in the institution. When one begins to believe too much that she can be safe thanks to other people, there comes a slap in the face. Listen, after all is said and done, you have to find safety inside yourself. You have to rely on yourself and nobody else. Believe me, my dear child, I know. Eventually, the human being stands alone with her own life. Do not seek out your dreams through others. The adult gadjis in this house are emotional invalids to their souls. But you will get over these misfortunes. (Lumberg 2011, 177)⁷

As a “customer” of state institutions, Memesa gets used to trusting no institution and none of its representatives.

Emotional invalids and the necropolitics of disability

While growing up, Memesa has various jobs, experiencing difficulties and discrimination on the basis of race and gender when being hired or, often, not hired. In the second part of *Samettiyö*, “Kärsimysten huoneet” [Rooms of Suffering], she succeeds in getting work as a trainee in a Helsinki hospital. This part of Memesa’s story is probably set in the 1970s, in the period characterized by Panu Pulma (2006, 201) as the fourth phase in the history of Romani politics in Finland, “the time of minority rights and ethnic awakening” (1960s–2000s). During those times, the Roma in Finland became urbanized but, in common with other parts of the rural poor, were faced with new and insurmountable problems in the jobs and housing markets (Pulma 2006, 187, 201).

As a trainee, Memesa gains insights into the way the welfare state and its agents treat not only employees with ethnic minority backgrounds such as herself, but also “other others” such as disabled and elderly patients. Emilia’s talk of “emotional invalids” acquires a bitterly ironic meaning. Having worked in “all the wards in the main building” (Lumberg 2011, 394), Memesa moves on to “the lower building” and starts working in Ward 9. In an apparently symbolic way, the lower building hosts disabled children from the age of three to eight, suffering from microcephaly, hydrocephalus or Down’s syndrome. First, Memesa wonders, in a rather straightforward way, how creatures with such big heads can exist, but soon she gets used to the situation and becomes fond of the small patients, especially of one

boy with the Down’s syndrome, called Taavi. When dealing with him and the other children, Memesa instinctively understands that they are suffering more from a lack of attention and affection than from the symptoms of their diseases. Gradually, Taavi becomes “Memesa’s boy”, behaving much “better” than ever before. This surprises the other nurses, who had been working in the ward for decades. They cannot understand Taavi’s change, having obviously suppressed their ability to empathize during the course of their careers.

Memesa tries to explain: “Well”, I say. “These kids do understand. You should just talk to them a lot, and repeat the same thing, but they do get it eventually” (Lumberg 2011, 397).⁸ Memesa gets acquainted with the stories of the children on the ward, and learns that one of them was abused and maltreated by her babysitter. As in other parts of the trilogy, Lumberg deconstructs the myth of attributing violence to a certain ethnic group (cf. Gröndahl 2010, 125, pointing to Mohanty). Some of the children have been “forgotten”, as nobody comes to see them. The longer Memesa spends working on the ward, the more she comes to care for the child patients. When Taavi falls ill, she is deeply worried and tells a nurse that he should see a doctor. He has a heart condition, so a cold and fever could be dangerous for him. The nurse responds: “Yeah, we’ll see” [Joo, katsotaan] (Lumberg 2011, 398).

The next day Memesa hears that Taavi has been transferred to another hospital as he could not breathe properly. The nurses discussing the case seem unconcerned. Memesa is shattered and asks why nobody reacted to her repeated warnings. She is told that the matron did not consider Taavi’s condition serious: “I feel furious. You just don’t care. I think for myself. He does not count, since he is disabled anyway” (Lumberg 2011).⁹ When Memesa tells the nurses who are her friends about Taavi, they do not seem surprised, claiming that “all sorts of things happen here” (Lumberg 2011, 399). One of the nurses, who works in the ward for adult patients, tells Memesa about a patient who strangled a woman patient in the TV room, because her whining made him nervous. The nurses were not there, so nobody heard anything. Memesa is reluctant to believe the story, so the nurses tell her about something they have witnessed themselves. In order to “test” whether the “mentally retarded” patients understand anything about sex, they strip them naked, lock them in a room and observe them through a window in the door. Nothing happens, since the patients “do not understand such things” (Lumberg 2011, 400). Memesa is disgusted. The next day she is shocked and sad to learn that Taavi has died:

On that afternoon my eyes were opened and I began to understand that the institute for the handicapped is not there for the children and adults with Down's syndrome, but for the employees – especially those who have spent many years there and who try to educate new recruits so that they become the same as them. Is professionalism the same as inhumanity? The life of a person with Down's syndrome has no other value than that of providing employment and his or her death is insignificant. (Lumberg 2011, 401)¹⁰

Memesa goes to speak to the matron and accuses the hospital of Taavi's murder. The matron forbids her to speak about the event and emphasizes that these things are none of a trainee's business. Finally, Memesa is comforted by a friendly nurse, who insists that Taavi would have died anyway and that this was "the best way" things could go, as Taavi no longer has to suffer. Memesa calms down; although her mourning and indignation are not over, she has to accept that she is helpless vis-à-vis the institutional practice of the hospital (cf. Laurén & Wrede 2010, 172), where she is at the bottom of the hierarchy. Her position is determined by the specific intersections of class, gender, ethnicity/"race" and age/seniority (cf. e. g. Skeggs 2004).

Like the episode with Rantanen in the children's home, here too the person responsible concentrates on covering up what has happened and trying to avoid extra problems. The Taavi episode can be viewed through the prism of research in the field of postcolonial and disability studies, which has shown how historical formulations of concepts such as "feble-mindedness", together with the various kinds of otherness in terms of race, gender, sexuality, class and age, served ideologically to legitimize social hierarchies within the modern colonial/imperial state (and colonies), because they helped to separate the "civilized subject" from the "primitive, indigenous object" of subjugation (cf. Kolářová 2017, 132). The indifference and carelessness, which remind Lumberg's readers of the fictional Roma grandmother's characterization of "emotional invalidism", evoke the economies of abandonment described by Elizabeth Povinelli (2011) not as a systems failure, but as a kind of moral pragmatism and a biopolitics of late liberal society. Kateřina Kolářová (2017, 134–135) presents a survey of British research, which shows that the learning disabled die much earlier than other groups. The reasons for this are structural, as a result of the biopolitics and necropolitics¹¹ of the "handicap" resulting in greater exposure of certain citizens to risk of death, which can be traced back to the rationale of the "necessary" that is present even in expert discourses (ibid., 151) or, in case of Lumberg's novel, found in the discourse of hospital and/or care home staff.

Typologically similar is Memesa's experience in a women's closed psychiatric ward in another Helsinki hospital. There, one patient tells her: "Don't you live too long girl, because then you cannot decide anything about your life" (Lumberg 2011, 437).¹² The allegedly "women-friendly" aspect of the Nordic welfare state (cf. Mulinari et al. 2009, 11) is being ironized from the point of view of this elderly female patient in a psychiatric ward. Indeed, Memesa finds out that the patients in the ward are hungry, and that one nurse in particular does not give them enough food. Memesa fights successfully with the nurse and is eventually able to give the patients their food herself, securing the patients' right to food and right to be fed with dignity – one of the most basic human rights:

They are happy when they get more food to fill their stomachs. I think these people have no rights at all. Would anyone let her own mother wear such rags? I feel like a concentration camp guard not a human being who is nursing and helping them. (Lumberg 2011, 438)¹³

In the hospital, Memesa appears to be the only person capable of empathy and resisting the anonymous institutional machinery with its economy of abandonment. At its worst, it neglects both what has been called *body work* (i. e. a biomedicalized approach) and the *person-centred approach* (where disturbed behaviours are "viewed as more than just symptoms") (McLean 2009, 592). Similarly shattering is Memesa's encounter with another "handicapped" human being – a woman who is "old and absent-minded, but not sick" (Lumberg 2011, 439). Her children do not come to see her; the nurses have no time to help her go to the bathroom so they force her to use diapers, fastening her to the bed with bands. The old lady becomes depressed and refuses to eat or drink. Memesa tries to feed her but the old lady refuses. Memesa sees her "eyes broken with distress" and she tries to explain that she is not allowed to unfasten her bands. Memesa is told that she must force-feed the patient, but she categorically refuses to do so. The dilemma is quickly resolved as the old lady dies the same day and Memesa goes to the "remotest corner of the big balcony to cry" (Lumberg 2011, 439).

Conclusions

Lumberg is not the only Romani author to discuss the way the others of the welfare state are treated and perceived by the majority society. In 2007, another Finnish Romani writer, Armas K. Baltzar, published his novel *Sadeaika* (Rainy Season) (see also Gröndahl & Rantonen 2013, 74), a love story between two disabled

young people narrated from a disabled boy's point of view. However, the protagonists in the novel are not Roma, so the moment of multiple consciousness and the multiplicity of the critical gaze are not as foregrounded as they are in Lumberg's work.¹⁴

By employing some of the stereotypical ways to portray the Romani community, such as showing Roma men as violent, domineering and threatening, Lumberg enters into dialogue with the classic representations of Roma in Finnish literature. However, she casts the same critical gaze on Finnish majority society and its state institutions, which function in the same spirit as the colonial mentality – the "civilising mission 'at home'" (cf. Mulinari et al. 2009). This mission has served the above-mentioned ideological legitimization of social hierarchies in Western/Nordic society, reflecting the heritage of colonialism, modernity and the nation state, which, in case of the Nordic countries, stood on the sidelines but was still active in reproducing colonial perceptions of the word (cf. Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012, 5). This heritage is intertwined with forms of othering and oppression operated by means of other categories of difference (such as the "handicap") in the historically conditioned intersections of these categories (cf. Kolářová 2017; Quijano 2007). The use of carefully contextualized postcolonial theories and their adaptation to the framework of Nordic, ethnic and Roma studies, combined with elements from other studies of otherness such as disability studies, enriches the intersectional reading of Kiba Lumberg's literary work. The de/valuation of disabled lives can be easily juxtaposed with the de/valuation of racialized lives, given the way Memesa was treated as a child in state institutions.

In denouncing the hypocrisy of the majority population and of Finnish society, Lumberg's heroine, Memesa, is an heir to the most radical (half)Roma character in Finnish literature – the young woman Kerttu, known as Homsantuu – found in the play *Työmiehen vaimo* (The Worker's Wife, 1885) by Minna Canth (1844–1897), the major representative of Finnish realism and naturalism, and a campaigner for women's rights and for human rights in general. *Työmiehen vaimo* is considered the first theatre piece about the life of the urban proletariat in the Nordic countries. Homsantuu is a hybrid creature who crosses borders; a girl of half Romani origin brought up by a white family, an other in many respects and a figure who questions the hierarchy of cultures and raises doubts about the "natural" character of cultural differences (Parente-Čapková 2011, 15). Homsantuu's tragic story is juxtaposed with the tragic story of Johanna, the white wife of a poor worker. Johanna's husband is an alcoholic who wastes all of Johanna's money. Here, Canth is consciously

campaigning for the separation of a wife's property from that of her husband.

Memesa is hybrid in a different way. She is a Roma who spent her childhood in a Romani environment. Only since her teenage years has she lived in the world of the majority population. Moreover, while Homsantuu is in love with Johanna's husband, Risto, who betrays both women, Memesa, the first queer Roma figure in Finnish literature, refuses the obligatory heterosexuality. Both Homsantuu and Memesa are merciless critics of the evils of society, highlighting structural and inherent injustice. Homsantuu utters the most revolutionary lines in 19th century Finnish drama: "Your law and justice, ha, ha, ha, ha. ... Those I should have shot". Memesa is similarly outspoken, accusing the representatives of the Finnish welfare state of indifference, cruelty and cynicism, the above-mentioned moral pragmatism, and what can be called the biopolitics of late liberal society (cf. Kolářová 2017).

According to Paola Toninato (2014, 116), Romani literature as ethnic literature references the situation of sustained oppression and social discrimination to which minority groups are subjected. Some Romani authors unequivocally claim a moral obligation, a mission to speak for their own people (ibid., 117). As Satu Gröndahl (2010, 128) has observed, Kiba Lumberg's writing, like that of most other Finnish Romani writers, exhibits a less united cultural identity than that of other Nordic Romani writers. The Memesa trilogy gives the notion of hybridity a rich, nuanced meaning, demonstrating the diversity in all social, professional, ethnic, gender, age and other groups and identities. Combining a critical gaze on all societal groups with the urge to defend their human rights and promote issues of equality and social justice, Lumberg is one of those authors who, in Maria Lugones' words, enriches her agenda by discussing oppressions that are "multiple but neither separate nor separable in thought or in the world" (Lugones n.d.).

Endnotes

¹ Kadun toisella puolella, Kirkkopuiston lippakioskin liepeillä on mustalaisten viinanmyyntipaikka. Kierrän sen aina kaukaa. Kuljen sitylle sydän kurkussa puiston toista reunaa ja Kirkkopuiston mäkeä alas, etten törmäisi kaaleisiin. Sydäntä kylmää, kun ajattelen mitä voi tapahtua jos omaiseni näkevät minut.

All the translations of Kiba Lumberg's texts are mine.

² Alan ymmärtää, ettei mustalainen ole suomalainen, vaikka asuisi Suomessa, vaan "niitä toisia", joita ei pidetä ihmisinä. Jo pienistä vivahteista pystyn lukemaan valkolaisten suhtautumisen minuun. Ne, jotka näkevät minut ihmisenä, kohtaavat minut luontevasti, mutta heitä on harvassa.

- ³ Toninato (2014) quotes Werner Sollors' *Beyond Ethnicity* (1986: 243), and highlights the difficulty in the notion of ethnicity. Toninato has compared Romani literature to the literature of indigenous nations and with migrant literature.
- ⁴ Nousukas (literally "the one who rises") can be translated as social climber, parveny or upstart; however in the finish literature of the 1800s and early 1900s, the notion did not just have negative connotations. It evoked the process of "rising" by means of education, which was in those days strongly intertwined with the national project (see e. g. Melkas et al. 2009). Again, we return to the need for careful contextualisation.
- ⁵ The concept of hybrid and hybridity has been much theorized and much criticized in post-colonial studies, where it refers to the process of ethnic and cultural mixing that occurs in a colonial context and gives rise to a whole range of new cultural dynamics (see e. g. Toninato 2014, 127). Toninatti has analysed the viability of the concept for studies on Romani literature, and called for a historical, contextualized approach (Toninato 2014, esp. 127–129).
- ⁶ ... pelkäämme kaikki. Ranskis tappoi äitinsä. Miksei tappanut sitä paskalahkeista isäänsä? Hän peri isänsä julmuuden ja jatkaa sitä. Kun hän tappoi äitinsä, hän tappoi samalla itsensä.
- ⁷ Katopas nyt, täs sie näät, et ei mikkää talo tuo turvaa, eivätkä siel olevat ihmiskätkä. Sitä ko alkaa liikaa uskotella, että toisist ihmisist saa turvan, saakii korvillee. Kuule kyl se turva on loppuje lopuks ihmises itessää. Siun on vaa yritettävä luottaa ittees, ei kehekää muihi. Usko miut rakas laps, mie tuijän. Viime käjes ihmine seisoo yksin oman elämänsä kans. Älä etsi unelmii toisten kautta. Nää tän talon aikuiset kaajeet ovat tunneinvalideja sielul-taa. Kyl sie selviät noist kolhuista.
- ⁸ "Niin", sanon. 'Kyl nämä lapset ymmärtävät. Heille pitää vaan puhua paljon, ja toistaa samaa asiaa, mutta kyl se perille menee'".
- ⁹ Minua raivostuttaa. Mielessäni ajattelen, että ettehan te välitä. Eihän sillä ole merkitystä, koska hän on vammainen muutenkin.
- ¹⁰ Sinä iltapäivänä silmäni avautuvat tajuamaan sen, että hoitolaitos ei ole kehitysvammaisia lapsia ja aikuisia varten, vaan työntekijöitä varten. Etenkin niitä, jotka ovat olleet siellä iät ja ajat, ja jotka pyrkivät kouluttamaan harjoittelijoista samanlaisia kuin itse ovat. Onko osaaminen sama kuin epäihimillisuus? Kehitysvammaisen elämällä ei ole arvoa muutoin kuin työllistäjänä, eikä kuolemalla merkitystä.
- ¹¹ Biopolitics, together with the Foucauldian concept of biopower, highlights ways of regulating and controlling people's lives by means of social and political power. Necropolitics is a term coined by Achille Mbembe to denote the use of social and political power to control citizens' lives, including their exposure to death.
- ¹² Älä tyttö elä liian vanhaks, koska silloin et saa päättää elämästäsi.
- ¹³ Kaikki ovat iloisia, kun saavat lisää ruokaa, masut täyteen. Ajattelen, että eihän näillä ihmisillä ole mitään oikeuksia. Kuka pukisi oman vanhan äitinsä tuollaisiin ryysyihin? Tunnen itseni keskitysleirin vartijaksi, enkä heitä hoivaavaksi, auttavaksi ihmiseksi.
- ¹⁴ We could, of course, discuss Lumberg's (as well as Baltzar's) work also within the context of (Finnish) literature depicting the learning disabled either from theirs or from others' point of view.

References

- Ahlbeck, Jutta. 2015. "Ratkaisuna sterilisaatio: Kansakunnan paratiisit ja naisruumiin uhka" [Sterilization as the solution. The paradises of the nation and the threat of the female body]. In *Kipupisteissä. Sairaus, kulttuuri ja modernisoituva Suomi* [Sore points. disease, culture and modernizing Finland.], edited by Jutta Ahlbeck, Päivi Lappalainen, Kati Launis, Kirsi Tuohela and Jasmine Westerlund. Turku: Utukirjat.
- Ashton-Smith, Alan. 2010. "Colonized Culture: The Emergence of a Romani Postcolonialism". *Journal of Post-Colonial Cultures and Societies* vol. 1, no. 2, April 2010.
- Boyarin, Jonathan 1994. "The Other Within and the Other Without." In *The Other in Jewish Thought and History: Constructions of Jewish Culture and Identity*, edited by Laurence J. Silberstein and Robert L. Cohen. New York: New York University Press, 423–452.
- Felski, Rita. 2003. *Literature after Feminism*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Ganser, Alexandra. 1994. *Roads of Her Own. Gendered Space and Mobility in American Women's Road Narratives, 1970–2000*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.
- Gröndahl, Satu. 2010. "Erilaisuuden kokemuksesta moniarvoisuuteen: romanien ja matkajien kirjallisuus Pohjoismaissa" [From the experience of diversity to the plurality of values: literature of the roma and the travellers in the Nordic countries]. In *Vähemmistöt ja monikulttuurisuus kirjallisuudessa* [Minorities and multiculturalism in literature], edited by Eila Rantonen. Tampere: Tampereen yliopistopaino, 106–131.
- Gröndahl, Satu and Eila Rantonen. 2013. "Romanikirjallisuus perinteiden ja modernin jatkumolla" [Roma literature as a continuum of the traditions and of the modern]. In *Suomen nykykirjallisuus 2: Kirjallinen elämä ja yhteiskunta* [Contemporary Finnish literature 2: Literary life and society], edited by Mika Hallila et al. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 72–75.
- Jernsletten, Kristin. 2011. *The Hidden Children of Eve. Sámi Poetics Guovtti ilmmi gaskkas*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø.
- Jordan, Shirley. 2013. "Autofiction and the Feminine." *French Studies* vol. 67, no. 1, 1 January 2013, 76–84.
- Keskinen, Suvi, Salla Tuori, Sari Irni and Diana Mulinari. 2009. *Complying with Colonialism. Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*. Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate.
- Koivisto, Päivi. 2008. "Taiteilija, kapinallinen" [Artist, rebel]. *Kiiltomato* 24 Nov. 2008. <http://www.kiiltomato.net/kiba-lumberg-samettiyo/>
- Kolářová, Kateřina. 2017. "'Mentální retardace' a afektivní politika zřeknutí se ["Mental retardation" and Affective politics of abandonment]. *Gender a výzkum / Gender and Research* 18, no. 2: 128–154. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13060/25706578.2017.18.2.374>
- Kremer, Jürgen, Werner Kremer and R. Jackson-Paton. 2014. *Ethnoautobiography: Stories and Practices for Unlearning Whiteness. Decolonization. Uncovering Ethnicities*. Sebastopol, California: ReVision Publishing.
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2000. "Towards an 'Indigenous Paradigm' from a Sámi Perspective". *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* vol. 2, 411–436.
- Lappalainen, Päivi. 2012. "'Haluan löytää oman tähteni'" ["I want to find my own star"]. In *Kertomuksen luonto* [The nature of narrative], edited by Kaisa Kurikka, Olli Löytty, Kukku Melkas and Viola Parente-Capková, 177–186. Nykykulttuurin tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 107. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Laurén, Jeannette and Sirpa Wrede. 2010. "Työkäytännöt ja institutionaalinen rasismi: hoitajan työ" [Work practice and institutional racism: nursing work"]. In *Vieraita työssä. Työelämän etnistyvää eriarvoisuus* [Strangers at work: The ethnification of inequality in working life], edited by Sirpa Wrede and Camilla Nordberg. Helsinki: Palmenia, Helsinki University Press, 172–192.
- Loftsdóttir, Kristin and Lars Jensen. 2012. "Introduction: Nordic exceptionalism and the Nordic 'others'". In *Whiteness and Postcolonialism in the Nordic Region: Exceptionalism, Migrant Others and National Identities*, edited by K. Loftsdóttir and L. Jensen. Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate, 1–9.
- Lugones, Maria (no date). "Indigenous Movements and Decolonial Feminism". <https://wgss.osu.edu/sites/wgss.osu.edu/files/LugonesSeminarReadings.pdf>
- Lumberg, Kiba. 2011. *Memesa-trilogia* [Memesa Trilogy]. Turku: Sannakkoo.
- McLean, Athena. 2009. "Beyond the institution: dementia care and the promise of the green house project". In *The Cultural Context of Aging. Worldwide Perspectives*, edited by Jay Sokolovsky. Westport-Connecticut-London: Praeger, 589–605.
- Melkas, Kukku, Heidi Grönstrand, Kati Launis, Maarit Leskelä-Kärki, Jussi Ojajarvi, Tutta Palin and Lea Rojola. 2009. *Läpikulkuihmisiä: Muotoiluja kansallisuudesta ja sivistyksestä 1900-luvun alun Suomessa* [Passers-By: Formulations of Nationality and Refinement in Finland at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Mulinari, Diana, Suvi Keskinen, Sari Irni and Sara Tuori. 2009. "Introduction: postcolonialism and the Nordic models of welfare and gender". In *Complying with Colonialism: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*, edited by Suvi Keskinen, Sara Tuori, Sari Irni and Diana Mulinari. Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 1–16.
- Nord, Deborah Epstein. 2006. *Gypsies and the British Imagination, 1807–1930*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nordberg, Camilla. 2010. "Tutut vieraat: Suomen romanit, työelämän marginaalissa?" [Well-known Strangers: Finland's Roma, in the Margins of the Work-Life?]. In *Vieraita työssä: Työelämän etnistyvää eriarvoisuus* [Strangers at work. The ethnification of inequality in working life], edited by Sirpa Wrede and Camilla Nordberg. Helsinki: Palmenia: Helsinki University Press, 254–273.
- Parente-Capková, Viola. 2011. "A domestic other. The role of Roma literary characters in the process of constructing Finnishness". *Multiethnica* 33 (December), 8–21.

- Parente-Capková, Viola. 2015. "Má duše se nevejde do cikánské sukně." Kiba Lumberg v kontextu finské romské literatury a literatury o Romech" ["My soul does not fit into Roma dress": Kiba Lumberg in the context of Finnish Roma literature and the literature on the Roma"]. *Romano džaniben. Časopis romistických studií*, vol. 22, no. 2, 115–120.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth. 2011. *Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Pulma, Panu. 2006. *Suljetut ovet: Pohjoismaiden romanipolitiikka 1500-luvulta EU-aikaan* [Closed doors: Nordic Romani policy from the 16th century to the EU era]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Quijano, Anibal. 2007. "Coloniality and modernity/rationality". *Cultural Studies* vol. 21, no. 2, 168–178.
- Ryvolová, Karolina. 2017. "Literatura Romů může lidi sblížovat". [Literature of the Roma can bring people together]. Blog "Hatefree" by Lukáš Houdek 21 April 2017. <https://www.hate-free.cz/blo/rozhovory/2117-karolina-ryvolova>
- Scheinostová, Alena. 2011. "Je romská literatura dost dobrá?" [Is Romani literature good enough?] (originally in Romea.cz). *iliteratura* 29 December 2011. <http://www.iliteratura.cz/Clanek/29113/je-romska-literatura-dost-dobra-in-romeacz>
- Skeggs, Beverly. 2004. *Class, Self, Culture*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sollors, Werner. 1986. *Beyond Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Toninato, Paola. 2014. *Romani Writing. Literacy, Literature and Identity Politics*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Valkeapää, Nils Aslak. 1971. *Terveisiä Lapista. Pamfletti* [Greetings from Lapland. A Pamphlet]. Helsinki: Otava.
- Vuorela, Ulla. 2009. "Colonial complicity: The 'postcolonial' in a Nordic context". In *Complying with Colonialism: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*, edited by Suvi Keskinen, Sara Tuori, Sari Irni and Diana Mulinari. Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 19–33.
- Wehrs, Donald J. 1998. "Morality in the narratives of Chinua Achebe". In *Critical Perspectives on Postcolonial African Children's and Young Adult Literature*, edited by Meena Khorana. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Essä

Kampen om 'människan'. Några nedslag i skildringen av romer i svensk litteratur efter 1880

ANN-SOFIE LÖNNGREN

Närvaron av romer finns dokumenterad på svensk mark åtminstone sedan mitten av 1500-talet, men redan då förefaller uppfattningen om denna folkgrupp ha varit åtminstone tudelad. Å ena sidan finns det tecken på att den betraktades som bestående av parasiterande utbölningar, och romer åtnjöt därmed tidvis mycket ringa eller till och med inget skydd alls av svensk lagstiftning. Å andra sidan verkar de ha setts som ett exotiskt inslag i den svenska demografin, som skickliga hantverkare och underhållare, fattiga och hemlösa men glittrande och dansande, kanske också med magiska förmågor (Cederberg 2010, 37–9). Denna tudelning syns fortfarande i Viktor Rydbergs välkända roman *Singoalla* från 1865. Huvudpersonen Singoalla är här ett trolskt och underskönt naturbarn, medan hennes familj ändå tecknas i enlighet med föreställningar om romer som opålitliga och tjuvaktiga.

Hur såg då bilden av romer ut efter det som ofta räknas som det svenska moderna genombrottet på 1880-talet? I takt med industrialiseringens utveckling blev en del av de hantverkstjänster romerna traditionellt kunde erbjuda obsoleta, och den romantiska och magiska aura som omgett denna folkgrupp minskade alltmer till fördel för ökad stigmatisering (Cederberg 2010, 41–2). Vad detta skulle komma att innebära belyses i det följande med några nedslag i svensk litteratur från 1800-talets slut till 2000-talets början. Jag gör alltså inte en fullständig förteckning över litterära representationer av romer inom denna avgränsning (och gör heller inga anspråk på att presentera en heltäckande översikt över den tidigare forskningen på området), utan diskuterar några verk och skönlitterära författare som konstnärligt gestaltar och problematiserar betydelsebärande diskurser i relation till denna minoritet.

I August Strindbergs ökända roman *Tschandala* (1887) framställs romer utifrån de föreställningar om svagare och starkare folkgrupper som socialdarwinis-

tiska tolkningar av Charles Darwin erbjöd (se Cederberg 2010, 35). Här skildras en maktkamp mellan två män: magister Törner, som är en 'äktsvensk' kraftkarl och intellektuell, och Jensen, som är föreståndare på en gård som ägs av en baronessa. Över en sommar tar Törner hyra med sin familj i en del av boningshuset, men börjar snart ana att något inte står rätt till. I hans beskrivningar skildras den svarthåriga och mörkögda men ljushyade Jensen som en udda fågel med pråliga fjädrar på den svenska landsbygden, och som en sällsynt misslyckad imitator av den svenske jordbrukaren. Djuren vanvårdas och gården missköts, och anledningen till detta tycker sig Törner finna då han enligt egen mening lyckas bevisa att Jensen inte är någon 'vanlig människa', utan rom. Därmed framställs han som inte bara oförmögen att sköta ett jordbruk, utan även som fundamentalt oförmögen att lära sig. I slutet av romanen visar Törner vad Jensen 'egentligen' är, då han genom hypnos förmår denne att gå ned på alla fyra och skälla som en hund, varefter han blir ihjälbiten av sina egna utsvultna hundar (för mer utförliga diskussioner av representationen av romer i *Tschandala* se exempelvis Etzler 1962; Olsson 1996; Laskar 2015; Lönngren 2015a).

Tschandala är en djupt diskriminerande och hatisk roman som egentligen inte borde uppmärksammas vidare, men jag vill ändå peka på att den förberäddar en del av de tendenser som ska återkomma i skildringen av romer i svensk litteratur under 1900-talet. I Selma Lagerlöfs novell "En historia från Halland" (1910) berättas det om en mor och en son som efter husbondens frånfälle hankar sig fram på en svårskött lantbruksegendom. Till hjälp hyr de in den glade Jan, rödhårig, blekhyad och mörkögda, som med sitt fiolspel muntrar upp det hårda livet på gården. Men efter att modern gått med på att gifta sig med Jan – trots att han öppet berättat för henne att han är rom – går tillvaron utför för dem alla. Jans talrika kringvandrande familj

gästar gården i veckor, och Jan själv blir alltmer benägen att dricka samt att spela kort och fiol snarare än att arbeta. När gården inte längre är lönsam ser sig familjen ingen annan utväg än att följa med Jans familj på deras kringflackande liv; ett beslut som slutar med att sonen tillbringar en tid i fängelse. Då han efter avtjänat straff återvänder till gården hittar han överraskande mäger; ett slags kalk med god förmåga att göda ofruktbara jordar. Förundrat inser han att Jan hittat denna redan långt tidigare, men underlåtit att berätta om fyndet för någon. Därav drar han slutsatsen att Jan är "av en annan art, och han måste leva så, som hans art bjöd honom. Om det lände till lycka eller olycka för honom själv och för andra, så måste han dock vara sådan, som naturen hade danat honom." (Lagerlöf 1915, 66)

Trots att tonen i Lagerlöfs berättelse är betydligt mer försonlig än i Strindbergs så aktiverar de båda liknande diskurser i förståelsen av romer. Liksom Jensen i *Tschandala* är Jan i "En historia från Halland" inte enbart okunnig i hur man sköter en gård, utan oförmögen att lära sig, och han är dessutom ovillig att leva ett stabilt liv på ett enda ställe. Fokaliserade genom representanter för den svenska majoritetsbefolkningen framstår romerna i båda dessa berättelser därmed som någonting annat än 'riktig' människa: som en annan art, ett annat slags människa, eller som en människa befinnande sig i ett tidigare utvecklingsstadium (se Lönngren 2015a, kap 1). I detta syns tydligt det socialdarwinistiska tänkandets genomslag runt sekelskiftet 1900, samt även hur detta togs i anspråk för det nationalistiska svenska projektet; en förståelse som beläggs av omständigheten att Lagerlöfs berättelse ursprungligen publicerades i Svenska turistföreningens årsskrift 1910 (se Erlandson-Hammargren 2006, 334–50). Vidare aktiveras i dessa litterära texter akut pockande politiska frågeställningar runt sekelskiftet 1900. Enligt den upplysningsfilosofi som skapade diskursiva och ideologiska förutsättningarna för det moderna samhället är varje människa unik; någonting som i det sena 1800-talets utveckling av demokratiska och sociala rörelser innebar privilegiet att åtnjuta vissa rättigheter. Även den långdragna process det innebar för västerländska nationer att avveckla de forna kolonierna väckte frågor om hur vissa grupper skulle tillförsäkras fortsatt tolkningsföreträde och inflytande – om nu alltså alla människor har lika värde, och därmed i förlängningen ska ha samma rättigheter. Därmed avgränsades det 'mänskliga' till vissa utdefinierade kroppsdrag, förmågor, trossystem, kommunikationssätt och kulturella vanor snarare än en specifik arttillhörighet. Sådana definitioner torde ha fått stor betydelse för det moderna svenska majoritets-samhällets syn på etniska minoriteter.

Frågan om rättigheter återkom starkt under 1930-talet,

då rasbiologiska tankegångar gjorde sig gällande i synen på romer och andra minoriteter. 1935 infördes lagen om frivillig sterilisering av 'tattare' och andra grupper som sågs som undermåliga element i den svenska folkstammen; en lagstiftning som skulle komma att äga giltighet till 1975 och drabba romer hårt. Frivilligheten i ingreppet har starkt ifrågasatts av eftervärlden, då personen ofta gavs valet att frisläppas från fängelse eller vårdanstalt om hen samtyckte till sterilisering – eller stanna kvar innanför murarna om hen vägrade. Man beräknar att det mellan 1937 och 1975 steriliserades ca 63000 personer varav 18600 av uttalat rashygieniska skäl; ett stort antal i den senare gruppen var romer. Under hela detta decennium var romer dessutom i lag förbjudna att resa in i Sverige, någonting som gällde mellan 1914 och 1954 och innebar en isolering av denna folkgrupp inom landets gräns (Cederberg 2010, 35–40; Broberg & Tydén 2005).

I den svenska litteraturen från 1930-talet fortsätter den tidigare tudelade bilden av romer att traderas, den som å ena sidan förknippar denna grupp med konstnärlighet, dans och underhållning – hos exempelvis Sigge Stark – å andra sidan med tjuvaktighet, dryckenskap och ansvarslöshet – som syns i Agnes von Krustenstjernas författarskap. Ny är emellertid den inrangering i en nazistisk ideologi som sker med skildringar av denna etniska minoritet hos exempelvis barnboksförfattaren Nanna Lundh-Eriksson (se Jonsson 2012, 294–7). Den svenske författare som gav sig in i den politiska debatten om romernas situation i denna period av snabb utveckling av det svenska folkhemmet, Ivar Lo-Johansson, betonade dock starkt de tidigare nämnda exotiska aspekterna i förståelsen av denna grupp (1929). Det romska folkets särart och frihetsbehov måste bevakas, menade han, inte ska dessa naturbarn placeras i skola och lägenheter, nej, låt dem fortsätta leva sina traditionella liv och utgöra en glimrande motpol till det alltmer välordnade svenska samhället.

De påvra levnadsförhållanden och fortsatta utanförskap en sådan politik understödde förefaller inte ha blivit föremål för någon livligare offentlig debatt förän på 1950-talet, och först på 1960-talet får svensk litteraturhistoria en röst inifrån gruppen ifråga. 1963 publicerade Katarina Taikon den informativa boken *Zigenerska*, 1967 fotoboken *Zigenare är vi* med Björn Langhammer, och 1970 ungdomsboken *Zigenare* samt *Förlåt om vi stör! Om zigenerska flyktingar* tillsammans med Thomas Hammarberg. Taikon gjorde dock även stora skönlitterära insatser, dels med en utgivning av "zigenardikter" 1964 och egna dikter 1968, dels med de självbiografiska anstrukna böckerna om Katitzi som började komma ut 1969 och har tryckts i otaliga utgåvor sedan dess. Med det inifrånperspektiv varifrån Taikon skrev utkristaliserades hennes retorik snart som

en stark motpol till Lo-Johanssons (1949, 1955, 1963) fortsatta exotisering och utifrånperspektiv. Romer behövde utbildning, bostäder och arbete, var Taikons hållning, och redan existerande lagstiftning och rättigheter omsattes nu alltmer i praktik även i relation till denna grupp (Cederberg 2010, 42–4; Mohtadi 2012).

Det faktum att stigmatisering och diskriminering bestod långt efter 1960-talet är dock uppenbart i såväl den gängse historieskrivningen som i skönlitteraturen. I svensk litteratur syns denna omständighet i det faktum att den svarthåriga personen med mörka ögon och blek hy av okänt ursprung och flyktig karaktär fortsätter att användas som en trop för utanförskap och problematisering av 'det mänskliga'. Ett gott exempel på detta finner vi i Birgitta Trotzigs roman *Dykungens dotter* (1985), där huvudpersonen – en ung flicka – framstår som redan från början dömd till ett oroligt och kringflackande liv i utkanten av den mänskliga gemenskapen. Trots att hon vuxit upp tillsammans med sin hårt arbetande svenska mor så slår arvet från fadern igenom; fadern, som är en svarthårig vandrare vars plötsliga uppdykanden och försvinnanden är ett störningselement i den välordnade vardagliga tillvaron. Som romanens titel antyder så förknippas han med natur och smuts snarare än med civilisation och det rena, välordnade; konnotationer som i hög grad går igen även hos dottern. Förutom att hon av grannbarnen kallas för "tattarfia" så gestaltas hon romanen igenom som befinnande sig på gränsen till det icke-mänskliga, som ett träskdjur såsom en groda eller en padda (Trotzig 1985, 59, 79); en avhumanisering som framstår som delar eller rentav en konsekvens av hennes romska arv (Lönngren 2015a, kap 2).

Trots att denna representation i det korta återgivande jag gör här kan låta diskriminerande och förtryckande så är berättelsens tendens och 'ton' genomgående på flickans sida, och vi får därmed en nyanserad bild av den växelverkan som sker mellan socialt och etniskt utanförskap, och exkluderingen ur kategorin 'mänskliga'. Ett liknande empatiskt omfamnande av den ensamma och utstötta karakteriserar Per Olov Enqvists roman *Kapten Nemos bibliotek* (1991). Här möter läsaren den svarthåriga och mörkögda Alhild, hon som har en vacker sångröst men som ingen riktigt vet vad hon kommer ifrån och som det ryktas är av 'tattarsläkt'. Efter två strokes tappar hon en stor del av sina kognitiva förmågor såsom tal och social interaktion, varför hennes sexåriga son helt sonika bestämmer sig för att betrakta henne som en häst istället för en människa. Därefter vidtar rörande beskrivningar av hur den lille pojken, under en sista sommar tillsammans med fadern på familjens enligt belägna sommarställe, tar hand som sin sjuka mamma som just en häst. Han leder henne med en rem ned till en närliggande å så att hon

får dricka, tjudrar henne på gräsmattan så att hon kan vistas utomhus i det fina vädret, och borstar noggrant varje morgon hennes långa svarta 'man'. Den säregna idyll som därmed tecknas upphör dock när myndigheterna upptäcker vad som pågår, och för Alhild till en vårdinrättning där hon så småningom dör (se Lönngren 2015a, kap. 2).

Enqvist är den författare av dem jag anför här som enligt min mening går längst i utforskandet av kopplingen mellan kategorierna 'människa', 'djur', kognitiva förmågor, och socialt och etniskt utanförskap. Liksom i Trotzigs roman blir den svarthåriga, blekhyade utböllingen en trop representerande den människa som ändå inte fullt ut kvalificerar som 'människa' i bemärkelsen medborgare, unik, berättigad. Det är en tendens som fortsätter in på 2000-talet, och i John Ajvide Lindqvists långnovell "Gräns" från 2006 möter oss i analogins form. Huvudpersonen Tina, som lever som människa i en nutida, mänsklig värld, upptäcker genom olika omständigheter att hon egentligen är ett troll som tagits från sina föräldrar som liten. Föräldrarna ansågs inte kunna ta hand om henne eftersom de bodde i ett smutsigt ruckel i skogen där de eldade rätt på marken och lät Tina – eller Reva som hon egentligen heter – krypa naken utomhus sent i oktober. Så Reva omhändertogs, fick svansen bortopererad och placerades i en människofamilj, medan hennes föräldrar sattes på mentalsjukhus där de så småningom avled. I Revas inre monolog situeras skeendet inom en kontext av förtryck utövat i namn av normalisering och framsteg: "Människorna som inte trodde på troll. Och hittade de några läste de in dem på mentalanstalt, opererade bort deras svansar, steriliserade dem och tvingade dem att lära sig människornas språk." (s. 69)

Med detta citat är det möjligt att göra en analogi mellan trollens situation i "Gräns", och romernas i relation till de aspekter av den svenska 1900-talshistorien som jag berörde här ovan, steriliseringar, internaliseringar och isolering i syfte att skapa ett välordnat och homogent modernt samhälle. En annan beröringspunkt är omständigheten att romska barn ofta tvångsomhändertogs av samhället under framför allt 1900-talets första decennier (Catomeris 2004, 231–35), på motsvarande sätt och med liknande bevekelsegrunder som Reva omhändertagits i "Gräns". Dessutom aktualiserar jämförelsen återigen Lagerlöfs novell "En historia från Halland", där det som sägs vara romens natur är just trollets:

Kom ihåg detta, att du aldrig ska lita på en tattare, för de är inte av vår stam, och de vill alltid svika oss. De är mer släkt med troll och strömkarlar än med oss. ... De är lika trollena också i det, att de gärna smyger sig ner till bygden och smilar och stäl-

ler sig in, så att de får tjänst hos oss bönder och blir gifta med våra döttrar och kommer åt våra gårdar. Men olycklig den, som får en sådan i huset, för alltid tar trollet hos dem ut sin rätt. (Lagerlöf 2015, 49)

När likheten mellan troll och romer återkommer i svensk litteratur skriven både 1910 och 2006 – med nästan ett sekel mellanrum – är det uppenbart att den är en central aspekt av de andrefierings-processer som underbygger det svenska moderna projektet. Fokuseringen av smuts, mörkt hår, tjuvaktighet och opålitlighet i skildringen av såväl troll som romer skapar metonymiska relationer mellan dessa båda grupper; allt noggrant kontrasterat mot 'äktsvenska' medelklassnormer (se Frykman & Löfgren 1987, 6, 163; Ebbe Schön 1999, 18–9; Lönngren 2015b).

Ytterligare ett verk skrivet på 2000-talet som använder motivet 'romen' på liknande vis som flera av de texter som redovisats här ovan, nämligen i relation till frågor som rör ontologi, rättigheter och rättvisa, är Amanda Hellbergs skräckroman *Stygelsen* (2008). Huvudpersonen är Singa, en liten svarthårig men ljusögd och blekhyad flicka och hennes på finska brytande, alkoholiserade far. De bor i en hemsnickrad husvagn och reser runt på olika marknader och tivolin. Flickan har en speciell egenskap i det att hon kan kanalisera de dödas själar, och hennes uppgift är därmed att anordna ett slags seanser för de besökare av tivolit som är villiga att betala för detta. Redan i romanens början blir hon dock kidnappad av ett illasinnat syskonpar, som bjuder henne hem till sig för en seans men istället håller henne inspärrad under årtal i en bur i en mörk källarhåla. Här blir det uppenbart att det är flickans utsatta position som gör att hon anses vara ett lämpligt offer för kidnappning. Det kidnappande syskonparet är av fin familj, och systemen, Eva, ger helt enkelt flickans far fyrahundra kronor och berättar att hon har dött av en exploderande gaslampa; därmed får den sorgsne mannen låta sig nöja, eftersom han varken har möjlighet eller kunskap nog att göra vidare eftersökningar. Flickans sociala utsatthet leder sedan vidare till att hon under flera års tid blir föremål för grovt våld och övergrepp, där hon rent kroppsligt tvingas att inta en roll som inom ramen för det moderna projektet snarare tillhör ett djur än en människa: fastkedjad, instängd, svulten, slagen. Detta intryck förstärks då hon dessutom vid ett tillfälle – sina övermänskliga förmågor har hon ju kvar – kanaliserar en död hund:

'Woehff! WOEHFF!' Tattarungen skällde. Hon låg faktiskt där och skällde på Eva. Hörntänderna var blottade och glänste i skumrasket. Eva snärtade till rakt över nosen. (Hellberg 2008, 57)

Mer än hundra år efter *Tschandala* är romer således fortfarande hundar i svensk litteratur (se Lönngren 2015, kap. 2). Hur kan vi förstå beständigheten i det paradigm som kopplar samman folkgruppen romer med det icke-mänskliga och animaliska? De yttre omständigheterna är ju väsensskilda vid tiden för publicering av respektive roman: När *Tschandala* publicerades 1887 var romer en svårt diskriminerad folkgrupp utan särskilt stöd eller specifika rättigheter, men när *Stygelsen* skrevs 2008 var romer sedan nio år tillbaka en erkänd svensk minoritet med egen flagga och lagstadgad rätt att tala sitt språk och bevara sin kulturella särart (Cederberg 2010, 47–8). Är svenska författare rasistiska, och är litteratur ett så trögt medium att förtryckande diskurser helt enkelt fortsätter att reproduceras genom seklerna? Nej, så enkla svar har nog inte den frågan. Mitt förslag är att det är litteraturens karaktär av kulturellt minne som möjliggör – för att inte säga påkallar – dessa traderingar. Berättelserna i en påtaglig andel av de litterära texter jag har diskuterat i denna essä är situerade längre tillbaka i tiden än de tillkom; exempelvis sägs *Tschandala* utspelas på 1600-talet, *Kapten Nemos bibliotek* och *Stygelsen* på 1940-talet, *Dykungens dotter* på 1920-talet. Denna omständighet belägger slutsatsen att användningen av motivet som bygger på den romske 'Andre' kan ses som en bearbetning av ett kulturellt trauma, av det våld och den andrefieringsprocess som varit oundgängliga delar i det nationalistiska moderna projektet och den därmed sammanhängande utkristalliseringen av 'svenskhet'.

Emellertid kanske vi nu börjar ana begynnelsen av ett annat sätt att bearbeta den västerländska modernitetens våldsamerhet, i och med uppkomsten av representationer som inte använder sig av stereotypa igenkänningseffekter. I Majgull Axelssons roman *Jag heter inte Miriam* (2014) uppmärksammas romernas särskilda situation under och efter andra världskriget. Malika är en ung romsk flicka som förs till koncentrationsläger, och det enda sättet hon ser att ta sig därifrån och få hjälp är att anta en judisk identitet. Hon blir Miriam, kommer till Sverige, gifter sig och får barn. Inte förrän i hög ålder är hon redo att konfrontera sitt förflutna och berätta sin verkliga historia för familj och vänner. Axelssons roman är unik dels genom graden av komplexitet, vilken framkommer genom att olika grupper villkor ställs mot varandra, och dels genom att stereotypa representationer av romer inte överhuvudtaget är en del av romanens inomlitterära verklighet, utan enbart synliga som motiverande för det våld som riktas mot denna grupp. Därmed definieras i slutet av den litterära odysse jag här har tecknat motivationen för de schematiska och förtryckande föreställningarna av romer efter 1880 som de politiska strävandena efter

nationell enhetlighet som ägt rum under 1900-talets gång.

Som en välbehövlig motpol: Vad kan passa bättre än att avsluta denna essä med en dikt av Katarina Taikon? I dikten "Längtan" i *Dikter* (1968) gestaltar denna egen-sinniga frihetskämpe på några få rader familjebandens smärta och skönhet samt längtan efter en tillhörighet, ett hem, en historia och en identitet som är större än den sköra konstruktionen av nationell enhetlighet:

Gröna blad av gräs
Jag lämnade min mor vid elden
Min far med stor längtan
Och min bror med svart sorg
Jag vandrade över bergen
In i Moldova

Referenser

- Ajvide Lindqvist, John. 2006. "Gräns." I *Pappersväggar*, 9–72. Stockholm: Ordfront.
- Axelsson, Majgull. 2014. *Jag heter inte Miriam*. Stockholm: Brombergs.
- Broberg, Gunnar, och Mattias Tydén. 2005. *Oönskade i folkhemmet. Rashygien och sterilisering i Sverige*. Stockholm: Dialogos förlag.
- Catomeris, Christian. *Det ohyggliga arvet. Sverige och främlingen genom tiderna*. Stockholm: Ordfront förlag.
- Cederberg, Irka. 2010. *Född fördömd. Romerna – ett europeiskt dilemma*. Stockholm: Leopard.
- Enqvist, Per Olov. 1991. *Kapten Nemos bibliotek*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Erlandson-Hammargren, Erik. 2006. *Från alpromantik till hembygdsromantik. Natursynen i Sverige från 1885 till 1915, speglad i Svenska Turistföreningens årsskrifter och Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige*. Hedemora: Gidlunds förlag.
- Etzler, Allan. 1962. "Zigenarmotivet i Strindbergs *Tschandala*." *Svensk Litteraturtidskrift* 25: 128–35.
- Frykman, Jonas, och Orvar Löfgren. 1987. *Culture Builders. A Historical Anthropology of Middle-Class Life*. Översatt av Alan Crozier. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Hellberg, Amanda. 2008. *Stygelsen. Skräckroman*. Umeå: h-ström – text och kultur.
- Jonsson, Bibi. 2012. *Bruna pennor. Nazistiska motiv i svenska kvinnors litteratur*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Lagerlöf, Selma. 1915 (1910). "En historia från Halland" i *Troll och människor*, 37–66. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers bokförlag.
- Laskar, Pia. 2015. "The Construction of 'Swedish Gender' through the G-Other as a Counter-Image and Threat." I *Antiziganism: What's in a word*, red. Jan Selling, Markus End, Hristo Kyuchukov och Pia Laskar, 138–159. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lo-Johansson, Ivar. 1929. *Zigenare. En sommar på det hemlösa folkets vandringsstigar*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Lo-Johansson, Ivar. 1949. *Vagabondliv*. Stockholm: Bonniers.
- Lo-Johansson, Ivar. 1955. *Zigenare. En sommar på det hemlösa folkets vandringsstigar med ett tillägg: 25 år efteråt*. Stockholm: Folket i bild.
- Lo-Johansson, Ivar. 1963. *Zigenare. En sommar på det hemlösa folkets vandringsstigar med ett tillägg: 25 år efteråt/med en efterskrift*. Stockholm: Prisma.
- Lönnngren, Ann-Sofie. 2015a. *Following the Animal. Power, Agency, and Human-Animal Transformations in Modern, Northern European Literature*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lönnngren, Ann-Sofie. 2015b. "Trolls!! – Folklore, Literature and 'Othering' in the Nordic Countries." In *Rethinking National Literatures and the Literary Canon in Scandinavia*, red. Ann-Sofie Lönnngren, Dag Heede, Anne Heith och Heidi Grönstrand, 205–230. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mohtadi, Lawen. 2012. *Den dag jag blir fri: en bok om Katarina Taikon*. Stockholm: Natur & kultur.
- Olsson, Ulf. 1996. *Levande död. Studier i Strindbergs prosa*. Stockholm/Stehag: Symposium.
- Rydberg, Viktor. 1865. *Singoalla*. Stockholm: Lamm.
- Schön, Ebbe. 1999. *Troll och människa. Gammal svensk folketro*. Stockholm: natur och kultur.
- Strindberg, August. 1897 (1887). *Tschandala. Berättelse från 1600-talet*. Stockholm: Beijer.
- Taikon, Katarina. 1963. *Zigenerska*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Taikon, Katarina (red.). 1964. *Zigenardikter: ett urval zigenardikter fra n olika la nder och miljo er*. Stockholm: FIB:s lyrikklubb.
- Taikon, Katarina, och Björn Langhammer. 1967. *Zigenare är vi*. Stockholm: Tiden.
- Taikon, Katarina. 1968. *Dikter*. Stockholm: Författarcentrum.
- Taikon, Katarina. 1969. *Katitzi*. Stockholm: Br Lagerström.
- Taikon, Katarina. 1970. *Zigenare*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Taikon, Katarina, och Thomas Hammarberg. 1970. *Förlåt om vi stör! Om zigenerska flyktingar*. Stockholm, PAN/Norstedt.
- Trotzig, Birgitta. 1985. *Dykungens dotter. En barnberättelse*. Stockholm: Bonniers.

Essay

The dilemma of writing minorities into national historiographies: reflections on the *History of the Finnish Roma*

MIIKA TERVONEN

In this brief text, I reflect on the dilemma of writing Roma minority 'into' national historiography, from the position of a Finnish 'gadje' (non-Roma) academic historian who has been engaged in a project attempting to do roughly just that. The text is based primarily on my experiences in working in the project *History of the Finnish Roma* (2010-2012), the main result of which has been published also in Swedish in the book *De finnska romernas historia från svenska tiden till 2000-talet* (2015).

My main argument is that the institutional and personal tensions facing non-Roma researchers on this field are ultimately unresolvable. This is because they derive from a legacy of racism that continues to skew social relations both outside and within the academia. On a field in which those whose cultures and histories are being studied continue to be exposed to daily discrimination, while those doing the studying continue to be mostly from the majority population, the dilemmas of positionality and unintentional exclusion (Kwiek 2009) will not disappear.

Yet from the point of view of politics of history, simply avoiding historical research dealing with the Roma – or other racialized minorities for that matter – is also deeply problematic. Such avoidance is in fact evident in the Finnish nation-state bound canon of historiography from 19th century onwards, with foundational writers such as Arwidsson, Yrjö-Koskinen or Schybergson bypassing their considerable knowledge on the history of the Roma in Finland when writing national historiographies (Tervonen 2014). Such systematic omission – evident also with other minorities – has been instrumental in creating a 'white-washed' understanding of the Finnish society and its past, ren-

dering mobility and diversity as something exceptional, and by extension as problematic.

The challenge in doing historical research related to the Roma minority is then to confront tensions, not to avoid them. From this perspective, the project *History of the Finnish Roma* can be seen as a series of compromises and mixed outcomes, serving useful and also humbling lessons for those involved.

The project started as an initiative of the Finnish National advisory board of Romani affairs in 2007.



Presentation of the book *History of the Finnish Roma* at the House of the Nobility in Helsinki, 24 October 2012. The volume was the result of a research project carried out by the Advisory Board of Roma Affairs and The Finnish Literature Society. Counsellor of Social Welfare Väinö Lindberg speaking. Foto: Gary Wornell, The Finnish Literature Society 2012.

After several years of groundwork and advocacy by a working group named by the board, the initiative found political backing and was in 2009 granted funding by the Ministry of Education. The Finnish Literature Society was tasked with coordinating the actual research, with docent Panu Pulma appointed as the leader of the project. The aim was to produce comprehensive account of the history of the Roma community

and culture in Finland, from 16th century onwards.

From the outset, the project was based on cooperation between Roma community and academic researchers. This was reflected in its organization: the work was supervised by a historical board, half of the members of which were named by the Advisory board of Roma affairs, half by the Finnish Literature Society.

I was hired to the project as a (at the time) PhD candidate working on a related theme in 2010, after three years of research political and ethnopolitical negotiations had already laid the basic scope and framework of the project. Immediately in beginning the work, and meeting interviewees, other researchers, members of the historical board, etc., several tensions became apparent.

One of these revolved around what *kind* of history was actually being written. Was the project primarily oriented towards academic, community, activist or family goals? Each of these meant somewhat different and at times directly contrary things. And while the working principles of the project combined cooperation with Roma communities with scientific autonomy of the researchers, those involved in the writing of the book 'History of the Finnish Roma' unavoidably faced different kinds of cross-pressures. Academic critical race perspectives might co-exist uneasily with family emphasis of establishing 'pantheons' of ancestors, or with narratives positing the history of the Finnish Roma as a success story of national integration (with participation into the second world war seen as the ultimate proof of national legitimacy).

Above all, there was the tension of being a 'gadje' hired to co-write 'the history of the Finnish Roma' – an outsider looking 'in' from a position of relative privilege yet limited access. Vivaly, however, we had a broad group of people writing the book together, involving highly talented Roma writers and academics, and connecting us to diversity of communities and political actors. Some of the tensions were thus alleviated by the multivocality that the working group represented. The actual book turned out to tell not one version of the past, but several ones. The same went for its underlying narratives.

In my reading, three parallel stories in particular were vital for the projects outcome. The first of these was the story of centuries of co-existence and interaction across the ethnic divide. In Finland as elsewhere, it is clear that the Roma have not been an isolated group. On the contrary, the survival of the mobile Roma in cold and poor country has been conditional on intensive interaction with the non-Roma. Histories of the Roma families have been intertwined with those of local village communities, and with the Finnish society

more broadly. The Roma have worked in innumerable occupations from highly mobile to strictly sedentary ones, and the ethnic boundary has been crossed in each generation through intermarriages, foster parenting, etc. Histories of such interaction offer an example that Finland has never been the monoculture that it is often imagined to be.

The second story, a corollary and also corrective to the first one, was that formed by the multiple, yet shared and distinctive experiences of the Roma families living in Finland for centuries. That experience has been, above all, one of strong family bonds and a sense of belonging. The rich life-worlds, or what Marko Stenroos calls the Romani social ontology,¹ were apparent in the astonishing richness and historical depth of family-related oral history information passed particularly through women. Without relating to this autonomous (albeit not unchanging or isolated) cultural and communal sphere, our project would have risked becoming a form of academic colonization of the history of a minority.

A third necessary story was that of persecution, assimilation, violence and racism directed against the Roma by the state and the majority population, in varying ways through five centuries. Also this perspective was vital for our project, particularly as it pointed to contemporary forms of racist exclusion, persisting on each level of the society. Together with the perspective on interaction, research on repressive state politics had the effect of turning the gaze of the researchers on 'us', the non-Roma society, and its strange and frequently violent obsession with a tiny group forming less than a permille of the population.

However, the ethos of the whole project was clearly set against reducing the history of the Finnish Roma into that of plain victimhood. This connected to a significant difference in the ethnopolitical landscape of Finland in comparison to Sweden and Norway, as the Finnish Roma organizations were during the project keen to point to their roles as *part* of the Finnish society, rather than as marginalized outsiders. This also led to less confrontative overall framing of the project vis-à-vis the Finnish state - which of course also provided the project's funding.

It is interesting in this respect to compare the Finnish attempts to write Roma history 'into' national historiography with that of the the Swedish 'Vitbok' ('White Book', *Den mörka och okända historien. Vitbok om övergrepp och kränkning av romer under 1900-talet* 2014). These two state-sanctioned projects were nearly parallel in terms of timing, yet differed strikingly in their focus and aims. Unlike the Finnish project, the *Vitbok* explicitly attempted to confront histories of persecu-

tion and discriminatory state policies against the Roma and Resande minorities in Sweden. While the end result privileged professional 'Rankean' archival research over community voices, it produced in-depth examinations of specific discriminatory policies in Sweden, pointing directly to the politics of the past.

This contrasts sharply with the Finnish project, which was attuned towards 'recognition' and 'knowledge', with the purposes of supporting Roma identity, and helping the Roma and non-Roma to better understand their shared past. This noticeably non-confrontational starting point was partly a reflection of an ethnopolitical reality, in which the Finnish Roma had managed since late 1960s to build a relatively strong and internally coherent minority organs, with state representation through the Advisory board of the Romany affairs. This incorporation has arguably pulled the Roma political leadership much closer to the Finnish state than what has been the case in Sweden, and perhaps also produced a less confrontational stance towards it. Meanwhile, questions of identity, language and cultural continuity have taken a prominent place on the minority political agenda (Friman-Korpela 2014).

Accordingly, the Finnish version of the *History of the Finnish Roma* included a multiplicity of Roma voices, many of which connected to traditions of Romany language and culture in Finland – elements, which the very nature of the Swedish *Vitbok* and the ethnopolitics behind it made absent. However, without a clear focus on state-led racist policies, our project ended up still lacking a thorough historical scrutiny of for example sterilization policy in relation to the Roma, or of the Gypsy Missio's children's homes,² a central tool of assimilatory policy that touched and often harmed the lives of most Roma families between 1950s–1980s.

In other respects, the experience of the History of the Finnish Roma appears as one of cautious optimism of large research projects involving both Roma civil society and academic researchers. Still, it is clear that many problems and tensions remained unresolved. In some sense, it seems a project with the all-encompassing title referring to 'the history' of 'the' Finnish Roma is inevitably going to produce a publication that, like the Swedish *Vitbok*, is to a large degree a reflection of the research political and ethnopolitical realities of its time, and does not necessarily age altogether gracefully.

Other unresolved tensions of our projects included overrepresentation of 'gadje' researchers, and the eternal problem of missing Roma voice in past sources. As I argue elsewhere (Tervonen 2016), even oral history materials appearing to bring out the 'voice' of the 'subaltern' can still reproduce racist stereotypes through their framing and question patterns, and offer the

interviewees positionalities that reduce people into representatives of culturally defined other.

In wider terms, the situation of the so-called 'Roma Studies' in Finland remains, as much as in the Nordic countries and elsewhere in Europe, riddled with paradoxes and persistent structural inequalities, reflecting those of the wider society. Racialization is interlocked with social inequality, which the worlds of education and academia take part in reproducing. While the so-called 'Gypsy Lore Society' tradition of research has been thoroughly implicated in the history racist othering (e.g. Selling 2018), it is far from clear that present-day academia would have overcome the inherent unbalance in producing knowledge by 'us' on 'them' (despite excellent counter-examples such as the *Critical Romani Studies* journal). And as the institutional tensions remain, so do those faced by an individual researcher. The dilemma of doing Roma-related research from a gadje position does thus not disappear.

Endnotes

¹ Presentation 6 November 2018, Helsinki City Museum.

² Despite Janita Grönfors' short but well-researched section on the topic in our book.

References

- Den mörka och okända historien. Vitbok om övergrepp och kränkning av romer under 1900-talet*. 2014. Ds 2014:8 Stockholm: Elanders Sverige AB.
- Friman-Korpela, Sarita. 2014. *Romanipolitiikasta romanien politiikkaan: Poliittisen asialistan ja toimijakonseption muutos 1900-luvun jälkipuoliskon Suomessa*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Grönfors, Janette. 2015. "Zigenarmissionens barnhemsversamhet". In Pulma, Panu (ed.) *De finska romernas historia från svenska tiden till 2000-talet*. Helsinki/Stockholm: Svenska Litteratursällskapet/Atlantis bokförlag.
- Kwiek, Gregor. 2009. "Unintentional Exclusion". *Romani E Journal* 2009:1, s 5–15.
- Pulma, Panu. 2015. *De finska romernas historia från svenska tiden till 2000-talet*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Selling, Jan. 2018. "Assessing the Historical Irresponsibility of the Gypsy Lore Society in Light of Romani Subaltern Challenges". *Critical Romani Studies*, 1(1), 44–61. <https://doi.org/10.29098/crs.v1i1.15>
- Tervonen, Miika. 2014. "Historiankirjoitus ja myytti yhden kulttuurin Suomesta". Markkola, Pirjo and Östman, Ann-Catrin (eds.) *Kotiseutu ja kansakunta. Miten suomalaista historiaa on rakennettu*. Helsinki: SKS, 137–162.
- Tervonen, Miika. 2016. "Going from house to house: exploring Roma encounters in rural Finland through oral history and written reminiscences". *Oral History Journal* 44(2) 91-99.

Conference report

Jews, Roma and the Nordic Countries: Current Research, New Perspectives

University College London, 6-7 September 2018

The purpose of the conference *Jews, Roma and the Nordic Countries* was to discuss recent research trends concerning Jews and Roma in the Nordic countries, and to acquaint scholars working on these themes in Finland, Scandinavia and UK. It was arranged jointly by Simo Muir (UCL Hebrew and Jewish Studies and University of Helsinki), Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies, and Uppsala University), Lily Kahn (UCL Hebrew and Jewish Studies), and Peter Stadius (The Centre for Nordic Studies, University for Helsinki) with generous support from The Finnish Institute in London. The successful interdisciplinary event provided an excellent opportunity for networking and discussing further research projects and meetings. The focus was on Finland with other Nordic countries also featured.

Peter Stadius delivered a keynote address on the theme *Nordic societies and tolerance: On research challenges and conceptual traditions*. It touched upon topics such as guilt, colonialist responsibility, dystopian modernism and unconscious discourses of whiteness, which challenge the tradition of Nordic countries defining themselves as champions of human rights. The talk also provided an introduction to minorities, marginal groups and otherness in the Nordic countries.

The topic of the first session was Holocaust in the Nordic countries. Pontus Rudberg (Uppsala University) presented his research on the Swedish Jews and the Holocaust. Rudberg identified a number of factors that enhanced or limited Swedish Jews' ability to aid the victims of Nazi terror, including Swedish immigration legislation and refugee policy, the availability of information about the extent of Nazi atrocities, the relative effectiveness of Jewish organizations and the financial resources available to the various Jewish relief committees. Silvia Goldbaum Tarabini Fracapane (independent scholar) gave a talk entitled "*Konnt Ihr mir mal etwas Lebensmittel senden?*" *Relief and aid to Danish Jews in Theresienstadt: The point of view of the deportees*. She gave examples of what exactly the Danish relief meant for the Danish ghetto inmates and how they conceived this important aid. Oula Silvennoinen's (University of

Helsinki) talk was titled *Finland and the Final Solution: Writing a comprehensive Holocaust history of Finland*. The talk included a look into the reception of Hitler's dictatorship in Finland with its continuously radicalizing Jewish policy, analysed mainly through foreign service and press sources. It provided a research-based reassessment of the involvement of the Finnish Waffen-SS battalion, as well as an outline of the emerging post-war history culture regarding Finland and the Holocaust, accessible through the personal archives of key personalities involved in drawing it up.

The topic of the second session was Finnish Roma. Simo Muir presented on post-war politics of memory among Jews and Roma in Finland. After the war both communities have invested in narratives that have emphasized the positive and unifying experience of the war, simultaneously silencing uneasy aspects, for instance forced labor squads and ill treatment of refugees. Both the Jewish and Roma communities have corroborated the post-war national narrative of 'separate-war', implying that Finland was not complicit in the Nazi atrocities and that the country was devoid of racism and discrimination of its minorities and refugees. Eija Stark's (University of Helsinki) talk was titled *In pursuit of progress: Narratives of education among the Finnish Roma*. Although the Finnish Roma have historically suffered from low levels of education and extreme poverty, surprisingly the 'gypsy narratives', i.e. oral histories, have represented to a notable and unprecedented degree the length and breadth of the Finnish welfare and education state. Marko Stenroos (University of Helsinki) talked about Roma agency, inclusion and integration. He elaborated on the impact of inner group power and age and gender hierarchies on the processes of societal inclusion and integration, and consequently disaggregated some of the elements that formulate an ontological world of the Roma. This paper constitutes a relatively rare exception within Romani Studies as it places Roma agency in the center and shifts the framing and viewpoint from interdependency towards a notion of cultural coexistence.

The third session was sponsored by the The Finnish Institute and continued the topic of the Roma. Kati Pietarinen (freelance journalist) gave a visual presentation entitled *The Stopped project: Challenges and successes of collaboration between research, journalism and art in investigating ethnic profiling in Finland*. The Stopped project (2015-2018) of the University of Helsinki is perhaps the only Finnish social science research project in recent years to yield a scoop: a news story covered by all of national media, and ultimately even featured on the BBC. The project was the first research into ethnic profiling in Finland. It was con-

ceived by a journalist, headed by a professor and realized in collaboration between researchers, journalists, a multimedia specialist, a photographer and a comic artist. The project concentrated on stops by the police targeting individuals from racialized minority groups. 145 people with experiences of stops were interviewed, among them numerous Finnish Roma and over twenty Bulgarians and Romanians earning their income on the streets, many of whom identified as Roma. Photographer Heidi Piironen and journalist Kimmo Oksanen (Helsingin Sanomat) presented their project *The invisibles – story of a beggar family*. For ten years, they have been following the life of Romanian Mihaela Stoica and her family and siblings in Finland, Romania, Greece, Estonia and France. Stoica came to Helsinki as a street beggar in 2007 from the village of Cetatea de Balt, Romania. Through the personal story of Mihaela, the project deals with larger societal issues, Romania, Europe and the reception of Romanian beggars in Finland. With photographs and texts, Oksanen and Piironen dig into the reasons for street begging, the living conditions of families in Transylvania, and the phenomenon of Romanian people leaving their homes and becoming street beggars in Western Europe.

The first session of the second day featured talks on Jewish communities in Sweden and Norway. Maja Hultman's (University of Southampton) talk was titled *Urban places of Jewish precedence, 1870-1939: What the construction of synagogues and kosher shops in Stockholm can teach us about Jewish/non-Jewish relations*. An investigation into the construction of sacred places revealed the vigour of Jewish life and offered a new perspective on the Jewish/non-Jewish relationship. Anti-Semitism and integration do not paint a complete picture: the talk proved how possibilities of peaceful encounters were numerous in the spatial sphere. Tyson John Herberger (Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences) gave a talk on expanding estimates of Norway's Jewish population. By cross-referencing immigrant stocks in Norway with Jewish population estimates in the relevant countries of origin, this paper suggested there are possibly thousands of people in Norway with Jewish backgrounds. The talk included a discussion on the complex question of who is Jewish and/or possesses a Jewish identity.

The topic of the final session was Jews in Finland. Laura Ekholm (University of Helsinki) presented on Jewish marriages and occupational choices in Sweden and Finland from the late 19th to the mid- 20th century. It placed Jewish marriage and occupational choices in the wider discourses of and research on integration and migration. Lily Kahn and Riitta Valijärvi talked about linguistic practices in the Finnish Jewish community

as reflected in Jewish publications. It focused on the distinctive features of the publications that place them in the continuum of Jewish ethnolects. These included orthographic conventions for rendering Hebrew and Yiddish lexical items, the symbolic use of Hebrew script, categories of Hebrew and Yiddish words, patterns of selection governing the selection of Hebrew vs. Yiddish, calques and incorporation (or lack thereof) of Hebrew and Jewish items in the grammatical structure of Finnish and Swedish. Riikka Tuori (University of Helsinki) presented the new research project *Boundaries of Jewish identities in contemporary Finland*. The small Jewish Litvak community in Finland is both unique and representative of more general patterns: among the approximately 1500 Jews, the number of converts and mixed marriages is exceptionally high but the community remains officially Orthodox and maintains a distinct Finnish Jewish identity. The project, which is based at the University of Turku, will approach Finnish Jewish identities from multidisciplinary points of view, including ethnographical and historical angle.

In the final discussion the participants were unanimous that the seminar had been very useful and had provided an excellent opportunity to learn about new research angles and topics with which they might not have been familiar. Especially combining Jewish Studies with Roma Studies enabled comparison of similar research themes. There was a strong desire to continue and widen the established network and to arrange a follow-up seminar in Norway in the near future.

Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi
Simo Muir
Lily Kahn

Conference report

Borders and bridges: Nordic nationalisms and transnationalisms

University of California at Berkeley 9-10 mars 2018

I dessa politiskt oroliga tider kan det ibland förefalla svårt att motivera den humanistiska forskningens intresse för ett visst områdes språk, historia, religion, konst och kultur. På ett generellt plan är det dock möjligt peka på den inneboende politiska aspekten av all kunskapsproduktion. Likaså är det relevant att betona vikten av dialog mellan forskning och det omgivande samhället. Mer specifikt så är det även viktigt att lyfta fram berättelsernas förmåga att tillvarata aspekter från såväl förfluten tid som nutid i gestaltningen av komplexa skeenden och möjliga framtida scenarier.

I inbjudan till konferensen *Borders and bridges. Nordic nationalisms and transnationalisms* vid Scandinavian Studies på UC Berkeley 9-10 mars 2018 var samtliga dessa motiveringar iakttagna. Konferensen anordnades av och för (främst) masterstudenter, doktorander och "early career-scholars", och tog den nuvarande politiska situationen som sin tematiska utgångspunkt. Redan i inbjudan utmanades den envist kvarhängande föreställningen om Skandinavien som befolknings-, språk-, och kulturmässigt homogent; en omständighet som gjorde att denna konferensinbjudan passade perfekt för oss i forskningsnoden *Kunskapsproduktion bortom normerna* vid Uppsala universitet. Noden är en av flera treåriga projekt som syftar till att skapa tvärvetenskapliga samarbeten över hierarkiska gränser inom akademien, och som finansieras av humanistiska och samhällsvetenskapliga institutioner samt den historisk-filosofiska fakulteten. Varje nod har sitt eget tema, och då vårt kan sammanfattas som ett intresse för akademisk kunskapsproduktion i relation till frågor rörande **makt, normer och politik** så är det lätt att förstå att vi tilltalades av anslaget till *Borders and Bridges*. Efter noggranna förberedelser avreste slutligen en grupp bestående av masterstudenter, doktorander och disputerade forskare till Berkeley i början av mars 2018. Med sju talare från noden visade det sig att vi stod för en knapp tredjedel av programmet.

Den första sessionen var "Rhetoric across Time, Place, Media", där Tim van Gerven (Amsterdams universitet) använde sig av äldre Norröna litteratur i en reflektion över Skandinavismen och det pan-nationella

förflutna under 1800-talet. Därefter föreläste Ellen Ahlness (University of Washington) om nationalismens territoriella anspråk: en presentation som fokuserade en nutida kontext av policy-, rättvis och säkerhetsfrågor i relation till ursprungsbefolkningars rättigheter och Arktiska rådet.

Det nutida perspektivet bibehölls även i den presentation som därpå följde av nodmedlemmen Astrid Juckenack, MA i förintelse- och folkmordsstudier (Hugo Valentin center, Uppsala universitet). Hon presenterade de preliminära resultaten av en studie om hur svensk kultur och svensk nationell identitet framställdes i tyska och brittiska populistiska och liberala mediernas rapporter om migrationsfrågor, särskilt avseende asylsökande och flyktingar, under perioden 2015–2016. I vårt digitala tidevarv, där medierna korsar såväl nationella som språkliga gränser, är det uppenbart relevant att studera hur en viss nation framställs medialt i andra länders rapportering. Det är även viktigt att undersöka hur dessa framställningar samspelar med nationella strömningar i de länder där rapporteringen sker. I undersökningen identifierade Juckenack återkommande teman som bekräftar likväl som suddar ut gränserna mellan det som ses som specifikt svenska och mer allmänt europeiska kontexter. Till dessa teman hör 'lärdomar' som anses vara möjliga att dra från erfarenheter gjorda i den svenska migrations- och asylpolitiken, uppskattande och/eller oroande observationer i högerförskjutningen i svensk politik, samt referenser till svensk historia: alltifrån svenska relationer med Nazityskland till räddningen av de danska judarna, mottagandet av Balkanflyktingar på 1990-talet, och kvinnors rättigheter. Juckenacks studie avslöjade ett grundläggande narrativ av vad som uppfattas som en långvarig historia av svensk exceptionalism, och en nutida katastrofartad nedgång. Slutligen kunde en slutsats dras angående att *det som händer igår kväll i Sverige* – ett citat från Donald Trump i februari 2017 – på ett generellt plan anses spela roll eftersom det förväntas förutsäga, på gott eller ont, vad som händer i Tyskland eller Storbritannien i morgon.

Därefter följde sessionen "Religious Ideology and Appropriation", där Ali Frauman (Indiana University) redogjorde för hur urtida isländska riter i nutiden kunde approprieras för nationalistiska syften, men även för att göra motstånd. Troy Wellington Smith (doktorand vid UC Berkeley) talade sedan om Kierkegaards kritik av Grundtvigs nationalistiska kristendom, ett föredrag som, liksom det föregående, gav ett historiskt perspektiv på spänningar mellan religion och politik i Skandinavien. Sessionen avslutades dock i nutid, då doktorand i teologi från Uppsala universitet Tomas Poletti Lundström föreläste om den svenska extremhögerns appro-

priering och politiska tillämpning av kristen symbolik och kultur; strategier som enligt många bedömare är en allt viktigare kontext till extrem- och radikalhögerns politiska legitimering.

Poletti Lundströms infallsvinkel återkom i nästa session, "Nationalisms: Radical, Romantic, Linguistic", där nodmedlemmen teol. dr. Johan Eddebo presenterade preliminära forskningsresultat inför ett projekt rörande den svenska och skandinaviska extremhögerns världsåskådningar. Här fokuserades den breda radikalhögerns etnokratiska målsättningar och principiella konflikter med den pluralistiska deltagardemokratins institutioner som blivit tydligt klarlagd i samtida forskning. En viktig fråga för det kommande projektet är att beskriva och klarlägga kopplingar mellan populära perspektiv bland allmänheten, och det världsåskådningsinnehåll som underbygger extrem- och den bredare radikalhögerns ideologi. Eftersom legitimiteten av den pluralistiska demokratins institutioner bland allmänheten potentiellt undergrävs i och med spridningen av en världsåskådning som är svärförenlig med sådana institutioner finns en tydlig politisk relevans i att påvisa sådana kopplingar som projektet syftar till.

Sessionen avslutades med James K. Puchowskis (University of Edinburgh) presentation av nynorsk-aktivisters arbete med att förankra målformens erkännande och deras förhandlingar och samarbete med etablerade institutioner.

Sista sessionen för konferensens första dag var "Landscapes: Urban, Rural, Foreign", där Sara Ann Knutson (UC Berkeley) föreläste om transnationella aspekter i Hans Christian Andersens litterära landskap. Denna presentation följdes av Jenna Coughlins (UC Berkeley) föredrag om den norska 1900-talsförfattaren Aslaug Vaas förbindelser med den afrikanska kontinenten.

Därefter var det dags för nodmedlemmen Lisa Grahn, som är doktorand i litteraturvetenskap och som talade om kopplingen mellan nationalism och moderskap i Sara Lidmans författarskap. Grahn gav en överblick över hur Lidmans författarskap har hanterat det svenska folkhemmets historieskrivning, med särskild tyngdpunkt på mödrarnas plats i densamma. I Lidmans Jernbaneepos, som består av sju romaner publicerade 1976–1999, gestaltas hur järnvägen kom till norra Sverige och hur den kopplade samman Norrland med centralmakten i söder. Tack vare järnvägen utvecklades industrierna och Norrland kunde sättas in i en kapitalistisk handelskedja tillsammans med resten av den moderna världen. I Jernbaneeposet skildras ofta moderskap som motsatsen till denna typ av aggressiv, modern maskulinitet. I en nationalistisk diskurs är mödrar inflytelserika och mäktiga, eftersom de har

huvudansvaret för barnen, och därmed för nationens framtid. Medan männens uppgift är att skydda landets gränser, måste kvinnorna skydda sina kroppar mot fiender och främlingar. De måste föda och uppfostra friska, svenska barn som kan fortsätta att bygga landet. Denna ordning kritiserar i Lidmans verk, menade Grahn, genom att järnvägsprojektet inte beskrivs som en framgångssaga. Istället synliggörs de uppoffringar som gjordes, bland annat från mödrarnas sida. Grahn tog även upp kritiken mot folkhemmet som finns närvarande i verk som *Bära mistel* (1960). Där presenteras huvudpersonen Linda Ståhl som en avvikande kvinna och, inte minst, en oansvarig mor. Här betonas konflikten mellan kvinnors uppgifter som mödrar och deras konstnärliga och skapande projekt som individer. Lidman visar hur kvinnligt konstnärskap nedvärderats, menar Grahn, och hon kontrasterar även staden mot landsbygden, klassisk musik mot folkmusik, män mot kvinnor. Kvinnors fria skapande tvingas tillbaka på bekostnad av det skapande som gynnar nationalstaten, det vill säga moderskapet.

Med sin fokusering på Sara Lidman och svensk historieskrivning visade sig Grahn bilda en fin brygga över till konferensens första keynote speaker Susan Brantly, professor i nordisk litteratur vid University of Wisconsin-Madison. Under rubriken "Trends in Nordic Transnationalism" talade hon utifrån sin nyutkomna bok om kopplingen mellan historia och litteratur, transnationalism och den postmoderna eran. I en jämförelse mellan historieskrivningen i svensk och amerikansk litteraturhistoria konstaterade Brantly att svenska historiska romaner ofta beskriver maktmissbruk, svältande barn och missväxt, medan till exempel den amerikanska berättelsen om det nya landet skildras som en framgångssaga där nybyggarna är hjältar och pionjärer. Enligt Brantly beror detta på ett behov av att berätta om hur mycket bättre den nya välfärdsstaten fungerade i en svensk kontext. Som exempel tog hon Per Anders Fogelströms *Mina drömmars stad*-serie, där samhället och karaktärernas livsförutsättningar förbättras ju närmare modern tid de kommer. Brantly nämnde dock Sara Lidman som ett exempel på författare som går emot den typen av historier, berättade av vinnaren. Istället kan man i Lidmans författarskap, menade Brantly, läsa om de som inte fick det bättre, utan gick under i moderniseringsprocessen. Där saknas den positiva framåtandan; istället visar Lidmans verk hur gamla förtryck och strukturer går i arv trots samhällsutvecklingen.

Konferensens andra dag började med sessionen "Materiality and Policy: Houses, Bridges, Technology". Där talade först Ella Rockar (University of Manitoba) om effekterna av neoliberalism och nationalism på den

danska lagstiftningen avseende hjälp till bostad. Denna presentation följdes av Alix Johnson (UC Santa Cruz), som talade av den dubbla betydelsen av IT som både bro och gräns i det postkoloniala Island. Det svenska och även kulturella perspektivet på den diskussion som fördes av Rockar och Johnson tillhandahölls slutligen av fil.dr. Lydia Wistisen (Stockholm University), som talade om det svenska miljonprogrammets litteratur.

Från noden deltog dock nästa talare förs i den andra sessionen, "Migration, Adaptation, Media", nämligen MA-student i Skandinavistik Diana-Petronela Adomnicăi. Hon kommer ursprungligen från Rumänien och har en bakgrund i musik, och presenterade en intervjustudie med den rumänska musikern Dana Dragomir. Genom sin karriär som professionell spelare av panflöjt lyckades Dragomir fly den kommunistiska regimen och hamnade slutligen i Sverige. Där blev hon känd genom att spela ledmotivet till Astrid Lindgrens klassiska barnsaga *Mio, min Mio* på panflöjt, och det var således hennes instrument som möjliggjorde för henne att rota sig i detta land. Hennes framförande av den sagoinspirerade melodin kan ses som ett lovpriande och sammanförande av två olika kulturer, och kräver förståelse av dem båda. Mer specifikt så undersökte Adomnicăi Dragomirs migrationsupplevelse och huruvida den musikaliska symbios hon skapade mellan Sveriges folkmusik och ett av Rumäniens nationella instrument underlättade hennes integrationsprocess i det svenska kulturella livet. Dragomir berättade att hon erfor en inre plikt att utveckla panflöjtens potential i andra genrer än där den brukar förekomma i Rumänien. Därmed korsade hon, genom sin transnationella erfarenhet, både politiska och kulturella gränser som även fick inverkan på hennes egen identitet. Panflöjtens ljud blev bron till det öppnare samhälle hon fann i Sverige men bevarade också den rumänska hemkänslan, och det blev därmed ett stöd för henne under migrationsprocessen. Även om Adomnicăis studie förmedlar en enskild persons perspektiv på migrationserfarenheten som musiker så bidrar den även till det transnationella forskningsfältet om musik och migration ur ett transnationellt perspektiv. Dragomirs berättelser skulle därmed kunna generaliseras bortom den individuella upplevelsen.

Den andra talaren i denna session var doktoranden Réka Szalkai (Eötvös Loránd University of Sciences, Budapest), som presenterade de nationella omständigheterna kring den skandinaviska stumfilmen *Laila* (1929).

Den tredje sessionen för dagen, "Memory, Text, (Post)colonialism", bestod av två närläsningar av två olika presentatörer. Philipp Wagner (University of Greifswald) gjorde en jämförande närläsning mellan

August Strindbergs roman *I havsbandet* (1890) och Henning Mankells *Djup* (2004), med särskild fokusering av relationen mellan minne och landskap.

Minne var även något som engagerade nodens medlem Carmen Lungu, som är MA-student i Skandinavistik med litterär inriktning. Hon kommer från Rumänien och är intresserad av migrationslitteratur, poststrukturalism och postkolonialism. Lungu valde att på konferensen presentera en analys av Jonas Hasen Khemiris roman *Allt jag inte minns* (2015), som var en del av hennes kandidatuppsats. Syftet med studien var att kartlägga vilken roll språk och kultur kan spela för skapandet av identitet. Presentationen fokuserade förhållandet mellan de litterära gestalterna Laide och Samuel, som båda är andra-generationsinvandrare i Sverige. När boken börjar är Samuel redan död, och hans karaktär rekonstrueras genom vännernas ord när de berättar om honom. Hela romanen är skriven som ett pussel av avsnitt som förklarar händelserna som leder till Samuels död. Laide är översättare och samtidigt karaktären som förklarar "den Andras" Sverige för Samuel. Hon tolkar invandrararnas värld både för Samuel och läsaren medan Samuel försöker anpassa sig till det invandrararnas Sverige som Laide presenterar för honom. För Lungus analys var språket i romanen mycket viktigt eftersom Khemiri har ett berättande som sätter detta i centrum i relation till karaktärernas egna livserfarenheter. Till exempel så har Samuels mormor demens, vilket påverkar hennes språk och i förlängningen det hon berättar om Samuel. Och Laide berättar att Samuel efter en tid började bryta på svenska precis som hon, och att hon tyckte att detta kändes falskt av honom. Lungus presentation visar hur en och samma karaktär kan påverkas i samspel med flera andra och därmed tala och bete sig olika i olika situationer, för att anpassa sig. På så vis skapas nya identiteter som en följd av förändrade omständigheter. Slutsatsen Lungu drar är att identiteten är en kontinuerlig process – Sverige och svenska språket förändras med tiden och interaktionen mellan medborgare och invandrare innebär ett kulturellt utbyte som förändrar både språket och landet.

Den sista sessionen var "Nation, Body, Sex, Text: Nordic Self-Identities", och här talade först Tuire Liimatainen (University of Helsinki) om konstruktionen av svenskfinnarnas identitet i en global tidsålder.

Därefter föreläste nodmedlemmen Malin Jordal, som har en doktorsexamen i internationell hälsa, om kvinnlig könsstympning (KKS) och rekonstruktiv klitoriskirurgi (KR). KR är ett relativt nytt men allt mer populärt kirurgiskt förfarande som syftar till att återställa, fysiskt och estetiskt, KKS-drabbade kvinnors könsorgan. Jordal studie bygger på individuella

intervjuer med 17 kvinnor som söker KR i Sverige, om varför de ville genomgå denna operation och vad de hoppades uppnå. Resultaten visade att kvinnorna, nästan alla immigranter från afrikanska länder, ansåg att förutom att vara "svart, afrikansk och invandrare" uppfattade de att KKS gjorde dem "annorlunda" från andra kvinnor i Sverige, både symboliskt och sexuellt. Kvinnorna förstod det som att könsstympningen hade försämrat deras förmåga till sexuell njutning, och borttagning av klitoris gjorde att de kände sig som "mindre än 100% kvinna". Förutom att uppleva sina genitalier som "fula" och "onormala" gjorde detta att de antingen undvek intima relationer och kontakter, eller att de kände sig obekväma och självmedvetna under sex. Att leva med KKS i Sverige skapar sålunda en känsla av isolering och "annanhet". Bortsett från den estetiska / sexuella aspekten så ville kvinnorna också ha KR som en symbolisk restaurering; att "ta bort" KKS. Detta var relaterat till att uppleva KKS som en form av våld och förtryck av kvinnor, och som en kvinnofiendlig och symbolisk handling som syftar till att radera kvinnans integritet och sexuella förmåga. Kvinnorna i studien värdesätter således de samtida ideal om kvinnlig sexualitet och kroppens individuella suveränitet som de anser finns i Sverige (likväl som på vissa andra ställen). Att ha blivit utsatt för KKS ingav en känsla av att ha blivit kränkt och berövad en "naturlig" kvinnlig sexualitet, vilket skapade känslor av att vara ett offer. Detta kan relateras till den växande globala trenden mot att KKS överges, men också en syn på "afrikanska" traditioner som "outbildade, barbariska och våldsamma". Kvinnorna hoppades befria sig från denna stigmatisering genom att genomgå KR.

Sista bidraget i denna session och även i konferensen som helhet var nodmedlemmen Cecilia Luzon. Hon är MA i litteraturvetenskap och presenterade delar av sin masteruppsats om migrationstematik i tre diktverk av Athena Farrokhzad, Gabriel Itkes-Sznep och Maja Lee Langvad. Luzon lyfte fram hur diskursen om författare med utomeuropeisk bakgrund eller erfarenheter av rasism och/eller exil har centererats vid författarnas föreställda biografi, snarare än deras faktiska litterära verk. Prefixet "invandrare" i beteckningar som *invandrarlitteratur* och *invandrarförfattare* har fått betydande konsekvenser inom akademiska och mediala sammanhang, detta trots att de är heterogena och godtyckliga och sällan refererar till att författaren erfarit immigration. Luzon menade att dessa benämningar har fungerat som sätt att kodifiera en framväxande litteratur som under de senaste decennierna har lyft fram erfarenheter av rasifiering och rasism, vilket har fått effekten att dessa författares litterära verk har diskuterats i termer av empirisk data snarare än estetik. Därför är

det enligt Luzon viktigt att den litteraturvetenskapliga diskussionen skiftar fokus, från att konstruera ytterligare beteckningar för att rymma andra litterära subjekt, till att istället skapa andra tankeverktyg än kategoriseringen. En sådan utveckling är nödvändig för att fånga det poetiskt-politiska i litteraturen. Själv formulerade Luzon figurationen Medeabarn – som refererar till Euripides klassiska tragedi *Medea*, en av världens första exilberättelser – som ett sätt att närma sig svensk- och danskspråkig samtidspoesi som förenas av att de behandlar teman som migration, exil och/eller rasism. Med teoretiska perspektiv på gränser, migration och subjektformering från Rosi Braidotti, Trinh T. Minh-ha, Gloria Anzaldúa och Mara Lee, diskuterade Luzon hur poesins subversivitet ligger i dess kraft att tänka kring och förnimma alternativa och marginaliserade perspektiv.

Både Jordals och Luzons presentationer fungerade som påfarter till konferensens andra keynote speaker, Ryan Skinner, som är docent i musikologi vid Ohio state university. Rubriken för föredraget var "Afro-Swedish Renaissance", och bestod av presentationer av fem afro-svenska artisters livshistorier, karriärer, artistiska uttryck, identifikationer och politiska engagemang. Med diskussioner om exempelvis Timbuktu, Senaibo Sey och Makode Linde fyllde Skinner förvisso en lucka i konferensens program avseende ras i relation till (trans)nationalism, någonting som framstår som särskilt angeläget i ljuset av den svenska nationalismen som en föreställd gemenskap grundande sig i föreställningar om *ett folk*: en etnicitet, en ras, en nation. Samtidigt som det naturligtvis kan ses som en politisk temperaturtagning i sig att en sådan här konferens anses angelägen att anordna just nu, så är det konstruktivt att nationalistiska föreställningar dekonstrueras på så bred front som skedde i programmet för *Borders and bridges*, Med denna välorganiserade konferens visar ämnet Scandinavian Studies, ett fält som ibland (oftast med orätt) anklagas för en viss statiskhet och stereotypisering, sin potential till hög samhällsrelevans och fruktbara korsbefruktningar mellan olika paradigmer.

Ann-Sofie Lönngren
Diana-Petronela Adomnici
Johan Eddebo
Lisa Grahn
Malin Jordal
Astrid Juckenack
Cecilia Luzon
Maria-Carmen Lungu

Nyheter från HVC

Nya projekt

"I Wintras kom pappa och mamma efter mig och skulle fara hem men ej ännu varit hem". Subaltern perspektiv på romanifolk i Sverige cirka 1780-1840.

Theresa Johnsson, fil. dr i historia, är verksam som postdoktor vid Hugo Valentin-centrum. Hon disputerade 2016 vid Historiska institutionen, Uppsala universitet, på en avhandling som behandlade tjänstetvångets och "lösdriveriets" praktiker i Sverige under 1830-talet ur ett underifrånperspektiv. Efter disputationen har hon bland annat arbetat med kursutveckling inom ramen för NAMIS (Forum för nationella minoriteter i Sverige), och hon har även forskat om upphandling i ett projekt under ledning av docent Erik Lindberg vid Historiska institutionen, Uppsala universitet.

Inspirerad av framför allt "history from below" och subaltern historieskrivning utforskar Theresa Johnsson i sitt postdoktorsprojekt vid Hugo Valentin-centrum olika aspekter på romanifolket de resandes sociala och ekonomiska vardagshistoria i Sverige cirka 1780-1840. Utifrån ett underifrånperspektiv och genom tillämpande av biografisk, mikrohistorisk metodologi ställs i projektet kritiska frågor om framväxten av den moderna nationalstaten, minoriteters handlingsutrymme, arkivens natur och de metodologiska implikationerna av att skriva historia om grupper som lämnat få egodokument efter sig. Projektets empiriska fokus ligger främst på tre områden vilka alla är eller kan vara avgörande för en människas välfärd: att lagligt kunna röra sig i rummet, att ha möjlighet till bosättning och laglig tillhörighet samt möjligheter till försörjning. Utifrån en mängd olika källor, kombinerande kvalitativa och kvantitativa data, konstrueras utifrån de sporadiska ögonblicksbilder som finns kvar av dem i arkiven, minibiografier om tre kvinnor vars liv används som nav för att utforska romanifolks erfarenheter och livsvillkor i Sverige liksom framväxten av den moderna nationalstaten. Den övergripande målsättningen är dels att problematisera olika former av historiska tystnader, dels att bredda och fördjupa förståelsen av romanifolkens långa historia i de nordiska länderna.

Parallella narrativ, konfliktfylld historia: historiebruk om andra världskriget på Västra Balkan, 1989–2018.

De senaste årens politiska utveckling har utmanat bilden av EU som en union av stater som delar en uppsättning universella demokratiska värderingar sprungna ur en historia präglad av totalitarism, politiskt förtryck och folkmord. Detta är särskilt tydligt på västra Balkan, där intensiva kontroverser kring andra världskriget och dess efterdyningar har påverkat

såväl sociala och etniska relationer inom länder, som diplomatiska förbindelser mellan stater. Projektets huvudsyfte är att ge ett teoretiskt förankrat svar på dessa frågor genom att analysera historiebruket kring fascism, kollaboration och kommunism i samband med andra världskriget på västra Balkan under perioden 1989-2018. Den empiriska undersökningen baseras på ett metodologiskt välintegrerat angreppssätt, som förenar kvalitativ innehållsanalys av vetenskapliga tidskrifter, media, läroböcker och kursplaner med sociala nätverksanalyser och semi-strukturerade lärarintervjuer. Projektet förväntas därigenom resultera i en detaljerad kartläggning av förändringar i historiebruket över tid och analysnivåer med en grad av sofistikerad som gör att det har goda utsikter att utgöra ett mycket viktigt bidrag till den internationella forskningen om minneskultur generellt. Projektet drivs av HVC:s föreståndare Tomislav Dulić i samarbete med Roland Kostić och Goran Miljan.

The 'Civilised' Nature of European Warfare?

Michelle Gordon holds a PhD in History from Royal Holloway, University of London and her PhD thesis examines three cases of British colonial violence as part of a longer tradition of European colonial violence and considers the British imperial project within a framework of extreme violence and mass killing. She began her position as a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in Genocide Studies at the Hugo Valentin Centre in August 2018 and her project will examine the relationship between extreme violence in intra-European and colonial contexts in nineteenth-century warfare.

It has been commonly accepted that nineteenth-century warfare was predicated on notions of 'civilised' (i.e. European) and 'uncivilised' warfare against indigenous 'savages'. As a result, there are two distinct bodies of work on colonial and European warfare and the relationship between the two has been hitherto under researched. Nineteenth-century intra-European and colonial violence took place in the context of the nationalisation, industrialisation and 'totalisation' of warfare. Simultaneously, international standards of warfare were being set – in a European context at least – to standardise and 'humanise' practices of war, although non-combatants were left unprotected under international law. Both types of warfare could be extremely brutal and methods of violence overlapped, including: collective reprisals, scorched earth, expulsions, blockades and starvation tactics. These tactics invariably had a devastating effect on local civilian populations.

This project will reassess the role of European troops in committing extreme violence and atrocities in intra-European and colonial conflicts in nineteenth-century warfare. Networks and 'transfers' of knowledge between the metropole and the periphery will also be examined and will consider the ways in which European powers 'learnt' new methods of violence both within and between empires. Empirical evidence from a range of archives will be investigated to dem-

onstrate how Europeans – and military men in particular – were thinking comparatively in the tactics they used both in and outside of Europe. This project will explore the ways in which the perception of one's enemy radicalised the methods used, including concepts of 'race' and 'illegitimacy'. By examining how methods and mentalities of extreme violence were transferred across and beyond empires, this research will contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how European colonial practices 'came home' in the genocidal intra-European violence of the twentieth century.

The Role of Jewish Couriers in Spreading Awareness of Mass Murder and Establishing Jewish Resistance Movements.

Sylwia Szyma ska-Smolkin holds a PhD in History and Jewish Studies from the University of Toronto. Her dissertation, "Fateful Decisions: The Polish Policemen and the Jewish Population of Occupied Poland, 1939-1945," examines the complicity of the Polish policemen in the Holocaust in occupied Poland (General Government). Sylwia began her position as a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in Holocaust Studies at the Hugo Valentin Centre in July 2018. Her project will examine how the first news about the Holocaust were disseminated among Jews in Poland and how this knowledge contributed to the creation of Jewish resistance.

During the Second World War German plans to completely cut off Jews from the outside world by forcing them into ghettos were thwarted by efforts to maintain contacts and exchange of information between ghettos as well as between ghettos and the "Aryan" side. Underground Jewish organizations and political parties in different ghettos worked independently but tried to establish contacts with movements in other ghettos. The success of the exchange of information was largely due to the work of Jewish couriers who travelled between ghettos in the General Government and then to areas occupied by the Germans in 1941.

This project aims to broaden our understanding of the mechanism of survival and resistance towards the Nazi regime's genocidal policies. It will examine the work of Jewish couriers and their role in establishing contact between communities to determine how the information about mass killings in the East was disseminated and received. It will discuss how the work of couriers contributed to raising awareness of German plans to murder Jews. The aim of the project is to broaden the discussion on the Jewish resistance movement in ghettos by moving it beyond the forms of direct combat. This project will also discuss how the couriers were received in the communities they reached and how the urges to organize armed resistance modeled on the FPO (United Partisan Organization) were understood and followed. The findings will show how both female and male couriers contributed to the efforts of establishing underground movements and organizing the active resistance. To answer these questions three ghettos will be examined in more detail, each

of them were located in a separate German administrative zone: Vilna (Reichskommissariat Ostland), Warsaw (General Government), and Bialystok (Bezirk Bialystok).

Nya publikationer

Pontus Rudberg, *The Swedish Jews and the Holocaust* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2017).

"We will be judged in our own time and in the future by measuring the aid that we, inhabitants of a free and fortunate country, gave to our brethren in this time of greatest disaster." This declaration, made shortly after the pogroms of November 1938 by the Jewish communities in Sweden, was truer than anyone could have forecast at the time. Pontus Rudberg focuses on this sensitive issue – Jewish responses to the Nazi persecutions and the Holocaust. What actions did Swedish Jews take to aid the Jews in Europe during the years 1933-45 and what determined their policies and actions? Specific attention is given to the aid efforts of the Jewish Community of Stockholm, including the range of activities in which the community engaged, and the challenges presented by official refugee policy in Sweden.

Goran Miljan, *Croatia and the Rise of Fascism: The Youth Movement and the Ustasha during WWII* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2018).

During World War II Croatia became a fascist state under the control of the Ustasha movement/organization – allied with Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Goran Milan's book for the first time examines and analyzes the ideology, practices, and international connections of the all-embracing fascist Ustasha Youth organization. The organization represented a crucial element in the Ustasha's all-embracing, totalitarian national revolution which in reality consisted of specific interconnected, mutually dependent practices. On the one hand, prosecution, oppression, mass murder, and the Holocaust – which were officially legalized within a month of the regime's accession to power – and on the other the youth regimentation and re-education, which served the purpose of creating a "pure" and "new" Croatian nation in line with the Ustasha worldview.

Satu Gröndahl and Eila Rantonen (eds.), *Migrants and Literature in Finland and Sweden*. Studia Fennica Litteraria 11 (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2018).

The volume presents new comparative perspectives on transnational literary studies. This collection provides a contribution to the production of new narratives of the nation. The focus of the contributions is contemporary fiction relating to experiences of migration. The volume explores the ways in which transcultural connections have affected the national self-understanding in the Swedish and Finnish context. It

also presents comparative aspects on the reception of literary works and explores the intersectional perspectives of identities. Further, it demonstrates the complexity of grouping literatures according to nation and ethnicity. This collection is of particular interest to students and scholars in literary and Nordic studies as well as transnational and migration studies.

Leanne Hinton, Leena Huss, Gerald Roche (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization*. Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics (New York & London: Taylor and Francis. 2018).

The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization is the first comprehensive overview of the language revitalization movement, from the Arctic to the Amazon and across continents. Featuring 47 contributions from a global range of top scholars in the field, the handbook is divided into two parts, the first of which expands on language revitalization issues of theory and practice while the second covers regional perspectives in an effort to globalize and decolonize the field. The volume also contains chapters on the revitalization of music, of whistled languages and sign languages, and how languages change when they are being revitalized. The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization is a resource for graduate students and researchers working in linguistic anthropology and language revitalization and endangerment.

Våra publikationsserier

Hugo Valentin-centrum publicerar både vetenskapliga rapporter och böcker, som vänder sig till en bred läsekrets av forskare och allmänt intresserade. Centret publicerar för närvarande följande bokserier: *Studia multiethnica Upsalensia* (SMU), *Uppsala Multiethnic Papers* (UMP), *Uppsala University Holocaust and Genocide Studies Publications* (UUHGS).

STUDIA MULTIETHNICA UPSALIENSIA

1. Kerstin Eidlitz Kuoljok, *The Revolution in the North. Soviet Ethnography and Nationality Policy*. 1985.
2. Erling Wande, Jan Anward, Bengt Nordberg, Lars Steensland & Mats Thelander, red., *Aspects of Multilingualism. Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Symposium on Bilingualism*, 1984. 1987.
3. Marika Tandefelt, *Mellan två språk. En fallstudie om språkbevarande och språkbyte i Finland*. Diss. 1988.
4. Robert C. Ostergren, *A Community Transplanted. The Transatlantic Experience of a Swedish Immigrant Settlement in the Upper Middle West, 1835–1915*. 1988.
5. Linda Benson & Ingvar Svanberg, red., *The Kazaks of China. Essays on an Ethnic Minority*. 1988.
6. Gunnar Broberg, Harald Runblom & Mattias Tydén, red., *Judiskt liv i Norden*. 1988.
7. Simon Szyszman, *Les Karaites d'Europe*. 1989.
8. Ingvar Svanberg, *Kazak Refugees in Turkey. A Study of Cultural Persistence and Social Change*. 1989.
9. Philip J. Anderson & Dag Blanck, red., *Swedish-American Life in Chicago. Cultural and Urban Aspects of an Immigrant People, 1850–1930*. 1991.
10. H. Arnold Barton, *A Folk Divided. Homeland Swedes and Swedish Americans, 1840–1940*. 1994.

11. Rochelle Wright, *The Visible Wall. Jews and Other Ethnic Outsiders in Swedish Film*. 1998.
12. Raimo Raag, *Från allmogemål till nationalspråk. Språkvård och språkpolitik i Estland från 1857 till 1999*. 1999.
13. Hernán Horna, *La Indianidad antes de la independencia latinoamericana*. 1999.
14. Philip J. Anderson & Dag Blanck, red., *Swedes in the Twin Cities. Immigrant Life and Minnesota's Urban Frontier*. 2001.
15. Lizette Gradén, *On Parade. Making Heritage in Lindsborg, Kansas*. 2003.
16. Angela Karstadt, *Tracking Swedish-American English. A Longitudinal Study of Linguistic Variation and Identity*. 2003.
17. Vera Lif, *Ingermanländares namnskick under 1900-talet. Kontinuitet och förändring*. 2004.
18. Maija Könönen & Juhani Nuorluoto, eds., *Europe–Europa. Cross-cultural Dialogues between the West, Russia, and Southeastern Europe*. 2010.
19. Hernán Horna, *A History of Latin America*. 2011.

UPPSALA MULTIETHNIC PAPERS

1. *Multiethnic Research at the Faculty of Arts, Uppsala University*. 1984.
2. Kjell Magnusson, *Migration, nation, kultur. En bibliografi över invandrar- och minoritetsfrågor med Jugoslavien som exempel*. 1984.
3. Ingvar Svanberg & Eva-Charlotte Ekström, *Mongolica Suecana. A Bibliography of Swedish Books and Articles on Mongolia*. 2:a uppl. 1988.
4. Ingvar Svanberg, *Invandrare från Turkiet. Etnisk och sociokulturell variation*. 2:a uppl. 1988.
5. Tordis Dahllöf, *Identitet och antipod. En studie i australiensisk identitetsdebatt*. 4:e uppl. 1991.
6. Sven Gustavsson & Ingvar Svanberg, *Jugoslavien i april 1984. Rapport från en multi-etnisk resa*. 1986.
7. Harald Runblom & Dag Blanck, red., *Scandinavia Overseas. Patterns of Cultural Transformation in North America and Australia*. 2:a uppl. 1990.
8. Mattias Tydén, *Svensk antisemitism 1880–1930*. 1986.
9. Aläqä Tayyā Gābrā Maryam, *History of the People of Ethiopia*. I översättning av Grover Hudson och Tekeste Negash. 2:a uppl. 1988.
10. Uno Holmberg, *Lapparnas religion. Med inledning och kommentar av Leif Lindin, Håkan Rydving och Ingvar Svanberg*. 1987.
11. Ingvar Svanberg, red., Adam Heymowski & Kerstin Ankert, *I samhällets utkanter. Om "tattare" i Sverige*. 1987.
12. Raimo Raag & Harald Runblom, red., *Estländare i Sverige. Historia, språk, kultur*. 1988.
13. Ingvar Svanberg & Mattias Tydén, red., *Multiethnic Studies in Uppsala. Essays Presented in Honour of Sven Gustavsson, June 1, 1988*. 1988.
14. Ingvar Svanberg, *The Altaic-Speakers of China. Numbers and Distribution*. 1988.
15. Jarmo Lainio, *Spoken Finnish in Urban Sweden*. Diss. 1989.
16. Eric De Geer, *Göteborgs invandrageografi. De utländska medborgarnas regionala fördelning*. 1989.
17. Kjell Magnusson, *Jugoslaver i Sverige. Invandrare och identitet i ett kultursociologiskt perspektiv*. Diss. 1989.
18. Ingmar Söhrman, *Sverige och de romanska kulturen*. 1989.
19. Nils-Erik Hansegård, *Den norrbottensfinska språkfrågan. En återblick på halvspråkighetsdebatten*. 1990.
20. Lars Wendelius, *Kulturliv i ett svenskamerikanskt lokalsamhälle: Rockford, Illinois*. 1990.
21. Dag Blanck & Harald Runblom, red., *Swedish Life in American Cities*. 1991.
22. Bahdi Ecer, *I fikonträdet skugga. Ett syrianskt utvandrarepos*. Med efterskrift av Carl-Martin Edsman. 1991.
23. Ingrid Lundberg & Ingvar Svanberg, *Turkish Associations in Metropolitan Stockholm*. 1991.
25. Ingvar Svanberg, red., *Ethnicity, Minorities and Cultural Encounters*. 1991.
26. Anders Berge, *Flyktingpolitik i stormakts skugga. Sverige och de*

27. Ingrid Lundberg & Ingvar Svanberg, *Kulu. Utvandrabygd i Turkiet*. 1992.
28. Karin Borevi & Ingvar Svanberg, red., *Ethnic Life and Minority Cultures*. 1992.
29. Ingmar Söhrman, *Ethnic Pluralism in Spain*. 1993.
30. Tordis Dahllöf, *¿Antipodenses? Un estudio acerca de la identidad australiana*. 1993.
31. Henrik Román, *En invandrarpolitisk oppositionell. Debattören David Schwarz syn på svensk invandrarpolitik åren 1964–1993*. 1994.
32. Karin Borevi & Ingvar Svanberg, red., *Multiethnic Studies. Report on Research and Other Activities from the Centre for Multiethnic Research*. 1994.
33. Tamás Stark, *Hungary's Human Losses in World War II. With an Introduction by Karl Molin: The Raoul Wallenberg Archive at Uppsala University*. 1995.
34. Sven Gustavsson & Harald Runblom, red., *Language, Minority, Migration. Yearbook 1994/1995 from the Centre for Multiethnic Research*. 1995.
35. Sven Gustavsson & Ingvar Svanberg, red., *Bosnier. En flyktinggrupp i Sverige och dess bakgrund*. 1995.
36. Kjell Magnusson, Midhat Medi & Harald Runblom, red., *Krig, exil, återvändande. Den bosniska konflikten och flyktingproblematiken*. 1996.
37. Maria Luján Leiva, *Latinoamericanos en Suecia. Una historia narrada por artistas y escritores*. 1997.
38. Leena Huss, red., *Många vägar till tvåspråkighet. Föredrag från ett forskarseminarium vid Göteborgs universitet den 21–22 oktober 1994*. 1996.
39. M.M. Jocelyne Fernandez & Raimo Raag, red., *Contacts de langues et de cultures dans l'aire baltique. Contacts of Languages and Cultures in the Baltic Area. Mélanges offerts à Fanny de Sivers*. 1996.
40. Andrzej Nils Uggla, *I nordlig hamn. Polacker i Sverige under andra världskriget*. 1997.
41. Masoud Kamali, *Distorted Integration. Clientization of Immigrants in Sweden*. 1997. 2nd Ed. With a New Preface. 2005.
42. Dag Blanck, Per Jegebäck et al., red., *Migration och mångfald. Essäer om kulturkontakt och minoritetsfrågor tillägnade Harald Runblom*. 1999.
43. Elżbieta Szejewska-Olsson & Michał Bron Jr, red., *Allvarlig debatt och rolig lek. En festskrift tillägnad Andrzej Nils Uggla*. 2000.
44. Harald Runblom, red., *Migrants and the Homeland. Images, Symbols, and Realities*. 2000.
45. Satu Gröndahl, red., *Litteraturens gränsland. Invandrar- och minoritetslitteratur i nordiskt perspektiv*. 2002.
46. Lars Wendelius, *Den dubbla identiteten. Immigrant- och minoritetslitteratur på svenska 1970–2000*. 2002.
47. Jasenka Trtak, *Framing Identities. Images of Us and Them in Two Serbian Novels*. 2003.
48. Harald Runblom & Andrzej Nils Uggla, red., *Polen och Sverige 1919–1999*. 2005.
49. Tomislav Dulić, Roland Kostić, Ivana Maček & Jasenka Trtak, red., *Balkan Currents. Essays in Honour of Kjell Magnusson*. 2005.
50. Ulla Börestam, Satu Gröndahl, Boglárka Straszer, red., *Revitalisera mera! En artikelsamling om den språkliga mångfalden i Norden tillägnad Leena Huss*. 2008.
51. Helmut Müssener och Per Jegebäck, red., *Rasen och vetenskapen*. 2009.
52. Sven Gustavsson, *Standard Language Differentiation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Grammars, Language Textbooks, Readers*. 2009.
53. Helmut Müssener, red., *Judarna i Sverige – en minoritets historia. Fyra föreläsningar*. 2011.
54. Helmut Müssener & Per Jegebäck, red., *Språket, makten och härligheten. Fem föreläsningar*. 2011.
55. Johan Gärdebo, May-Britt Öhman & Hiroshi Maruyama, red., *Re:Mindings. Co-Constituting Indigenous/Academic/Artistic Knowledges*. 2014.

56. Li Bennich-Björkman, Roland Kostić & Branka Likić-Brborić, red., *Citizens at Heart? Perspectives on Integration and Refugees in the EU After the Yugoslav Wars of Succession*. 2016.

ENDANGERED LANGUAGES AND CULTURES (ELC)

1. Susanna Angéus Kuoljok, *Lulesamiska. Ett hotat minoritetsspråk i Skandinavien*. 2003.
2. Rafiq Sabir, Kamal Mirawdeli & Stephen Watts, *Modern Kurdish Poetry. An Anthology & Introduction*. 2006.
3. Astrid Starck-Adler, *Yiddish. Continuity and Change*. 2007.
4. Laura Palosuo, *En inventering av forskningen om romer i Sverige*. 2009.
5. Hristo Kyuchukov, ed., *"A Language without Borders..." The International Romani Language Conference in Stockholm and Uppsala 7–9 January 2007*. 2nd Rev. Ed. 2009.
6. Hristo Kyuchukov, *Essays on the Language, Culture and Education of Roma*. 2010.
7. Björn Lundqvist, *Svensk syd- och umesamisk bibliografi 1990–2008*. Sammanställd av Björn Lundqvist. 2011.

NAMIS-SERIEN

1. Lars G. Benktson, *Att tillfriskna språkligt på olika sätt. Medicinska ord och fraser på quechua, spanska och engelska*. 2004.
2. Rikard Jennische, *De nationella minoriteterna och folkbiblioteken. Folkbibliotekens hantering av nationella minoritetsfrågor i ljuset av Sveriges officiella minoritetspolitik*. 2004.
3. Eric de Geer & Vera Lif, red., *Ingermanlänarna 60 år i Sverige. Symposiet i Örebro den 18 juni 2005*. 2007.
4. *Kunskap för egenmakt. Minoritetskvinnor och folkbildningen*. 2010.
5. Leena Huss, *Ska vi tala finska? En idéskrift för finskan i Sverige – Puhutaanko suomea? Ideoita suomen kielen elvytykseen*. 2010.
6. Krista Orama, *"Vi är ju också människor!" Ett barnrättsperspektiv på nationella minoriteter i Sverige*. 2011.

THE HUGO VALENTIN LECTURES

1. Saul Friedländer, *Mass Murder and German Society in the Third Reich. With Two Articles by Hugo Valentin*. 2002.
2. Henry R. Huttenbach, *The Universality of Genocide. With an Article by Hugo Valentin*. 2004.
3. Wolfgang Benz, *Anti-Semitism in Europe. Traditions, Structures, Manifestations. With a Chapter from Hugo Valentin's Antisemitism: Historically and Critically Examined*. 2004.
4. Debórah Dwork, *Auschwitz and the Holocaust. With an Article by Hugo Valentin*. 2007.
5. Nechama Tec – Claudia Koonz, *Explorations of Oppression and Resistance – How Racism became Respectable*. HV Lectures V–VI. 2012.
6. William A. Schabas – Nanci Adler, *What's in a Word? Atrocity Crimes and the "Genocide" Label – Communism's "Bright Past": Narratives of Loyalty to the Party before, during, and after the Gulag*. HV Lectures VIII–IX. 2013.

UUHGS PUBLICATIONS

1. Laura Palosuo, *Yellow Stars and Trouser Inspections. Jewish Testimonies from Hungary, 1920–1945*. Diss. 2008. (Distr: Uppsala Univ. Library.)
2. Karin Kvist Geverts, *Ett främmande element i nationen. Svensk flyktingpolitik och de judiska flyktingarna 1938–1944*. Diss. 2008. (Distr: Uppsala Univ. Library.)
3. Helmut Müssener & Per Jegebäck, red., *Rasen och vetenskapen*. 2009.

DIGITALA SKRIFTER FRÅN HVC

1. Boglárka Straszer, *Ungrare, ungerska och ungersk kultur i Sverige och Finland. En översikt*. 2010. (Diva fulltext)

HUGO VALENTIN-

FÖRELÄSNINGEN 2018

DEN SEXTONDE HUGO
VALENTIN-FÖRELÄSNINGEN

8 mars 2018

Prof. STATHIS N. KALYVAS
University of Oxford

REVISITING THE LOGIC OF CIVIL WAR
VIOLENCE

State of the Art and Future Perspectives

DEN SEXTONDE HUGO VALENTIN-FÖRELÄSNINGEN hölls av professor Stathis N. Kalyvas, Universitetet i Oxford. Kalyvas är samhällsvetare och en ledande forskare inom fältet "civil war studies", med boken *The Logic of Violence in Civil War* som främsta vetenskapliga verk. Under föreläsningen anknöt Kalyvas till sin tidigare forskning om inbördeskrig, vari undersöks hur våldet mot civila ofta ses som en "naturlig" förlängning av krigets logik. Denna typ av våldsutövning har givit upphov till förundran och fascination, eftersom dödandet strider mot grundläggande band av gemensamt medborgarskap, grannskap och social gemenskap, till och med familjerelationer. Kalyvas diskuterade med utgångspunkt i sin tidigare och mycket omfattande forskning denna problematiken utifrån nyare forskningsrön och med konflikter i närtid som empiriska exempel.

Stathis N. Kalyvas innehar Gladstone-professuren i samhällsvetenskap vid Institutionen för politik och internationella relationer, Universitetet i Oxford. Han har mottagit ett flertal prestigefyllda utmärkelser för sin forskning och varit gästforskare vid universitet och forskningsinstitutioner såsom European University Institute, Max Planck-Institutet, Universitetet i São Paulo och Lingnan-universitet i Hong Kong.

Tidigare års Hugo Valentin-föreläsare:

2017 Christopher R. Browning
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

2016 Cathie Carmichael
University of East Anglia, Norwich

2015 Dieter Pohl
Alpe-Adria Universität, Klagenfurt

2014 Dan Michman
Bar-Ilan-universitetet och Yad Vashem, Jerusalem

2013 Ervin Staub
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

2012 Ulrich Herbert
Freiburg Institute for
Advanced Studies, Freiburg im Breisgau

2011 Nanci Adler
Royal Netherlands Academy of
Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam

2010 William A. Schabas
National University of Ireland, Galway

2009 Omer Bartov
Brown University, Providence, R.I.

2008 Claudia Koonz
Duke University, Durham, N.C.

2006–2007 Nechama Tec
University of Connecticut at Stamford

2005 Debórah Dwork
Clark University, Worcester, Mass.

2004 Wolfgang Benz
Technische Universität Berlin

2003 Henry R. Huttenbach
City College, City University New York

2001–2002 Saul Friedländer
University of California Los Angeles



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Hugo Valentin-centrum

Verksamma 2018

Lior Becker, doktorand
Berit Bliesemann de Guevara, gästforskare
Robert Borges, postdoktor
Carl Henrik Carlsson, forskare
Reçep Doğan, gästforskare
Tomislav Dulić, universitetslektor, föreståndare
Satu Gröndahl, universitetslektor
Holly Guthrey, forskare
Michelle Gordon, postdoktor
Anne Heith, gästforskare
Johannes Heuman, postdoktor
Leena Huss, professor emer.
Stefan Christian Ionescu, universitetslektor
Theresa Johnsson, postdoktor
Roland Kostić, universitetslektor
Kate Lonergan, doktorand
Hiroshi Maruyama, hedersdoktor
Goran Miljan, postdoktor

Hugo Valentin-centrum är en tvärvetenskaplig enhet vid Historiska institutionen med huvudsaklig inriktning på forskning och utbildning inom två områden: studiet av kulturella, sociala och politiska fenomen och förändringsprocesser relaterade till den etniska dimensionen i mänskligt liv, respektive Förintelse- och folkmordsstudier (Holocaust and genocide studies). Till områdena hör t. ex. minoritetsstudier, flerspråkighet, etniska relationer, Balkanstudier, Förintelsens historia, studiet av folkmord och liknande förbrytelser, samt våldets effekter på individ och samhälle. Forskningen bedrivs från såväl nordiska som vidare internationella perspektiv, där kultur, språk, historia, religion och politik är givna utgångspunkter för verksamheten. Hugo Valentin-centrum skall koordinera verksamheten Nationella minoriteter i Sverige (NAMIS) och kan även arbeta med att ta fram uppdragsutbildningar. Utbildningen sker företrädesvis inom Masterprogrammet för studier kring Förintelsen och folkmord, men även inom minoritetsstudier, språkso- ciologi och nationalism.

Helmut Müssener, professor emer.
Ida Ohlsson Al Fakir, postdoktor
Jim Porter, postdoktor
Nika Pontinkara, postdoktor
Pontus Rudberg, postdoktor
Sywia Szymańska-Smolkin, postdoktor
Kerstin Öhman, ekonomiadministratör

Styrelse (2016–2018)

Mohammad Fazlhashemi, professor i islamisk teologi och filosofi, Teologiska institutionen, Uppsala universitet (ordf.)
Karen Bronéus, lektor i freds- och konfliktforskning, Samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten, UU
Michael Dunn, professor i lingvistik, språkvetenskapliga fakulteten, UU
Satu Gröndahl, universitetslektor i finska, Hugo Valentin-centrum, Uppsala universitets personalorganisationer
Heléne Lööw, Universitetslektor i historia, Historisk-filosofiska fakulteten, UU
Pontus Waldemarsson, studerande, Uppsala universitets studentkårer

The Hugo Valentin Centre is an inter-disciplinary unit at the Department of History with its main focus on research and education within two prioritized areas: on the one hand cultural and social phenomena and processes of change related to the ethnic dimension in human life, on the other hand Holocaust and genocide studies. To these subject fields belong for instance minority studies, multilingualism, ethnic relations, Balkan studies, Holocaust history, the study of genocide and similar atrocities, as well as the effect of violence on individuals and society. Research is carried out from Nordic as well as wider international perspectives, where culture, language, history, religion and politics are natural points of departure for the activities. The Hugo Valentin Centre has the task to coordinate the research and teaching activities concerning the activity National minorities in Sweden (NAMIS) and may also develop contract teaching courses. Teaching is primarily carried within the framework of the Master Programme in Holocaust and Genocide Studies, but also in the fields of minority studies, socio-linguistics and nationalism.

Medverkande i *Multiethnica* 38 (2018):

Diana-Petronela Adomnicăi, masterstudent i skandinavistik, Uppsala universitet

Tomislav Dulić, docent i historia och föreståndare vid Hugo Valentin-centrum,

Uppsala universitet

Johan Eddebo, teol. dr i religionsfilosofi, Uppsala universitet

Lisa Grahn, doktorand i litteraturvetenskap, Uppsala universitet

Satu Gröndahl, docent och universitetslektor i finska, Uppsala universitet

Malin Jordal, fil. dr i internationell hälsa, Uppsala universitet

Astrid Juckenack, fil. mag. i Förintelse- och folkmordsstudier, Uppsala universitet

Lily Kahn, docent i hebreiska och judiska språk vid Institutionen för hebreiska och judiska studier, University College London

Maria-Carmen Lungu, fil. mag. i skandinavistik, Uppsala universitet

Cecilia Luzon, fil. mag. i litteraturvetenskap, Uppsala universitet

Simo Muir, hedersforskare vid University College London, samt docent i judiska studier vid Helsingfors universitet

Viola Parente-Čapková, docent vid Åbo universitet och Karlsuniversitetet, Prag

Jim Porter, fil.dr i historia, Uppsala universitet

Miika Tervonen, fil.dr, seniorforskare vid Migrationsinstitutet i Finland och docent vid Helsingfors universitet

Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi, universitetslektor i finska, Uppsala universitet



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

HUGO VALENTIN-CENTRUM

The Hugo Valentin Centre

Box 521, SE-751 20 Uppsala

Tel. +46-(0)18-471 23 59

Fax. +46-(0)18-471 23 63

E-post info@valentin.uu.se

Webbplats: www.valentin.uu.se

Besöksadress:

Engelska parken HC, Hus 4

Thunbergsvägen 3 D, plan 1

Uppsala

multiethnica

Hugo Valentin-centrum, Uppsala universitet

Nr 38 (2018)

ISSN: 0284-396X | © Hugo Valentin-centrum 2018

Redaktör: Satu Gröndahl (e-post: satu.grondahl@valentin.uu.se)

Medredaktör detta nummer: Ida Ohlsson Al Fakir

Redaktionskommitté: Satu Gröndahl, Ida Ohlsson Al Fakir, Carl-Henrik Carlsson, Johannes Heuman.

Ansvarig utgivare: Tomislav Dulić

Tryck: Kph, Uppsala

Omslagsfoto: Gary Wornell, Finska litteratursällskapet