Introduction

EUROPE AND BEYOND

Milica Trakilović and Gabriele Proglio

This edited volume engages with the "question of Europe," which relates to the discursive meaning and function of the term, using a combined lens of postcoloniality, mobility, and memory that highlights the need to foreground noncanonized cartographies of Europe in the current political context. Cartography, as interpreted by the contributors to this volume, does not merely refer to the practice of mapmaking, although this endeavor has always entailed an ideological function of centralizing, universalizing, and personifying Europe (Dainotto 2007: 38). Rather, we conceive of the project of mapping from a broader and more politically informed perspective as an intervention and active engagement with the symbolic chain of meaning, representation, and narration of Europe. The symbolic conceptualization of Europe—that is, the way Europe is and was imagined—is part of the process of border building that informs the framing of all aspects of Europeanness. As Dainotto observes, this "rhetorical unconscious" of Europe "still determines what we think and do about it; what our dailies report; and what our policy makers decide" (2007: 8). Thus, initiatives that challenge discursive hegemonic and representational politics constitute interventions relating to an ongoing reconfiguration of Europe, looking beyond the centrality of the notion of Europe and opening it up to a consideration of multiple significations and associated assemblages.

The task of "looking beyond" also applies to the organization of this volume and permeates its content. While the chapters constituting this collective volume are the cumulative outcome of the "Bodies Across Borders in Europe: Oral and Visual Memory in Europe and Beyond" (BABE) Project funded

by the European Research Council, we also invited external collaborators to contribute to the book to foster a dynamic and ongoing investigation into debates surrounding contemporary Europe. Specifically, this book was thematically and theoretically configured by our investigation of the relationship between mobility and memory, considered as a key discursive and conceptual cluster within postcolonial Europe. In the following sections, we expand on each of these notions by highlighting relevant scholarly debates and theoretical insights that have informed our understanding of postcolonial Europe, mobility, and memory. We subsequently describe the organizational rationale and structure of the book.

Postcolonial Europe

At this critical juncture, life in Europe assumes a particular meaning of an enduring peace that is unmarked by the chronological timeline of wars occurring outside of its borders. The idea of Europe as an island of peace and freedom brings to mind the centrality of the colonial conception of modernity that equated Europe with progress and civilization. There is a clear connection between the mid-eighteenth-century imaginary and the contemporary social perception of Europe as a place devoid of conflict under the white man's law. One of the main reasons for the endurance of this collective memory, which, according to Halbwachs (1950), is associated with being European, is the reproduction of a hegemonic cultural heritage through the device of the European border system. Merely reversing the model by refuting the centrality of Europe is not sufficient. What is required is an inquiry into how colonialities have been problematized and deployed within personal and shared memory that necessitates a reconsideration of the positionalities of non-white and non-hegemonic subjects within Europe. Applying multiple research pathways, we sought to do this within the BABE Project.

Two moments are critical to our exploration of Europe, mobility, and memory: the post-9/11 moment and the European migration "crisis." Both of these moments have reverberated in the West, reflected in the rise of an anxiety-ridden politics that has not only led to the framing of migrants as cultural outsiders but has also entailed their subjection to processes of pathologization and racialization that are intended to legitimize their expulsion from, or differential inclusion within the national-cultural frameworks of each of the countries within Europe. A consideration of these processes solely from a presentist framework obscures the ways in which they have been informed by much longer historical legacies of multiple imperialisms and colonialisms that reverberate with Europe's prevailing understanding of itself. This historical dimension is crucial for apprehending the rise of right-wing

politics and the forms that it has assumed in different European contexts to oppose this charged figure of cultural otherness. The ways in which the Other is invoked again and again—within the media, popular discourse, and in politics and policies—is indicative of a "neo" hidden within the postcolonial, which, as Gilroy argues, "will have to be ruthlessly and repeatedly uncovered and interrogated" (2016: xvi). Therefore, an understanding of Europe's post-colonial characteristics enabled the contributors to this volume to reflect on how their sources—ethnographic and archival data and visual and discursive material—relating to colonial and imperial historical processes could be critically assessed and connected to the present moment.

While we do not consider the notion of Europe to be singular, we do acknowledge that an idea of Europe as a clearly delineated and exceptional place is a potent one that has been mobilized within contemporary popular and political discourses. As Derrida (1992: 60) famously argued, the discursive construction of Europe as a "heading" or privileged place has always been predicated on its self-propagation according to an image of Western progress through the production of difference and otherness. Moreover, Stuart Hall pointed out that Europe is perennially caught up in a search for its identity, its place in the chain of possible representations, noting that this quest is predicated on the invocation of that which is outside of it (Hall 2002: 60). The contributors to this volume query how notions of the outside (that which is "beyond" Europe) and the Other are mobilized within anxiety-ridden political responses to migrants and refugees in Europe. At the same time, they critique these exclusionary processes, recognizing their long-enduring historical roots in bodies of otherness within colonial discourses. This critique interrogates the meaning of contemporary Europe, which, as Sandra Ponzanesi argues, exists as "a paradox that undermines the idea of Europe as a historical project based on singularity and exceptionalism while subscribing to the future of Europe as a location for hope and cosmopolitan solidarity" (2016: 160). It is precisely this double gesture of producing a critique on the one hand while introducing alternative registers of meaning on the other hand that characterizes our efforts to go "beyond" and "map" Europe differently.

Even though we acknowledge that Europe has been shaped by ideas of difference wherein that which is outside of Europe is othered, we also want to highlight some of the ways in which the idea of Europe is sustained through internal divisions and hierarchies. For instance, we consider how the idea of Europe has been constructed on the basis of a dichotomy that separates centers and peripheries as well as immediate border zones and more "inward" destinations. Étienne Balibar proposed an imaginary of Europe conceived as a composite of concentric circles comprising one central core and several outer areas, the relevance of which progressively diminishes as their distance

from the nucleus increases (Balibar 2004: 169). Prevailing anxieties around migration further complicate and augment this construction. Considered from this perspective, Italy as well as countries like Greece, Turkey, and some of the Balkan countries can be considered as places of immediate arrival, whereas countries such as the Netherlands and other more "inward" destinations like Austria, Germany, and Scandinavia can be considered as places that mark the continuation of those journeys, thus revealing a significant geopolitical tension that requires further investigation. In this volume, we specifically consider what the differential placement of Italy and the Netherlands within the political framework and imaginary of Europe reveals about changing configurations of Europe in light of the phenomena of migration and mobility in the early twenty-first century. Italy and the Netherlands are differentially positioned in terms of their colonial histories and legacies and within discourses on European migration. Whereas Italy is metaphorically viewed as one of the "doors" to Europe, the Netherlands is conceived as part of the centers of Europe. Consequently, the picture that emerges from a joint examination of the statuses of migration, mobility, and memory in contemporary Europe, wherein they are brought into dialogue with each other, while not purporting to be a comprehensive one, is nevertheless timely and urgent.

In recent decades, both countries have witnessed significant cultural shifts in public and critical responses to their respective colonial legacies. The public cultural sphere in Italy has been innovated as a result of what can be termed a postcolonial turn effected by scholars, writers, and artists who have drawn attention to the historical responsibilities of the country—continuing to the present—in terms of its relationships with former colonized countries and populations. Of particular interest to the BABE Project has been the demonstration and denouncement of the involution and rigidification of "Fortress Europe" and the role of Italy in this process that have been clearly evident within the postcolonial literature and the visual arts. The Netherlands is undergoing a related process in which various individuals and groups (including scholars, critical thinkers, writers, activists, and artists) are assuming a more prominent role in addressing the country's colonial legacies that are still largely underaddressed or denied. Projects such as *Zwarte Piet is Racisme* ("Black Pete is Racism"), the Amsterdam Black Heritage Tours, and debates emphasizing the need to decolonize institutions, such as the well-known Tropenmuseum (Tropics Museum), are all examples of initiatives taken in the last decade that have sought to highlight, problematize, and dismantle colonial practices that constitute part of the Netherland's cultural capital.

The contributions in this volume consider how both Italy and the Netherlands have been shaped by historically and regionally specific discourses that nonetheless contribute to the symbolic delineation of Europe and to the

actual fortification of European borders. According to David Theo Goldberg, Europe is ultimately a raced phenomenon; but within Europe, different racial histories and narratives can be distinguished. These racial regionalizations should be understood as "regional models or mappings, rather than ideal types, broad generalizations as contours of racist configuration, each one with its own material and intellectual history, its prior conditions and typical modes of articulation" (Goldberg 2006: 333). Moreover, these regional models correspond to various national formations and to the tendency to "erase" race from conscious reflection while retaining it as a central pillar of identity that corresponds to the overarching racialized framework of Europeanization, providing a sense of coherence and contributing to the idea of Europe as an exceptional place.

The production of racisms and cultural Otherness both in Italy and the Netherlands can be examined from the perspectives of their particular regionalisms as well as from a broader European perspective. Convergences can be seen in terms of the mounting fear, xenophobia, various forms of racism, as well the explicit efforts of some political parties to exploit these public feelings. In the Netherlands, much of the public response to the current refugee crisis, but also to other cultural phenomena such as the hotly debated Sinterklaas celebrations, has revolved around anxieties that stem from the desire to safeguard some kind of assumed "authentic" Dutch national identity through a disavowal of how colonialism has shaped and continues to inform the Dutch cultural sphere. Growing skepticism and fear regarding the influx of cultural Others have given rise to ever stricter policies and procedures relating to immigration, integration, and the granting of asylum. Whereas previous policies (notably those implemented in the 1960s and 1970s) emphasized cultivating newcomers' languages and cultural practices, the new laws on integration foreground cultural homogeneity, mandating familiarization with the Dutch language and customs. Since the turn of the twenty-first century, Italy, which has long been a country of immigrants, has undergone a process of sensitization—both in a negative and a positive sense—toward the reception and acceptance of new waves of immigration. This shift can be partly attributed to the country's postcolonial geopolitical location extending across the Mediterranean in a way that has been formative of its pivotal role as a "door to Europe." The development of xenophobic and racist attitudes in a country that formerly boasted about "not being racist" is striking when compared with a history of labor emigration from Italy, especially to the Americas but also, to a lesser extent, to Australia and other parts of the world. A postcolonial feature of the Italian situation with negative reverberations is apparent in the enduring perception of past colonial engagements as insignificant and even appeals to this colonizing past as justification for interventions aimed at curbing migration from African countries, as in the cases of Libya

or Niger. While memories of Italian colonialism have faded within the public sphere, the language that has evolved within this domain—forged through representations, images, imaginaries, and practices inscribed on black bodies—is being deployed to impose new forms of difference, exploitation, and segregation that are positioned between exclusion and differential inclusion.

Italy and the Netherlands can be understood as sites of potent discursive clusters relating to the configuration of contemporary Europe. In the context of this volume, their positioning is not intended to be comparative; rather, they represent productive analytical starting points because of their convergences and divergences in relation to colonialism and imperialism. It is their contributions to "Europe's undigested colonial history" (Gilroy 2016: xi), viewed through a critical postcolonial lens, that the authors of this volume seek to elucidate.

Mobility

In this volume, we consider the faculty of mobility to be intimately intertwined with literal and symbolic as well as tangible and discursive border-making processes that determine, direct, and are challenged by present-day movements of bodies across European borders. The approach to mobility applied in this volume is theoretically informed by critical border studies, an interdisciplinary field of research on contemporary borders conceived not as fixed phenomena (according to the "line in the sand" metaphor) but rather as a dispersed set of practices. This conceptualization of the border as a set of practices fosters an understanding of the performative dimension of borders that "injects movement, dynamism, and fluidity into the study of what are otherwise often taken to be static entities" (Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2012: 729). These insights are linked to a multiperspectival approach to borders, as proposed by Chris Rumford (2012), which is particularly useful because this kind of study does not focus on a single site or experience of borders. Instead, bordering practices are understood to be dispersed, multiple, and entangled, and the aim is to formulate an account of contemporary bordering practices that acknowledges this complexity while avoiding claims to exclusivity or finality. While the account of Europe that emerges within this volume echoes these principles, the analytical breadth of the contributions is indicative of the need for hybrid conceptualizations of Europe that encompass multiple levels of analysis.

Furthermore, studying mobility through the notion of the border is not a singular enterprise. Given the equivocal quality of borders (Balibar 2002: 78), it is not productive to ask what the border is. A more appropriate inquiry is to examine how it comes into being; how it is constituted and

enacted—institutionally and symbolically—in the name of Europe; and how it impacts migrating subjects. Accordingly, Leila Whitley suggests that the border should be conceptualized as a verb, that is, "something that must be done in order to come into being, and that does not exist as a noun without this active, processual, doing of the border" (Whitley 2015: 14). An emphasis on the processual nature of the border within critical border studies also reflects this principle and is indicative of the ways in which borders (and thus mobility) are "intimately bound up with the identity-making activities of the nation-state and other forms of political community" (Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2012: 730). Thus, the studies of the mobility of individual migrants and groups of migrants presented in this volume are always situated within a broader framework of institutionalized border regimes within Europe.

More concretely, and from a geopolitical perspective, Europe has multiplied its boundaries (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013), externalizing its borders to Frontex—the EU agency responsible for border controls—and simultaneously restricting the movements of non-EU subjects toward and within Europe. "Fortress Europe"—a term used during World War II and subsequently reintroduced in recent years by journalists—is riddled with checkpoints, walls, barbed wire, military posts, and border fortifications, such as those constructed in the Spanish North African enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla. The Mediterranean Sea has become an "open-air cemetery," with more than thirty thousand dead since 2000 (Del Grande 2007). The management of the "migration crisis" by Italy, given its location within the central Mediterranean area, has been criticized. Several policies that were planned and implemented by governments of different political orientations in Italy demonstrate continuity in terms of their focus on securing national territories. Moreover, with the shift from Turco-Napolitano Law, enacted in 1998, to the Minniti-Orlando Act of 2017, conditions have worsened for non-EU people attempting to cross borders and apply for national citizenship. The colonial experience and its periodization for each national case can be understood as a common and diversified strategy for controlling mobility within a global and interconnected space. Colonies were practically managed through the creation of a system of routes used to move people and goods that took into account the roles and claims of other nations that were actors performing on the same military and political stage. In this sense, colonialism can be interpreted as a complex system of intertwined and overlapping devices for organizing space and producing, through a process of subjectivation, genealogies and positionalities that continue to endure in contemporary Europe.

During the course of the five-year BABE research project (2013–2018), the researchers who contributed to this volume encountered some of the recent changes in the configuration of Europe's borders. More generally, given

the growing dangers entailed in pursuing migration paths or crossing borders for non-European people, it has become progressively more difficult to stay in contact with individuals who have just arrived in Europe. There has been a sudden increase in deportations from the North to the South, both within individual European countries and within a wider geopolitical context. Additionally, as a consequence of the spread of xenophobia across Europe, societies have been resegmented and new liminal positionalities have been defined and assigned to new Europeans. Borders restructure the social hierarchies within each European nation and have been operative in the imposition of a subjectivity of otherness on the bodies of non-Europeans, calling into question the cluster of imaginaries, representations, and practices of domain that have been formative of the colonial archive (Stoler 2008). Consequently, these subjects have been assigned a positionality within Europe that is framed in terms of labor, citizenship, and status.

The arrival in Europe of tens of thousands of people attempting to escape from social, economic, and ecological emergencies has provoked different perceptions of "migrant" mobility. Through the mobilization of the European colonial archive (Said 1978; Stoler 2008; Wekker 2016), images of non-white subjects as enemies preparing to invade and conquer the land, to undermine the health of societies, and to compromise their economic and social equilibria have been evoked within the public imaginary. Populisms promoted by xenophobic parties in Europe have prompted the mobilization of racial hierarchies, some of which originate in the colonial era (Muddle and Rovira Kaltwasser 2017). Within the Dutch public sphere, the onset of the twenty-first century has been marked by debates surrounding the perception of a threatening or unmanageable number of migrants entering the country, resulting in a tightening of the country's immigration and integration policies. Populist sentiments have gained traction through discourses of xenophobia and homonationalism in which the cultural Other, often conflated with the image of the Muslim/refugee, is seen to pose a threat to Dutch traditions and values.

This fear of the Other has generated a genealogy of subjects who are considered "non-something": non-European, non-white, non-French, and so on. At the same time, a vocabulary has been mobilized and deployed for nominating and assigning a positionality to the subject, who is described using a "declaration of negation." Individuals are ranked according to their condition of mobility (migrants), citizen status (refugee, asylum seeker, etc.), place of origin (Morocco, Africa, Maghreb, etc.), and skin color (black or ways of being non-white). Thus, for the most part, descriptions of new Europeans have been and continue to be framed in terms of a "denial of being us" that refers to a national community and as a "denial of self" through a process of subjectivation imposed on their bodies. This process starts with the recognition of

bodies in movement at the border, their categorization, and the subsequent attribution of positionalities within or outside of the destination society.

The limited possibility of bestowing a meaning encompassing both "us" and "self" as a metaphor of the physical and social mobility of new Europeans across Europe's borders is being questioned and sometimes subverted. In fact, diasporic networks and black communities within Europe have been introducing other languages along with new meanings, social practices, and cultures. To talk about decolonization from below is not appropriate, as this entails once again assigning positionalities to processes, bodies, and subjectivities. Although diasporic cultural narratives have foregrounded a critique of Fortress Europe, their underlying intent of opposing hegemonic thinking is not always actualized. This does not mean that there is no resistance in place. On the contrary, the daily erosion of the centrality of white privilege within Europe and in its discourse is clearly evident (Mbembe 2013). Diasporic communities have had and continue to have a relevant role in directing individuals during the migratory journey, supporting and helping them to reach Europe. These communities were and are a symbolic refuge from the subjectivation process forged at Europe's internal and external borders through biopolitical practices. They enable new Europeans to stay connected with their loved ones who are thousands of kilometers away and to plan a kind of social redemption in response to their perception of being betrayed upon their arrival in Europe. For all of these reasons, and for many others that cannot be addressed here, diasporic communities are changing the public sphere and face of Europe, which, in the coming decades, will remain white only in the public imaginary.

The above reflections on the notion of mobility reveal the relevance of considering mobility in relation to a multiperspectival understanding of borders. It is important to note that the aim of a multiperspectival-border-studies approach is not to occupy the "standpoint of the subjugated," which is but one perspective. Multiperspectivalism in this case is not synonymous with "bottom up," although it may incorporate this view. Moreover, the borders in question are by no means always at the periphery. A multiperspectival approach to border studies is concerned with borders that are diffused throughout society as well as with those at the edges (Rumford 2012: 899). Adopting this approach allows us to consider how mobility and migration are mobilized and constrained in contemporary Europe by institutions and discourses that produce a "permanent condition of crisis" to legitimize wars, land-grabbing, and xenophobia and racisms in the name of Europe. At the same time, mobility is also a faculty that belongs to migrating subjects, diasporic communities, and "new" Europeans who are constantly crossing borders, challenging and redefining the meaning of Europeanness. It is this multiperspectival approach to mobility and borders that frames the chapters comprising this volume.

Memory

In this volume, we examine the role of memory in fostering as well as contesting wider cultural repertoires and imaginaries of and within Europe, considering its individual and collective dimensions as well as its historical and contemporary ones. Our choice of an elastic conceptualization of memory is a deliberate one, as narrow definitions and "attempts to separate" certain aspects and faculties of memory (whether individual or collective, canonized or unofficial, inside or outside of history, fiction or nonfiction) "prevent us from seeing the threads that connect such phenomena" (Errl 2011: 7). Moreover, "the individual person always remembers within sociocultural contexts," and "cultural formations are based on a 'collective memory'" (Errl 2011: 9). These principles have framed our use of the notion of memory throughout this volume. Along with the notions of postcolonial Europe and borders/mobility, memory served as an analytical tool that enabled us to navigate and study the manner in which Europe has been constructed as a constellation of diverse individual and collective imaginaries. Our inquiry seeks to identify memory discourses that have constituted a dominant conceptualization of Europe and to elucidate how alternative and critical memory practices can open up the question of Europe beyond an insular view.

We also seek to understand how memory politics in Europe have engendered colonial durabilities and forms of aphasia that exist in the present and that inform our understanding of Europe as a postcolonial space. In doing so, we are informed by Ann Stoler's conceptualization of colonial "duress" that demonstrates three key features: namely, "the hardened, tenacious qualities of colonial effects; their extended protracted temporalities; and, not least, their durable, if sometimes intangible constraints and confinements" (Stoler 2016: 7). Such a conceptualization of memory politics extends beyond a simplistic notion of memory as the recalling of events and asks how legacies from the past live on in occluded forms in present-day cultural and institutional practices, recognizing how "[c]olonial entailments endure in more palpably complicated ways" (Stoler 2016: 35). Our inquiry further seeks to elucidate how processes of racial denial and disavowal (Goldberg 2006; Wekker 2016) convey a denial of coloniality, constituting an ideology that severs the link between Europe's colonial history and the management of migration and mobility in contemporary Europe. The fact that migration to Europe in the past decade has been popularly and officially deemed a "crisis" accords with the repression of colonial memory and history, as both migration and colonialism represent forces that are seen as disruptive and alien to the European space and imaginary. Understood as such, their removal and containment is justified. Gurminder Bhambra makes the following observation: "The failure to address their own colonial history is part of the explanation for why

Europe and European politicians and intellectuals are seemingly unable to address their postcolonial present, or even recognize it as something other than an external intrusion disrupting an otherwise ordered European polity" (Bhambra 2016: 188). The denial of coloniality is a selective memory practice that is part of Europe's dominant memory politics and that perpetuates neocolonial practices in the present (Bhambra 2016: 189; Gilroy 2016: xvi). Consequently, the response to the migration "crisis" as well as the management of mobile populations is informed by older discourses of racialization, xenophobia, and European exceptionalism. A further implication of this memory practice is that multiple and oftentimes competing sets of memories exist between "new" Europeans and marginalized and racialized groups of Europeans on the one hand, and those "native" Europeans who experience migration as a crisis on the other. Accordingly, "the victims (and their descendants) of Europe's colonial crimes often know that bloody history [Europe's imperial and colonial past] far more intimately than the Europeans who appear to be doomed to reenact it" (Gilroy 2016: xiv).

This insight has two important implications for how we understand memory practices in relation to Europe in this volume. The first relates to the need to displace the notion of singularity and to think of Europe in pluriform, encompassing many different memory practices that shape it as both a real and imagined space. The question of Europe may thereby be opened up to alternative significations and cartographies, including the memory practices and mobile modalities of "new" Europeans and minorities. Second, dominant memory practices do not cancel out those that are more alternative, marginalized, or even silenced, even when they seem to stand in stark opposition to each other. Following Michael Rothberg's theory of multidirectionality, we consider memory as expansive and expanding, "working productively through negotiation, cross-referencing, and borrowing; the result of memory conflict is not less memory, but more—even of subordinated memory traditions" (Rothberg 2014: 176). Thus, there is a difference between memory as politics (ideological and institutional) and memory as practice (cultural, collective, and individual), although each of these modalities impact each other. Understanding memory as a practice attunes us to the ways in which memory is alive and continually negotiated. We understand memory practices to appear in many forms as plurimedia constellations (Errl 2011: 147) that may be oral, visual, textual, or archival, all of which feature in this volume. Our conceptualization of memory as both politics and practice and our emphasis on alternative and mobile memory challenges a singular narrative of Europe and asks how Europe may be reconfigured according to voices and narratives hitherto considered to be "in, but not of Europe" (Hall 2002: 57).

Mobility assumes a multiform meaning when other possible cultural geographies of Europe that stem from the memories of new Europeans and

non-Europeans are considered. It becomes an ongoing, perpetual, and collective process of rethinking memories of migration and colonialisms, entailing the production of informal knowledge. This knowledge, which emerges from the condition of being out of place in Europe and in diaspora within an ongoing dialogue between those people who are not considered European within Europe, is not immediately or necessarily in opposition to the idea of Europe grounded in border practices. Evidently, thousands of people have crossed and continue to cross frontiers illegally and to deploy methods of regularly bypassing and eluding border devices within Europe. Thus, the public and private spaces in which they live are shaped by the mobility of people and ideas produced within diasporic and migrant networks. To affirm the presence of multiple geographies of Europe that coexist with the official ones means to complexify the relationship between the roles of institutions and migrant flows that have no determinate ending. From another perspective, this affirmation suggests that those who are not considered European can resignify places within Europe through a combination of their mobility and memory.

As some prominent scholars have pointed out (e.g., Stoler 2008; Wekker 2016), the colonial archive is an organized system of knowledge constructed from representations, practices, and imaginaries that is primarily responsible for the creation of a past and present geography based on Eurocentrism and whiteness. The border is a device deployed in the production of space that has inherited the legacy of European colonial powers, namely the creation of forms of dominion over other lands and bodies. From this perspective, an analysis of migration paths can focus on the condition of migrant people in relation to both colonial cultures and postcolonial conditions. We adopted this approach to investigate the connection between Italy and the Netherlands, attending to the question of how people coming from former colonies experience multiple forms of violence as material and immaterial heritages of colonialisms along their migratory paths and subsequently in the act of remembering their condition upon their arrival in Europe. Racial minorities within Europe also deploy and reelaborate their memory of colonialisms and slavery to problematize inequality as the outcome of a tension that relates to their status as the descendants of those subjected to colonial violence and also as a consequence of discrimination experienced in postcolonial contexts. A postcolonial Europe can be conceptualized in terms of the assembling of many colonial archives and narratives through the device of the border while applying an interpretative gaze that extends across many countries and frontiers. Accordingly, the connection between Italy and the Netherlands can be viewed as one of many possible assemblages of migrant trajectories that postcolonial Europe imposes on migrants, those coming from multiple counties, and with many positionalities, who are obliged to move across Italy in order

to reach the Netherlands. Starting from a conception of this assemblage, which simultaneously encompasses colonialities and postcolonial conditions, all of the contributions in this volume have sought to foreground and analyze the role of memory and mobility in the emergence of multiple cultural geographies within Europe.

Organization of the Book

While *The Mobility of Memory* elaborates on some of the results of the BABE Project, its scope extends beyond these outcomes through the inclusion of two contributions by external collaborators. These analyses complement those of the BABE researchers, as they also grapple with questions of European identity, memory, and mobility. The nature of the topic of our inquiry—namely, the ways in which mobilities and memories currently shape and interrogate the "question of Europe"—necessitated this wider analytical framework. We were guided by the approach taken by Mezzadra and Neilson, who "question the limiting perspective imposed by the view that the breadth of research compromises its depth and rigor [and] proceed with the commitment that breadth can produce depth, or better, produce a new kind of conceptual depth, 'new ideas'" (2013: 10). Similarly, the contributions to this volume demonstrate an expansive analytical configuration aimed at mapping constraints and possibilities relating to the mobilities and memories of migrants as they negotiate the meanings of Europe.

The chapters in this volume deploy diverse datasets—ethnographic and archival data as well as discursive/textual and visual materials (drawings, art, and photographs). Interviews held with individual migrants or with groups of migrants conducted in educational settings, public spaces, and private residences in Italy and the Netherlands are key sources of data collected for the majority of the contributions. While a focus on the subjectivities, memories, and mobilities of migrants and minorities is essential for addressing our question on how Europe could be configured otherwise, our aim was not to produce an essentialized portrayal of the "mobile minority/migrant subject." Nor did we want to restrict our focus to "studying down" without also "studying up." The term "studying up" originates in Laura Nader's influential essay in which she urged anthropologists to turn their attention from the study of disenfranchised groups to dominant and powerful elites who are responsible for the conditions endured by the disempowered. Specifically, she advocated the "study of the colonizers rather than the colonized, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than the culture of poverty" (Nader 1972: 289). However, Nader's proposition does not simply entail a reversal of focus; as she noted, exclusively studying up would

eventually require the investigator to study down again. Therefore, she called for a simultaneity of "up, down or sideways" approaches within anthropological research (1972: 292). We believe that it would be pertinent to revisit this call in the current political climate, which is characterized by heightened attention to migration in Europe, particularly in light of a substantial body of research conducted on (im)migration that could run the risk of "fetishizing the immigrant as an anthropological object of study" (Coleman 2012: 161), thereby not sufficiently accounting for the structures and institutions that create and maintain the category of migrant/refugee. Therefore, the analytical framework developed in this volume should be considered as an "up, down [and] sideways" approach that simultaneously foregrounds migrant trajectories, experiences, and mobilities while offering a critique of the mechanisms of governmentality that generate the conditions under which borders are institutionalized and migrant and minority subjects are produced and regulated.

This book is structured around four sections, each of which engages with the notion of the mobility of memory in Europe from specific thematic positions that have informed the BABE Project. Each of these sections comprises two contributions that provide a focused entry point into the debate in question.

The first section of the book, titled "Mobility Framed by Language: Constraints and Possibilities," is aimed at problematizing and investigating the possibilities that are inherent in subjectivities framed by migration. In the first chapter, Milica Trakilović draws on her fieldwork conducted in the Netherlands to interrogate the constraints imposed on individuals who are made to identify with the "refugee" or "migrant" label while also revealing the potential for negotiating what is often perceived as a confining category. The second contribution in this section by Giada Giustetto explores narrative models communicated through words and images within the works produced by secondary school students in Italy with whom she engaged in the context of the BABE Project. The outcomes of her investigation are what she describes as different "languages of mobility" that are potential building blocks for a "pluricultural European identity."

A central emphasis in the contributions in the second section of the book, titled "Transcultural Subjectivities in Educational Settings," is on didactic practices that encourage the acknowledgment, safeguarding, and nurturing of different cultural backgrounds within the classroom. Graziella Bonansea's chapter is based on her work with secondary school students in Italy in the context of the BABE Project. The chapter explores how the participating students engaged with and responded to questions of cultural difference through their own visual depictions of embodied subjectivity, suggesting the possibility and desire to move from a national to a transnational belonging.

The second chapter in this section is a joint contribution by Emmanuelle Le Pichon-Vorstman, Sergio Baauw, Debbie Cole, Suzanne Dekker, and Marie Steffens, all researchers in the Education of International Newly Arrived Migrant Pupils (EDINA) Project. Drawing on data collected in the course of this project, these authors argue that the incorporation of migrant students' mother tongues within the (Dutch) school curriculum is not only advantageous for the students in question but it also benefits the classroom dynamic and enriches the overall learning process.

The third section of this volume, which is titled "Diasporic Memories and Archival Trajectories," is concerned with the question of how cultural memory is shaped and mediated by embodied subjects and specific cultural narratives. In the opening chapter, Gabriele Proglio conceptualizes the memories of Italy's Eritrean diaspora in terms of a "geography of emotion." The second chapter in this section by Liliana Ellena investigates the colonial archive that underlies two Italian films, both titled *Eva Nera*, which were respectively released in 1954 and 1976. She does so through an examination of the intertwined processes of production, distribution, and representation relating to these films. Both of these contributions are based on data collected during the BABE Project. In Proglio's case, the data were ethnographic, whereas Ellena used archival data.

The fourth and final section, titled "Visualizing Memory and Resistance," proposes a visually oriented conceptualization of resistance to oppressive nationalist and cultural frameworks. In her contribution, Iris van Huis presents an array of visual accounts, ranging from photographs to paintings and plays produced by individual migrants or collectives based on data she collected during her ethnographic fieldwork conducted in the Netherlands. These accounts entail a critique of xenophobic attitudes and discourses concerning migration to the Netherlands. In the second chapter in this section, Sara Verderi specifically analyzes the ways in which the Syrian diaspora in the Netherlands critically engage with violence and militarism through nonviolent visual and artistic means.

The four thematic sections of this volume each approach the topic of mobility, memory, and migration in Europe from distinct but interconnected entry points, thereby expanding the debate on symbolic as well as material European borders. The book not only conveys the reflections of the BABE researchers relating to different facets of their fieldwork experiences but it also includes the perspectives of two external collaborators from the Netherlands who were invited to share their research paths. These contributions have consequently challenged and complexified our own epistemological and methodological standpoints. The volume attempts to elucidate changing configurations of mobility and memory in Europe. At the same time, the individual contributions reflect our restitutive goals as a research group and

as individual scholars and trace research paths that illuminate topics, questions, and sociocultural transformations that will likely face Europe in the near future.

Milica Trakilović, PhD, teaches Gender and Postcolonial Studies in the Graduate Gender Programme at the Department of Media and Culture Studies, Utrecht University. As a research associate on the ERC project Bodies Across Borders: Oral and Visual Memory in Europe and Beyond, she conducted ethnographic research on groups and individuals with a migration background, focusing on migration trajectories. She also researched popular and political discourses that produce the categories of "migrant" and "refugee." Her PhD project focuses on border figurations in Europe, specifically the figure of the migrant and the geopolitical space of the Balkans.

Gabriele Proglio is an FCT researcher in the Centre for Social Studies at the University of Coimbra. He earned his PhD at the University of Turin, Department of History, with a research project on colonial imaginaries. He was a visiting scholar at the University of California, Berkeley, and assistant professor in History of the Mediterranean at the University of Tunis El Manar. As a research associate on the ERC project BABE, he conducted oral history research on migrants from the Horn of Africa. His research interests focus on colonial legacies in Europe, postcolonial societies, borders, frontiers, mobilities, and memories of migration across the Mediterranean. His recent publications include *Border Lampedusa: Subjectivity, Visibility and Memory in Stories of Sea and Land* (Palgrave, 2018) and *Decolonizing the Mediterranean: European Colonial Heritages in North Africa and the Middle East* (Cambridge Scholars, 2016).

References

Ambrosini, Maurizio. 2018. *Irregular Immigration in Southern Europe: Actors, Dynamics and Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Balibar, Étienne. 2002. *Politics and the Other Scene*. New York: Verso Books.

———. 2004. *We, The People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2009. "Europe as Borderland." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27: 190–215.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2016. "Whither Europe?" *Interventions* 18, no. 2: 187–202.

Campesi, Giuseppe. 2015. *Polizia della frontiera: Frontex e la produzione dello spazio europeo*. Rome: Derive Approdi.

Coleman, Matthew. 2012. "The 'Local' Migration State: The Site-Specific Devolution of Immigration Enforcement in the U.S. South." *Law & Policy* 34, no. 2: 159–90.

Dainotto, Roberto M. 2007. *Europe (In Theory)*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Del Grande, Gabriele. 2007. *Mamadu va a morire: la strage dei clandestini nel Mediterraneo*. Rome: Infinito.

Derrida, Jacques. 1992. *The Other Heading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Donnan, Hastings, Madeleine Hurd, and Carolin Leutloff-Grandits, eds. 2017. *Migrating Borders and Moving Times: Temporality and the Crossing of Borders in Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Errl, Astrid. 2011. *Memory in Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gilroy, Paul. 2016. "Foreword: Europe Otherwise." In *Postcolonial Transitions in Europe: Frontiers of the Political*, edited by Sandra Ponzanesi and GianMaria Colpani, xi–xxv. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Goldberg, David Theo. 2006. "Racial Europeanization." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, no. 2: 331–64.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1950. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Hall, Stuart. 1992. "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power." In *Formations of Modernity*, edited by Hall and Gieben, 185–227. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in Association with the Open University.

———. 2002. "'In, but Not of Europe': Europe and Its Myths." *Soundings* 22: 57–69.

Margulis, Matias, Nora McKeon, and Saturnino M. Borras, eds. 2014. *Land Grabbing and Global Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mbembe, Achille. 2013. *Critique de la Raison Nègre*. Paris: La Découverte.

Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Muddle, Cas, and Cristobal Rovira Kaltwasser. 2017. *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nader, Laura. 1972. "Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology*, edited by Dell Hymes, 284–311. New York: Pantheon Books.

Passerini, Luisa, Dawn Lyon, Enrica Capussotti, and Ioanna Laliotou, eds. 2007. *Women Migrants from East to West: Gender, Mobility, and Belonging in Contemporary Europe*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Parker, Noel, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2012. "Critical Border Studies: Broadening and Deepening the 'Lines in the Sand' Agenda." *Geopolitics* 17, no. 4: 727–33.

Ponzanesi, Sandra. 2016. "The Point of Europe: Postcolonial Entanglements." *Interventions* 18, no. 2: 159–64.

Rothberg, Michael. 2014. "Multidirectional Memory." *Auschwitz Foundation International Quarterly: Témoigner. Entre histoire et mémoire [Testimony between History and Memory]* 119: 176.

Rumford, Chris. 2012. "Towards a Multiperspectival Study of Borders." *Geopolitics* 17, no. 4: 887–902.

Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2008. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2016. *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Tazzioli, Martina. 2016. "Border Displacements: Challenging the Politics of Rescue between Mare Nostrum and Triton." *Migration Studies* 4, no. 1: 1–19.

Wekker, Gloria. 2016. *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Whitley, Leila Maire. 2015. "More than a Line: Borders as Embodied States." PhD dissertation, London, Goldsmiths, University of London.