INTRODUCTION

Racialization and Racism in Denmark

By Bontu Lucie Guschke, Iram Khawaja and Lene Myong

Our ambition with this special issue on “Racialization and Racism in Denmark” is to support and expand critical and generative engagements with how racialization and racism continue to influence, structure, and operate in a Danish context, including the territories and areas that are connected to Denmark through (post)colonial ties. We initiated work on the special issue in the spring of 2021, and while it responds to calls for more critical scholarship on colonialism, decolonialization, racialization, and (anti)racism across many fields, including those of gender and feminist studies in the Nordic countries, it also reflects how such research is gathering pace.

Gender studies constitutes an ambiguous force in relation to research on racialization and racism in Denmark. It is not a coincidence that “Racialization and Racism in Denmark” finds a home in Women, Gender & Research. This is illustrative of how gender studies functions as one (but not the only) entry point to critical interrogations of racialization and racism in Denmark. At the same time, gender studies’ historical investment in gender as its primary object, its reliance on white and Western epistemologies, and its attachments to institutional spaces dominated by white scholars, also hold true in a Danish context. These conditions continue to shape the field of gender studies and its approaches to race, and lead to complex and shifting internal relations between gender studies and research on racism and racialization.

As we discuss in this introduction, research on racialization and racism in Denmark has followed different but sometimes converging routes (see also Hansen & Suárez-Krabbe 2018; Hervik 2019a; Padovan-Özdemir & Øland 2022). Therefore, we refrain from making any claims about when the field of gender studies in Denmark ‘first’ started to engage with the themes of race, racialization, and racism, nor do we offer an exhaustive mapping of the existing literature, which includes the connections between gender and migration studies. We acknowledge that racist power structures have been scrutinized, engaged with, and countered for much longer and in more domains than those covered by us.

In this introduction, we focus our reflections on the relationship between gender studies in Denmark and research on racialization and racism over the past 30 years. Our aim is to consider both how gender studies has approached race and where we might be heading in terms of the emergence of what may or may not be considered a more established field of racism and racialization studies. As part of this endeavor, we recognize, acknowledge, and build upon the important critical
research on racism and racialization that has been conducted in a variety of fields in the past. Nonetheless, we assert that we need more research and more spaces for such research in a Danish, and more broadly speaking, a Nordic context.

Gender studies and the turn to ethnicity

Ethnicity, migration, and postcoloniality became focal points for Nordic gender studies during the 1990s and early 2000s (Mulinari et al. 2009). In the context of Women, Gender & Research, Signe Arnfred’s article “Pengene eller livet? Feministiske forskningsnoter med afsæt i Afrika” [“Money or life? Feminist research notes from Africa”, our translation] (1996) constitutes an early example of a discussion that grapples with white supremacy, ethnicity/race, and how feminist scholars approach such issues. However, these insights were not picked up by feminist researchers to reflect more carefully upon the impact of racism and white supremacy on contemporary Danish society and the field of gender studies itself. Instead, there was a more pronounced interest in postcolonial theory in analyses of (post)colonial relations and cultural production (e.g. Petersen 1996; Kledal 1997).

Inspiration from postcolonial theory also shaped ethnographic and qualitative research methods, which gained significant impact within Danish gender studies during the 1990s. Empirical studies examining contemporary processes of othering and minoritization (e.g. Staunæs 1998), hybridity (e.g. Mørck 1998), and identity formation among Muslims (e.g. Christiansen & Rasmussen 1996) sought to dislodge gender as a primary or isolated anchor point for feminist research, while emphasizing the relevance of other categories, most notably ethnicity. The turn to ethnicity converged with a more general orientation towards poststructuralism within gender studies, as feminist poststructuralist theory became a central inspiration for the theorization and analysis of issues such as ethnic-racialized forms of exclusion (Staunæs 2003, 2004). It is a topic for further studies to unpack in more detail how and to what effect the analytical category of ethnicity has shaped and/or foreclosed research on racism in Denmark, not only in relation to gender studies but across the human and social sciences. In gender studies, the concept of ethnicity proved useful to ‘diversify’ analyses of power, but the employment of ethnicity as a euphemism for race has also worked to support race-evasive vocabulary and perspectives.

Intersectionality without race

When feminist scholars started to use the concept of intersectionality in Nordic gender studies during the early 2000s, one of the motivations was to strengthen critical engagements with race (de los Reyes, Molina & Mulinari 2002). In many instances, however, intersectionality was taken up in ways that projected engagements with race as a possibility, but never as a core commitment or a priority for intersectional analyses. Many Nordic adaptations have sifted standpoint feminism out of intersectionality, and the concept has become more aligned with poststructuralist conceptualizations of subjectivity and performativity (for discussions of this point, see Carbin & Edenheim 2013; Hvenegård-Lassen & Staunæs 2020).

Critics have argued that Nordic (and European) adaptations have enacted a whitening and depoliticization of intersectionality: rather than foregrounding race, such adaptations have contributed to its erasure and the excavation of Black feminist thought (see e.g. Carbin & Edenheim 2013; Lewis 2013; Tomlinson 2013; Bilge 2014; Dahl 2021). Another point of critique concerns how the anchoring of intersectionality within a poststructuralist paradigm has enabled “assimilation into white liberal epistemologies” (Groglopo & Suárez-Krabbe 2023, 5). Gender studies scholars who have made contributions to intersectionality research in a Danish context have responded and engaged with a number of these assessments (for recent examples see Christensen & Jensen 2019; Fiig 2019; Faber, Christensen & Mørck 2019; Hvenegård-Lassen, Staunæs & Lund 2020; Lykke 2023). Some of these engagements have included
arguments for a re-orientation of intersectionality towards race (Hvenegård-Lassen & Staunæs 2020) and reckonings with white ignorance and accountability (Lykke 2020).

While the concept of intersectionality may thus have opened the door to considerations of race and critiques of ‘colorblindness’ in gender studies in Denmark, it is notable that, even though intersectionality has been applied to a range of research topics, the concept has not been used as a welcome starting point for generating more studies of structural and institutional racism in Denmark, or for studies with a dedicated focus on the oppression of Black or brown women and people. Early adaptations, as well as the ‘mainstreaming’ of the concept, have relied in many instances on a displacement of race, which has been articulated through the projection of race as an optional category. This has worked to suspend race as an urgent analytical commitment for gender studies, thus preserving “the epistemic habit of whiteness” (Dahl 2021, 117-118). Moreover, it bears mention that Black scholars and scholars of color working in Danish academia have to a large extent been absent from discussions and conceptual work on intersectionality. In this sense, adaptations of the anti-racist framework of intersectionality have worked to reinforce white exclusivity and epistemic reproduction within an academic system that grants only limited and differentiated access to non-white bodies.

Race-critical research

If we look beyond the field of gender studies to consider the broader landscape of research on racialization and racism in Denmark during the 1990s and early 2000s, we see that a number of studies have examined racism in media discourse and media representations of religious, ethnic, and racial minorities (e.g. Hussein, Yilmaz & O’Connor 1997; Hervik 1999, 2002; Yilmaz 2000). Other studies have addressed migration discourse, legislation, integration politics, and racial discrimination (e.g. Schierup 1993; Regilds 1995; Jagd 1997; Horst 1998; Justesen 2003; Singla 2004). Conceptualizations of a ‘new’ form of racism in Denmark, operating through the fixation of cultural differences that result in the subordination and racialization of minorities, were analyzed in many of these studies. While the concept of racism was explicitly mentioned and applied analytically, manifestations of racism were rarely investigated in relation to sexualized or gendered forms of oppression, or in the global context of colonialism. Kim-Su Rasmussen’s (2004) theorization of Danish racism constitutes a unique but overlooked contribution from this period. Building on the work of Frantz Fanon, Rasmussen warned against (liberal) conceptualizations of racism as prejudice or discrimination, instead emphasizing that colonial racism operates through the essentialization of national identities, a forgetting of colonial history, and as a traumatizing social and psychic structure.

Within gender studies, more race-critical research emerged during the 2000s and early 2010s; for example, in analyses of historical manifestations of racism in Denmark (Andreassen 2003; Andreassen & Henningsen 2011; Blaagaard & Andreassen 2012) and in empirical studies of racialization in Danish media representations (Andreassen 2007), the ethnic/racial othering of young men (Jensen 2007), and the principle of racial assimilation in transnational adoption (Myong 2009). In gender studies, as well as in adjacent research fields, a growing interest in critical perspectives on Nordic exceptionalism (Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012), and in particular whiteness (Frello 2007; Andreassen, Henningsen & Myong 2008), also left an imprint; for example, in studies of racialized and gendered forms of minoritization/majoritization in educational and pedagogical settings (Staunæs 2004; Kofoed 2005). It is also notable that the use of ethnicity as a privileged lens to understand Muslims and Muslimness was replaced by concepts such as religiosity and belonging (Khawaja 2010). This shift also produced critical examinations of how feminist ideals of gender equality were being mobilized by politicians to control and marginalize Muslim women (e.g. Andreassen & Siim 2010). It is also possible to observe a preliminary focus on racial capitalism during this period, for example in
research focusing on au-pair migration (Stenum 2011).

Although studies such as the above outlined new research areas and new research questions, feminist engagements with racialization and racism during the 2000s nevertheless appear to have been limited both in scope and in the choices of theoretical frameworks and in relation to research themes. Critical perspectives on Denmark’s colonization of Kalaallit Nunaat (see also Andersen, Hvenegård-Lassen & Knobblock 2015; Graugaard & Høgsfeldt this issue) – and territories in the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia – were not given much space or consideration within gender studies. This lack of engagement with racism’s colonial past and present has continued to characterize not only gender studies but the broader field of research on racism in Denmark.

**Interdisciplinary perspectives on racialization and racism**

Similarly to these concerns, critics have argued that research on racialization and racism in Denmark has employed a narrow theoretical and methodological repertoire, which contributes to rendering invisible the wealth of theories and methods that have been conceived outside the European and North American university (Hansen & Suárez-Krabbe 2018). Knowledge production from the Global South was, and remains, largely absent from the Euromodern university (Lapiņa et al. this issue). In the research on racialization and racism that has taken shape over the past 10 years, however, we do see indications of a broader range of theoretical approaches to racism being applied, as well as a more general shift away from analyses focusing on the racialization of identity and subjectivity towards analyses that are attuned to structural and institutional racism, the specificity of racism, and racism’s colonial and capitalist underpinnings.

Broadly speaking, we see two (connected) strands in this literature. One focuses on conceptualizing how racialization and racism are taking form in a Danish context. A growing cluster of studies use qualitative methods to approach racialization and racism at a micro level in order to conceptualize how whiteness, race, and/or colorblindness/racelessness shape cultural organizations (e.g. Thorsen 2020), reproduction and kinship (e.g. Kim-Larsen 2018; Andreassen 2019), media discourse and public debate (e.g. Smedegaard Nielsen 2014, 2021; Yilmaz 2016; Danbolt & Myong 2019; Hervik 2019b), and educational settings (e.g. Lagermann 2013; Khawaja 2015; Jaffe-Walter 2016; Padovan-Özdemir 2016; Skadegård 2018; Hvenegård-Lassen & Staunæs 2019; Vertelyté 2019; Li 2021; Vertelyté & Staunæs 2021; Berisha this issue; Li & Yang this issue). This has generated concepts such as “minority taxation” (Thorsen 2019), “racialized forecasting” (Yang 2021), “unspeakability” (Guschke 2023), a focus on the benevolence of racialized discrimination (Skadegård 2017), and how “good intentions are not enough” (Lagermann & Khawaja 2022), but also specific accounts of anti-Black racism (e.g. Diallo 2019; Hunter 2023) and anti-Muslim racism (e.g. Hassani 2023; Kristensen this issue). This is adding to more specific and expanded interpretations of how racism and structural discrimination coagulate at an institutional level and affect people’s everyday lives.

We also see a growing number of studies interested in using and developing creative methodologies such as memory work, autoethnography, and affective and embodied archives as methods to decolonize knowledge production within and beyond the classroom (e.g. Lapiņa 2018; Diallo & Friborg 2021; Khawaja 2022; Khawaja, Staunæs & Vertelyté 2023; Acharya & Musasya this issue; Loving Coalitions Collective this issue). Cutting across many studies is the use of and inspiration from affect theory (e.g. Andreassen & Vitus 2015; Myong & Bissenbakker 2016; Lindberg 2022; Bissenbakker 2023) and new materialist theorizations (e.g. Hvenegaard-Lassen & Staunæs 2019; Khawaja, Staunæs & Vertelyté 2023).

The second strand of literature is broadly characterized by interrogations directed toward the regulation and implementation of state racism and the connections between colonialism, capitalism, and the welfare state. This encompasses
studies that foreground coloniality and anti-Blackness as constitutive of modernity and contemporary Danish society (e.g. Elg 2020, 2021; Cramer, Elg & Jørgensen 2021; Hunter 2021, 2023) and research that takes Denmark’s colonial past as the starting point for theorizations of contemporary racism (e.g. Danbolt 2017; Hvenegård-Lassen & Staunæs 2020), including new and critical inquiries into the links between eugenics and racism (Sørensen this issue). As part of this stream of research, a growing number of studies interrogate racism as a state-sanctioned tool; for instance, by examining how state racism is implemented and enforced through detention and deportation regimes (e.g. Arce & Suárez-Krabbe 2018; Suárez-Krabbe & Lindberg 2019), in welfare state practices (Padovan-Özdemir & Øland 2022; Brodersen & Øland this issue), or through the regulation of labor (Spanger 2022). Several studies also approach racism through concepts of biopolitics and necropolitics (e.g. Nebeling & Bissenbakker 2021; Myong & Bissenbakker 2023; Brøndum this issue), or as an imperialist technology (Dahler 2020).

In the above overview, we have not differentiated between contributions from gender studies and contributions from other research disciplines. This is indicative of the theoretical and methodological shifts that have taken place over the past 10 years, which have led to research on racialization and racism in Denmark assembling in new patterns, less clearly defined by disciplinary borders. While it is our impression that research on racialization and racism has thereby become more interdisciplinary, we acknowledge that blurred disciplinary borders and overlapping approaches have always been a defining factor of research on racism and racialization in Denmark. These developments raise the question of whether research on racialization and racism is emerging to become its ‘own’ field, despite the continuing lack of institutional anchoring (see also the discussion of this point in Roundtable this issue).

Looking back over the past 30 years, it is evident that broader epistemological waves in the social sciences and humanities have formed the contested relations between the field of gender studies and critical research on racism and racialization. We noted above how the poststructuralist discursive turn during the 1990s and 2000s oriented Danish gender studies toward interrogating intersectionality, ethnicity, and—to a lesser extent—race, whilst the affective turn from 2000 onwards has informed conceptualizations of racialization as affective processes connected to emotions such as shame, discomfort, or anger, and with the power of mobilizing/obstructing societal change. We might also talk about the more recent new materialist turn in the social sciences, where performative, agentic human and non-human forces are shedding light on how race is always already at play in different contexts and processes of becoming.

Another significant development is the growing scholarly interest in the notion of racial capitalism which, influenced by Marxist thought, allows the reconceptualizing and rethinking of the historical continuities in the deep entanglement of capitalist and racist extraction. The perspective of historical engagement is also seen in decolonial theorizations of the Global North and the Global South, which have greatly influenced ways of interrogating processes of racialization as formed through continuous structures of colonial oppression and othering. Importantly, these shifts and changing approaches to racism and racialization do not form a well-aligned, progressive, and neat pattern. There are, and continue to be, many important and fruitful internal differences and disagreements in terms of conceptualizations, methodologies, theoretical inspirations, and levels of macro-micro analytical focus among scholars researching racialization and racism.

**Anti-racist knowledge production beyond academia**

This special issue has been produced at a time when research on racism, migration, gender, and sexuality is under close political scrutiny and heavy attack, with the aim of delegitimating and silencing these research fields (cf. Folketinget 2021; Dansk kønsforsknings indre og ydre rammer 2022). These attacks need to be seen within
a larger global political context, where the political mobilizations against social justice movements serve, among other things, to mainstream nationalist and anti-immigration politics. Over many years, and in many contexts, including Denmark, resistance to race-critical thinking has been a key driver of such attacks (see also Danbolt & Myong 2019; Schmidt 2021; Lapiņa et al. in this issue). There is no doubt that this makes the conditions for conducting research within the above-mentioned fields difficult because it rekindles a structural and historical reluctance to critically examine racism and white supremacy and a fear of doing so. This fear has been mobilized in particular via the categorization of research on racism and racialization as activism, and hence political and ‘pseudoscientific.’ In the case of minoritized and racialized researchers, there is an added dimension of belittling the research(ers) as too personally motivated and hence not neutral and failing to live up to the objective standards of ‘true science.’

This special issue does not intend to prove the scientific credentials and validity of research on racism and racialization by distancing itself from activism and thereby reproducing a racialized binary between white research and Black, Indigenous, and people of color activism. On the contrary, we wish to highlight how knowledge production on racism and racialization always occurs in many different ways and contexts. The anti-racist mobilization amongst Black, Indigenous, and people of color in Denmark is generating crucial insights and interventions, both in dialogue with, and in opposition to, research. This is evident, for example, in the cross-field of arts, research, and media. Small, independent publishers, translators, online publications, and media portals, such as Frikton, (un)told pages, Respons, and Marronage, have carved out alternative spaces for racialized people and anti-racist perspectives. Moreover, there has been a proliferation of literature, both translated and original, from Black, Indigenous, and people of color authors focusing on the affective, lived, and embodied processes of racism and racialization. Within the field of the arts, which has a long history of anti-racist struggle and solidarity, an “agitating aesthetics” (Danbolt 2020) emerged during the 2010s, with a growing number of artistic initiatives and interventions confronting colonialism and structural racism. An example of the contemporary interaction between art and research can be seen on the cover of this special issue, which was illustrated by Maya Acharya. On her choice of images and design, she writes: “I explore the theme of racialisation through a collection of fragments, materials, objects and visions that—to me—evoke embodiment, connection, desire, shattering, memory, and protection.”

Our aim for this special issue was, amongst other things, to create a space for a broad variety of analytical perspectives, knowledges, and interventions that critically engage with racial oppression. In our call for papers, we quoted scholar and poet Suhaïymah Manzoor-Khan (2019, 81-82), who pointedly writes:

*Equal access to unjust systems is not liberation*

*More people of colour on pedagogically unchanged reading lists is not salvation, and no number of black and brown faces in universities can fundamentally undo the racism.*

*Just because they give you a seat at the table doesn’t mean they’re prepared to change the room.*

Inspired by Manzoor-Khan, we wanted to assemble a collection of texts that move beyond calls for non-white inclusion and representation. We therefore encouraged submissions that enable us to understand, and radically change, the different rooms, structures, and processes that maintain and uphold racialized and colonial structures of subjugation and oppression. While we believe that many of the articles we are able to publish as part of this special issue engage with exactly these challenges, we also acknowledge that our—the editors’—own positioning as (junior and senior) scholars within academic institutions and our related orientation toward certain forms of
research and certain areas of knowledge production has undoubtedly shaped the submissions we received, as well as our editorial process. As an editorial team consisting of a non-Danish, queer scholar of color, a religious minoritized scholar of color, and a transnational adoptee of color, situated in different geographical locations (Germany, Norway, Denmark) we always tried to complement as well as challenge each other’s perspectives and hold each other accountable to our ambitions. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that there are more themes and perspectives that could certainly have been part of this issue; therefore, we hope that our work will be taken up, critically examined, and fruitfully challenged within the different communities aiming to understand and fight racialization and racism in Denmark.

Overview of the contributions to this special issue

The issue opens with a roundtable discussion that took place as part of the Danish Gender Studies Conference on 19 August 2022 at the University of Copenhagen. The roundtable was planned by the three editors of this special issue. While Iram Khawaja and Lene Myong chaired the discussion, Bonitu Lucie Guschke joined as a participant, together with researchers Elizabeth Löwe Hunter, Jin Hui Li, Oda-Kange Midtvåge Diallo, Mira C. Skadegård, and Ferruh Yilmaz. The roundtable participants discussed questions about the field of racialization and racism studies, the questions, topics, and bodies that have been excluded from this field, the relation between racialization and racism research and gender studies, and possible ways forward in regard to strengthening the field, the research, and its positioning during these times of political mobilization against researchers and academics engaged in studying racialization and racism. It thus opens up a variety of themes and questions that are further engaged within the eight articles, two essays, and three book reviews in this issue.

The first article is Maya Acharya and Gabriella Isadora Muasya’s “Sensible Ruptures: Towards Embodied and Relational Ways of Knowing,” in which the authors explore queer and racialized experiences in Danish academia through affective, embodied, and sensory ways of knowing. They conceptualize these as ‘sensible ruptures’ which are unfolded through the creation of an online, audio-visual archive that allows “thinking not only against, but beyond, disembodied colonial logics.” In their text, they work with queer epistolary forms in creating and sharing knowledge in a relational, affective, and situated way. Their article challenges and reconfigures in multiple ways how knowledge about racialization and racism is generated and made accessible.

In her article “In Women's Hands': Feminism, Eugenics, and Race in Interwar Denmark,” Victória E. Pihl Sørensen investigates how knowledge about eugenics was both shaped and utilized by bourgeois Danish women in their endeavor to promote ‘racial hygiene.’ Critically analyzing two stories, one of nationally acclaimed women’s rights advocate Thit Jensen and one of the Copenhagen Housewife Association’s eugenics radio Listener Group, Sørensen focuses in particular on the entanglements of race and class in the eugenic targeting of the poor and working class, identifying eugenics as a “decidedly racist project.”

Tringa Berisha investigates the complex relations between racialization and space in her article “Racialized Spatial Attachments: Researcher Positionality and Access in a Danish Suburban High School,” introducing the notion of ‘spatial attachments’ to grasp and analyze how bodies are positioned according to their assumed spatial and racialized attachments. The article is based on methodological reflections on how it is possible to gain access to and navigate through contested racialized spaces as a racialized and minoritized researcher.

Jin Hui Li and Ahrong Yang also write about space and racialization in educational contexts in Denmark, but include a temporal perspective on the experiences of racially minoritized girls/women in a Danish primary school context in their article “Forhandlinger af tilhørsforhold på tværs af tid. Racialt minoriserede kvinders erfaringer med at høre til i den danske folkeskole” [“Negotiations of belonging across time. Racially minoritized
women’s experiences of belonging in the Danish public school]). Drawing on spatial educational research, they investigate the experiences of racially minoritized girls/women between 1970 and the 1990s, as well as female students attending school today, and identify that belonging in the Danish primary school and in Danish society more generally is a constant struggle for racially minoritized female students. Working with time narratives, they are able to demonstrate that, neither in the 1970s nor today, is belonging neutral or taken for granted for racially minoritized students.

Tine Brøndum also works with narratives in her article “The Curse of the Refugee: Narratives of Slow Violence, Marginalization and Non-Belonging in the Danish Welfare State,” which draws on narrative interviews with people who have fled to Denmark, recently or in the past. Investigating central sites of refugee management: asylum camps, municipal integration initiatives, schooling, and employment, the article analyzes the racialization, control, and structural violence experienced during the process of being cast as a ‘refugee.’

In the article “We Are Never Allowed to Just Be Ourselves!: Navigating Hegemonic Danishness in the Online Muslim Counterpublic,” Morten Stinus Kristensen uses the notion of hegemonic Danishness as a dominant racial project in Denmark, which divides people into groups that belong and those that do not, depending on their imagined proximity to a socio-cultural and racialized understanding of what it means to be Danish. The article presents an analysis of how young Muslims navigate and counter this dominant racial project through public social media practices, revealing an emergent Danish Muslim counterpublic.

Marianne Brodersen and Trine Øland’s article, “Gendered Racism: The Emancipation of ‘Muslim’ and ‘Immigrant’ Women in Danish Welfare Politics and Professionalism,” delves into how emancipatory welfare initiatives are based on racial capitalist and Orientalist logics that produce controlling images of the Muslim girl as inhibited and the immigrant housewife as unfree. The authors specifically focus on the intersecting oppressions and gendered racism of Danish welfare politics and professionalism.

The final article in this special issue is a contribution by the Loving Coalitions Collective, entitled “The Magic of Feminist Bridging: A Mosaic of Anti-Racist Speech Bubbles about Othering in Swedish Academia.” Turning their focus to Denmark’s neighbor, Sweden, the collective—consisting of seven interdisciplinary gender studies scholars of diverse ethnic and racial origins—creates a feminist coalition with the aim of “questioning and shaking the colonial/racist foundations of Swedish academic knowledge production and the overall Swedish society.” Working with poems, letters, and personal testimonies that grapple with experiences and memories of Othering, racialization, and disidentification with Swedish academia and society, they offer not only a critical understanding of racism in the context of Swedish exceptionalism, colonial amnesia, and silence on Swedish whiteness, but also a creative methodological process that embraces lived and embodied knowledges.

The articles are followed by two essays. Naja Dyrendom Graugaard and Amalie Høgfeldt Ambrosius’ text “The Silent Genocide: Why the Danish Intrauterine Device (IUD) Enforcement in Kalaallit Nunaat Calls For An Intersectional Decolonial Analysis” turns its focus towards the colonial, racial, and gendered continuities of Denmark’s role as a colonial power in Kalaallit Nunaat. Engaging with the silenced history of Danish authorities initiating and performing coercive insertions of intrauterine devices (IUDs) in Kalaallit women and adolescents, the authors pinpoint the intimate relations between colonialism, racism, and patriarchy in Danish colonial practices and urge the forthcoming investigation to consider these entanglements in order to challenge the continuity of this act of gendered violence.

The second essay, “How Is the Anti/Not/Un-Racist University a Radical Idea? Experiences from the Solidarity Initiative at Roskilde University,” is written by a group of scholars who were involved in a university campaign for solidarity with anti-racist struggles at Roskilde University and around the world. The authors, Linda Lapina, Rashmi Singla, Julia Suárez-Krabbe, Karmen Tornius, and Laura Horn, describe the events surrounding
the solidarity campaign, which was initiated in 2020, including the continuing struggles to gain institutional support for the initiative. Working with the metaphor of doors, they reveal through their experiences how and for whom these institutions function, which doors are “opened, shut or slammed into someone’s face,” but also how “to continue to crack walls and push doors open.”


References


Introduction

Tomlinson, B. 2013. To Tell the Truth and Not Get Trapped: Desire, Distance, and Intersectionality at the Scene of Argument. Signs. 38(4), 993-1017.