The Question of Archival Reparations [Working title]

Özgen - Havekotte, A.

Publication date
2025

The question of archival reparations and the audiovisual heritage of migrant worker women from Turkey in the Netherlands

Aslı Özgen, Universiteit van Amsterdam

Prologue: An-sisters

Regarding the history of women of colour's political activism in the Netherlands, a young researcher Nawal Mustafa recently wrote: "het lijkt alsof er niks is, terwijl er heel veel is."[1] It looks like there is nothing; whereas, in fact, there is a lot!

These lines strongly resonated with my own journey in this research.

A few years ago, I started looking for media objects —such as films, television programmes, audio or print materials— produced by the Turkish left-wing activists (i.e. a wide range of shades from socialist to communist, Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary Marxist) for political campaigning. The initial hypothesis was "there isn't much in the archives." So have I heard repeatedly from scholars whom I consulted in the beginning of this journey, so have I heard repeatedly from friends and colleagues raised in the Netherlands. So did I sit down before my screen to leaf through the catalogues of archives, with low expectations. My first queries contained the broadest keywords possible: 'Turks' 'Turkije.'

Appalled and fascinated by the amount and range of archival holdings detected by these queries, I decided to limit my focus to women's activism —a focus dear to my heart, having migrated to the Netherlands myself and looking to connect and learn from my feminist antecedents, or 'an-sisters', to borrow a neologism by the artist belit sağ.[2]

The archival holdings with and by migrant worker women from Turkey may be limited in number, however, as I leafed my way through the boxes of documentation preserved at the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, I encountered a rich legacy of activism for social impact. In their fight for equal rights in the workplace and social life, Turkish women formed alliances with a vibrant network of women of colour activists. Reading the fascinating registers of impactful campaigns, one question kept resounding in my head.

Why doesn't anyone know about this bit of history? It's there, but it's not there.

To go back to Nawal Mustafa's similar fascination, "hoe kunnen we dat overdragen?"[3] How to transmit this knowledge? How to counteract erasure and forgetting?

James Baldwin once said, "History is not the past. It is the present. We carry our history with us."[4] How to mobilize this legacy as a radical intervention from an amnesiac nowhere to an immediate now-here?

How to overcome 'the tradition of silence' (Gloria Anzaldúa)?[5]

I. (What) Can archives repair?

"There is no political power without the control of the archive, if not of memory." – Jacques Derrida[6]

"We may ask: With whose eyes have we been made to see, with whose body have we been made to live, with whose voice are we speaking?" – Rolando Vázquez[7]

Studying migrant, displaced, and diasporic communities in the archives poses difficulties on many fronts. While these difficulties prompt further research, they also require researchers to write long clarifications and descriptions of their specific topic to avoid reproducing the epistemic violence of the hegemonic identity discourses. This is one of the challenges in my research, too, and I will start with some clarifications before moving onto the kern discussion of migrant (audiovisual) heritage and the question of repair.

My broader research concerns the audio-visual heritage of migration from Turkey to the Netherlands.[8] This encompasses the relocation of Dutch settlers from Anatolia to the Netherlands in the 1930s after more than three hundred years of inhabitancy, following the deterioration of their status after the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1923. The large part of my research, however, focuses on the workforce recruitment from Turkey and the subsequent arrival of workers to the Netherlands in the mid-1960s, following the Recruitment Agreement (*Verwingsverdrag*) in 1964. From this date onwards, there have been multiple waves of migration from Turkey to the Netherlands, each with its own specific demographic and political characteristics. For example, the relocation of women and children within the scope of the Family Reunion Act in 1974; the acceleration of political migration in the late 1970s due to increasing polarisation and human rights violations in Turkey; and a significant wave of asylum seekers immediately before and after the violent military coup in 1980—to name a few. There is a new wave of migration from Turkey post-2015 for a combination of political and economic reasons,[9] but this new wave is outside of the scope of my research.

Having been raised in a family of revolutionary activists, I'm primarily intrigued by the forms of political activism performed by the migrants and refugees from Turkey in the Netherlands. I focus on the first two decades, which allows a study of urgent issues that demanded action targeting domestic policy and the shifts to transnational activism around the coup of 1980. And, as a film historian, I'm interested in all forms of media (ranging from print media such as pamphlets, posters, magazines to visual media such as photos, films, television as well as audio material such as local radio broadcast and taped letters), produced by migrants from Turkey as a form of resistance and solidarity to effect a change in their adopted home as well as the one they left behind.[10]

I insist on using the formulation 'from Turkey' rather than 'Turkish' as much as possible. 'From Turkey' indicates an identity based on citizenship status as a starting point. It avoids imposing gender, race, ethnicity, or religion as identity markers. Such markers are usually imposed by the State (home or host alike) and tends to reproduce the hegemonic discourses. While I seek a more inclusive and broader conceptualisation of migration from Turkey to the Netherlands, I strongly resist collapsing different groups and different waves into a single homogeneous category. In order to attend to specific dynamics at play, I practice a critical intersectional approach to avoid reproducing the epistemic violence that I seek to dismantle.[11] This means, rather than a static view of identity on the basis of nation, ethnicity, race, gender, sex, or class, I zoom in on the 'intersections' of these various factors, positionings, and performances of identity.[12] I distance myself from a neoliberal appropriation of intersectionality as listing various identities adding up to affirm the unique difference of each individual. Rather, adopting 'critical intersectionality' as a method enables a profound analysis of power structures that keep social (and economic, cultural, and political) hierarchies and inequalities intact.[13] My research aims to address the media production as well as the archive as one of such power structures that can be dissected through a critical intersectional lens.

Embarking on this research made me realise the crucial role archives play in shaping the past, present, and future. The deeper I excavated the archives, the more I'm intrigued by the archival status of this material and how different materials pose different questions related to archives and archiving. Therefore, writing this history is organically linked to the critique of archives as *agents* of historical knowledge production.[14] The problem is not only that 'there isn't

much in the archives'. Paucity of archival material is certainly a crucial problem that needs to be addressed with urgency. However, *how* the material gets archived is as crucial and pressing, as a decisive factor of access, and eventually enabling redress.

Many scholars from the archival science field have underlined the role of quotidian archival processes in upholding the hegemony of the State. Eric Ketelaar wrote "governing the nation-state both for its internal organisation and for its disciplinary and surveillance power depends on the creation and maintenance of records."[15] Joan Schwartz and Terry Cook spelled out how records "are about imposing control and order on transactions, events, people, and societies through the legal, symbolic, structural, and operational power of recorded communication."[16] Jacques Derrida underlined the role of the archivist in these quotidian processes:

> "there is no archive without the signature of the archivists. By 'signature of the archivists', I don't mean the individual signature of the person in charge, but the signature of the apparatus, the people, and the institution, which produces the archive. The signature is a language. The archivist doesn't simply receive the documents. It organises it, it produces it in a certain way, and in this production implies the language on the part of the archivist."[17]

The archive is that "system of statements," those "rules of practice," that shape the specific regularities of what can and cannot be said.[18] This is the main factor of epistemic violence in the state archives. Who makes these statements? Who is allowed to perform them? In other words, *who is speaking?*

Archives may add new items to their collections from under-represented communities, but without transforming archival processes (i.e. appraisal, accessioning, recordkeeping, cataloguing, access, outreach, and deaccessioning), there is no effective way to redress the epistemic violence enacted by the state archives as a fundamental part of their existence. This transformation should address the latent bias in the archival processes that manifest itself, for example, as gaps/absences/mistakes in the metadata as well as racialised expressions that sustain a white supremacist 'cultural archive.'[19]

In light of this, I suggest a methodology which, as an initial step, consists of shifting where we look, and secondly, resists taking archival presence and absence as a clear-cut dichotomy. To put it more simply, I argue for expanding the critique from 'what gets archived and what doesn't' to '*how it gets archived*'. From this perspective, the question of archival representation of migrant communities applies to broader processes that shape archives, and their role/function in reproducing hegemonic social categories and histories. Just as labour migrants from Turkey (and elsewhere) were drivers of change on many fronts of social and political rights, I argue that this legacy can potentially be *a driver of change for archives and archiving*, by revealing the limitations of conventional/established practices.

This brings me to my next point, a clarification on 'repair' and 'redress.' Restitution, repatriation, rematriation,[20] return, repair, and redress are some of the concepts that have been increasingly used within the context of accelerating activities around stolen artefacts preserved in the heritage institutions of colonial powers.[21] While these terms, and the processes that they entail, are not synonymous, they largely operate in an ethnographic and museology framework. The scholarship has yet to expand toward the (state) archives as implicated in committing colonial crimes of the same nature. Furthermore, the specific case of the audiovisual object and the questions of repair, restitution, or return have not been tackled widely yet. The audiovisual heritage raises specific problems, which do not always overlap with those around ethnographic objects.[22]

In this paper, I'm modelling my discussion of archival reparations on the decolonial thinker Rolando Vázquez's views on restitution. While the focus is again on the ethnographic object and museums, Vázquez's critique is directed to the widespread notions of repair and restitution, and through this critique, he conceptualises a more fundamental shift. Vázquez points to *eviction*,

silencing and *uprooting*.[23] These three practices could also be seen in the state archives, especially regarding their collections concerning communities of colour. 'Eviction' concerns the modernity/coloniality imperative of controlling presences and absences—i.e. "who gets affirmed as historical presence" and who gets evicted from history.[24] Archives have played a crucial role in instilling this dichotomy of historical presence and absence. Typically, racialised and ethnicised communities enter the archives through the eyes of the state.[25] Records have power by *what* they record, and *what not*, and *how* they record.[26] By this practice, communities of colour, racialised and ethnicised communities are evicted from history. This is how silences are created.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot, in *Silencing the Past*, also pointed to the role of archives in producing silences.[27] The moment of fact creation (the making of *sources*) and the moment of fact assembly (the making of *archives*) are two initial phases that silences enter the process of historical production.[28] In Vázquez's view, such historical silences and modernity/coloniality's tradition of silencing are equally at play in the present. Giving the example of Gloria Anzaldúa and Gloria Wekker's experiences in Western institutions, Vázquez writes: "Neither of them could have a voice through the established grammars of [their] disciplines. They could not speak about their experiences. They were muted, silenced. In order to be heard, they had to speak in the normative language. So, when we speak of epistemic struggle, of epistemic and aesthetic restitution, we are speaking about *that possibility of coming to voice*".[29] Here, how *eviction* and *silencing* are practices of epistemic violence is clearly spelled out.

Although *uprooting* is specifically evoked in relation to the ethnographic object becoming dispossessed, desacralized, fixed, frozen, and displayed in an atemporal vitrine; this process may also inspire a critique of archival processes of record creation, cataloguing, preservation, and access. When the ethnographic object gets uprooted, it is "placed in separation" and thereby it undergoes "violence of the destruction of its relationality".[30] In archives, we may consider the visual registers of indigenous communities or audiovisual material created by colonial powers as examples for uprooted archival objects. The relationality of these records to their communities is severed, they are taken to the ownership of the archives, they are desacralized (specifically for communities who believe in the spiritual component of visual images), they are fixed and frozen as a record, their access and use are placed in control of the archival institution. Uprooting doesn't only severe the ties of intimacy, it's also a practice of dispossession, extraction, and appropriation. "The objects that are uprooted," for Vázquez, "highlight the importance of epistemic restitution".[31] The relationality that has been severed, must be redressed.

In light of this, how can we imagine archival reparations? As we have seen up until now, the issue of repair goes beyond the question of giving back, and one must also ask *who repairs* and *for whom*?[32] Vázquez suggests reimagining repair as 'recalling' and 'bringing back home' where "those that are recalling, reclaiming, and bringing back are those that are active in the process of healing".[33] Keeping this suggestion in mind for now, I want to move on to my final clarification and then to the specific challenges posed by the audiovisual heritage of the migrant worker women from Turkey.

Up until here, I consulted the knowledge and perspectives brought forward by anti- and decolonial thinkers. These choices could raise some questions of applicability or suitability when discussing labour migrants and/or political refugees from Turkey, which has not been strictly a colony of the Netherlands. Staying within the framework of this strict definition, the relocation of workers or activists from Turkey to the Netherlands does not fall within the same historical phenomenon as (so-called) postcolonial migrants relocating from the former colonies. In this line of thinking, decolonial perspectives or Black feminist perspectives coming from African diaspora, may be deemed irrelevant or even seem like appropriating. This criticism may pose a relevant question and open up a productive discussion on the different manifestations of coloniality; however, I insist on the value of emphasising the following two points, which clarify the relevance of decolonial frameworks in this discussion. First, spanning from mid-1960s to early 2000s, there was a vibrant network of political solidarities among the migrant, ethnicised, and racialised

communities. While there were different struggles specific to different groups, they supported each other by showing up in the demonstrations, forming platforms, serving in each other's committees, and organising joint events. Furthermore, these communities of colour were positioned (and treated) similar ways by the Dutch state, bundled up together into the problematic category of the '*allochtonen'* versus the '*autochtonen'*. In the words of Gloria Wekker, the conceptual duo is a racialised binary, one that mobilizes a certain construction of whiteness and indigeneity (i.e. the 'auto' in the 'autochtonous' denotes indigeneity) as the original Dutch; versus the people of colour who come from elsewhere (i.e. the 'allo' in the 'allochtonous' denotes "from a different environment, habitat, or geographical area").[34] When it comes to the reflections of this in the 'cultural archive', we see a lot of commonalities in the racialised discourse concerning post-colonial migrants and labour migrants from the SWANA region. In state archives, therefore, it is common to see similar patterns, in terms of evicting, silencing, and uprooting mentioned earlier, and broader practices of epistemic violence. It is in light of these encounters, finds, and observations that I veered toward the decolonial thought and activism to look for answers.

This does not have to mean homogenising all these groups into one indistinct whole. As I clarified earlier, I take these common histories as a starting point. But these common histories are also an ending point, to restore the relationalities that have been severed, to reorient the plurality of worlds that have been evicted from the history, and to resound the silenced histories of ethnicised and racialised struggles for change.

II. Show me your wound

With these in mind, I want to tackle the specific challenges posed by the audiovisual heritage of Turkish migrant women's political activism to the question of archival reparations. While the scope of Turkish migrant women's activism is not limited to the collective I'm focusing here today, the archives of *Hollanda Türkiye Kadınlar Birliği* (Association of Women from Turkey in the Netherlands; hereafter, HTKB), preserved at the International Institute for Social History (IISH) in Amsterdam, provide an effective object of study to address the discussion earlier.[35]

HTKB is the first collective founded by migrant women from Turkey in the Netherlands in 1975. Its official Dutch title was *Turkse Vrouwenvereniging.* Aiming to reach as many women as possible regardless of their political, religious, ethnic affiliations, or education level, the collective primarily positioned itself as a women's association. The absence of the word 'feminism' in the title may indicate such broad outreach. In the words of founder Maviye Karaman, the primary objective of the association was to raise awareness among Turkish women about their social position.[36] That position, for Karaman, involved a three-fold disadvantage: as women, as migrants, and as workers. Therefore, their fight for liberation must simultaneously be a gender, anti-racist, and class struggle.[37]

The most successful political campaings by HTKB are the Tuschinski Strike, Independent Residence Permit for Women, and the Gifts for the Children of Jailed Feminist Activists in Turkey. Next to these campaigns, the Women's Day celebrated on 8 March was a key moment of activity for HTKB and they collaborated with other women's organisations to organise diverse, inclusive, and impactful celebrations. HTKB also initiated the European Conference of Turkish Woman Migrants in 1985. These are just a few of impactful and wide-reaching events they organised or collaborated.

Growing rapidly to hundreds of members and branches in various cities, HTKB has produced (or contributed to the production of) a substantial body of media —ranging from printed material such as magazines, posters, booklets, and pamphlets to audiovisual material such as slide sets, education films, and documentaries— in its activities spreading over five decades.[38] This material is mostly bilingual (Dutch and Turkish), and sometimes multilingual including Arabic, among others. The presence of multiple languages attests to the political solidarities, or rather sororities, that they were part of.

This vibrant period of activism is largely absent from the cultural memory of the present. It is *evicted* from the recent history of the Netherlands; specifically the histories of activism concerning worker's rights, women's rights, and migrant's rights are silent about the struggle of migrant worker women's activism and wins.

In the past few years, however, there has been a few moments of significance that symptomize a growing momentum for the history of intersectional feminist activism of migrant women. It wasn't until 2020 that the '*arbeidsmigranten'* [guestworkers] were added to the Dutch Canon, an educational instrument about major events and persons in the Dutch political and cultural history.[39] This may have brought long-overdue recognition of guest workers as significant part (and this choice of word is intentional) of Dutch history. However, this addition does not reinstate guest workers as actors that shaped the Dutch present, a leading economy that they co-built.

Specifically concerning the history of migrant women, Atria: Institute on Gender Equality and Women's History, organised a series of webinars focusing on *Zwarte- Migranten- en Vluchtelingenvrouwenbeweging*, which translates as Black, Migrant, and Refugee Women's Movement (hereafter, BMR-WM). In these webinars, activists from this movement took stage along with new generation of activists. Around this remembering and reactivation, Atria also produced a video series of interviews with the activists at the forefront of the movement, such as Gloria Wekker and Maaike Baayman among others, next to producing educational material to be used in classes.[40] A significant outcome of this newly kindled interest in this fascinating bit of history, the canonical volume *Caleidoscopische Visies* (Kaleidoscopic Visions) —which originally came out in 2001 and recorded the state of the BMR-WM that year— has been republished.[41] With a new foreword, the new edition of the book clearly positions itself as reviving the history and memory of intersectional thinking and activism of black, migrant, and refugee women's collectives.

Almost simultaneously with this new edition, a new series of archive books came out in Spring 2024 under the title Archival Textures.[42] At the time of writing, there are four volumes, each revisiting, recentring, and republishing a form of media activism —such as posters, (maga)zines, pamphlets, etc.— that have been significant tactics in the history of BMR-WM activism in the Netherlands. In the words of the series editor Tabea Nixdorff: "with Archival Textures, we draw from unlikely holdings of established archives and turn to local community archives, personal collections, and conversations to find writings of the past that can inform our current vocabularies of resistance and solidarity."[43]

These three instances can be taken as starting points to think about repair. While the addition of guestworkers to the Dutch Canon could be seen as a recognition —albeit one that comes dreadfully late; it exemplifies a one-sided 'inclusion' policy. It inserts the historical representation of a group into the past, but it evades effectively re-centring them (*the evicted*) in the history from which they have been so effectively banished. *Who repairs* and *for whom*?

What makes Atria's project so impactful is a genuine effort to *resound* the *silenced* histories of intersectional feminist activism, and a genuine belief in their relevance for the present as well as their value for the future. Organising talks with the activists at the forefront of this movement in the 1990s *recentres* their narratives, memories, and emotions. These video productions can be seen as archival endevours in their own right to make up for the absences of these narratives, memories, and emotions. Here, remembering Vázquez's words about Gloria Wekker that I quoted earlier, we see an opening, a willingess to entice *that possibility of coming to voice*. Here we see a different endeavour than the first instance, where the state repairs for itself. Here we see an enactment of repair as 'recalling' where "those that are recalling, reclaiming, and bringing back are those that are active in the process of healing."[44]

The third instance, which to some extent is an outcome of the momentum generated by this campaign by Atria, could be considered in relation to *uprooting*. Across four volumes, the overarching ethos of these publication series is to *revitalize* the political sororities by re-publishing,

re-circulating, and re-framing the activist (print) media. This allows, for example, to recover the relationalities that have been lost when these objects entered the archive.

These are some of the few steps in the direction of repair, on the specific case of the BMR-WM. As readers have noticed, these attempts at repair and redress are not necessarily positioned *within* the archives nor do they target the archival processes that I mentioned earlier. What can we expect or imagine transforming archival processes from the perspective of repair?

III. With or without you

In the beginning of this paper, I emphasised that simple inclusion or acquisition is not a solution to the epistemic violence of the archives, when it comes to the preservation and accessibility of migrant heritage. The archival status of migrant and diasporic items poses a challenge to the established archival processes.[45] And I argued that these challenges should be taken as productive starting points to reconsider archiving. The question of archival reparations, in this sense, breaks open an entire power structure that governs "with whose eyes have we made to see, with whose body have we been made to live, with whose voice are we speaking?"[46]

Earlier research into the media representations of migrant women from Turkey revealed that 'migration coverage is saturated with moments of Othering.'[47] In a detailed study, media scholar Andrea Meuzelaar showed how, in the Netherlands, television played a crucial role in perpetuating racialised stereotypes of Muslim women with a migration background.[48] Crucially, archives sustained the circulation of these stereotypes, as tagging and keywords in archival metadata were significant factors in the ways these images were retrieved and reused by mainstream broadcast over the years.[49] Archival gaze and media representation feed each other, and so do they get entrenched in the cultural archive – "in the way we think, do things, look at the world, in what we find attractive, in how our affective and rational economies are organized and intertwined."[50] In this line of thinking, archival reparations is a question that goes beyond 'fixing' small details here and there. Here, repair "challenges the whole edifice of Western aesthetics."[51]

Removing the racialised and ethnicised bias from the archival processes is no easy task. In the recent years, a few interesting projects have opened up new horizons. For example, the *Words Matter* project brought together culture professionals to rethink the racist, sexist, ableist, white supremacist and homophobic vocabulary widely used in culture institutions such as museums and archives.[52] These words appear in catalogues, metadata descriptions, inventory cards, exhibition leaflets, placards, labels, and more. Words Matter, decidedly 'incomplete' and 'work-in-progress', is an open-access thesaurus that tackles derogatory vocabulary and provides substitutions. In the words of one of the editors Wayne Modest, the publication is a "tool for empowerment."[53] Enhanced with short articles that underline the political power of language and how language acts, functions, and shapes the world view, the booklet has ben an impactful step in the cultural sector.

A project that followed Words Matter was De-Bias, which specifically targeted archival institutions.[54] De-Bias included an element of active participation by the communities to work on the derogatory, racist, sexist, ableist, ageist, and homophobic vocabulary found in the object titles, catalogue entries, metadata tags, and descriptions. Building on the knowledge of Words Matter, De-Bias also featured an AI component that is able to detect derogatory terms in the digital catalogues. Human moderation is needed to complement this tool, basically to check whether the term indeed is used in a derogatory way or not. This tool can be useful to remove the harmful vocabulary across a shorter period of time than manual labour.

I have been following De-Bias as close as I can since its early days: I attended many conference presentations, joined a workshop held at the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision (NISV) last summer, and participated in the project evaluation session organised by the NISV. What I value in this project is the active inclusion of communities in removing the biased descriptions and tags in the metadata. In this way, the project aimed to re-centre the voices and experiences of the communities. Despite its certain limitations, De-Bias could inspire new ways of thinking about archival reparations, for example, how to effectively empower and incorporate

polyvocality around a single archival object? Can we reimagine metadata as a palimpsest? What can be the digital interfaces or tools to facilitate *polyvocalities* and *relationalities*?

One problem, or a risk if you like, that have been addressed by the project managers themselves was *the erasure of violence*. The derogatory vocabulary in the archives and museums is symptomatic of a colonial ideology and mindset. In that sense, they are undeniable part of the history and a constructive component of European civilization. Should we erase this part of history? De-Bias provided an option to flag the derogatory vocabulary as 'sensitive content' by blurring or hiding them. If the user/resarcher wants, there is the option to view the sensitive content flagged as derogatory. This is one way to keep the evidence of epistemic violence.

This brings us to another point raised by Vázquez when talking about repair: "It should help address the colonial wound as something that needs to be healed, *not forgotten*".[55] Since we haven't discussed the term of colonial wound, let's keep our focus to one component/form of colonial wound that we did discuss: the epistemic violence. We may then imagine archival reparations as ways to addresses the epistemic violence and contribute to epistemic redress, but this should not entail *forgetting* or retrospective erasure of violence.

This recalls Kader Attia's view of repair: It is 'a cultural strategy, a counter-reaction' in which the fracture and transformation of an object are recognised and honoured.[56] The wounds and injuries inflicted by history *cannot be cured*; rather, they have to be acknowledged and rethought in the present.

Before I conclude, we have yet to touch upon another aspect of repair that is posited by these intiatives. Going back to an earlier question: *Who is repairing* and *for whom*? Do state archives seek community input in an extractivist way, say, to improve their own processes at the cost of intellectual and emotional labour of the community members? How to move from *owning* to *owing*?[57] How can state archives look for ways to re-centre the communities of colour evicted from history, silenced, and uprooted? How to reinstate the relational, the communal, the plurality of worlds?

How can we envision archival reparations in which those who remember both the violence (the wound) and the beauty of uprooted relationships are actively engaged in the healing process? How to reimagine the archive, not as a governance apparatus of the (colonial) state, but as a space for healing, coexistance, and conviviality —and specifically concerning the archives of feminists of colour: a space for sorority?

At the time of writing this article, there isn't any similar project that I know of that tackles the epistemic violence (the gaps, absences, mistakes, and derogatory language use) in the archives concerning the (audio-visual) heritage of the Turkish diaspora. The many reasons of which are beyond the scope of this article. Elsewhere, I argued for a conception of 'community engagement' as a mutual process, whereby archives can be activated by the communities, but the communities themselves can also be activated by the archives. This means, communities may recall the relationalities and the communal once they encounter the archival records of a silenced past. An impressive instance of this has been the Moluccan Audiovisual Heritage project, which activated the severed community bonds in unexpected ways around the search for a videotape collection. The project's title *Verloren Banden* is very telling in this sense.[58] With inspiration coming from similar initiatives, there is a lot of work that waits to be done: to *recentre* the community, to *re-member* the beauty of communal relations, to recover *sororities*, to resound silenced histories, to engage in healing in conviviality, and to find power in these actions to overcome the tradition of silence.

Repair is not exclusively about the past, it's about the present and the future.

NOTES

[1] Maayke Botman et al. "Inleiding" in *Caleidoscopische Visies*, ed. Nancy Jouwe et al. (Amsterdam: Mazirel Pers, 2024), 18.
[2] Eli Witteman, "What does that image do, what is its power? — belit sağ on their artistic research and 'ansisters'". *Metropolis M* (15 December 2023), n.d. Last accessed 1 September 2024

https://metropolism.com/nl/feature/48848_what_does_that_image_do_what_is_its_power_belit_sa_on_their_artistic_research_and_ansisters
[3] Botman et al. "Inleiding", 18.
[4] James Baldwin, *I am not your negro* (London: Penguin Books, 2017), 107.
[5] Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands La Frontera, The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2012), 81.
[6] Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 4.
[7] Rolando Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life. Recalling Earth, Overcoming the Contemporary, Knowing Otherwise." *Errant Journal* 5 (2023), 53.
[8] Asli Özgen, "Unsettling Borders of Archives: Activating the Audiovisual Heritage of the Turkish Community in the Netherlands" VIEW: Journal of European Television History and Culture, 12. 24 (2023): n.d. Open access at https://doi.org/10.18146/view.308. Last accessed 1 September 2024
[9] Daniel Thorp, "What's behind the rise in Turkish citizens seeking asylum in Europe and North America?", *The New Humanitarian* (11 June 2024). Last accessed 1 September 2024. https://www.thenewhumanitarian.org/news-feature/2024/06/11/whats-behind-rise-turkish-citizens-seeking-asylum-europe-north-america
[10] See for example Asli Özgen, "Unsettling Borders of Archives."
[11] See for example Gülay Türkmen, "Categorical Astigmatism: On Ethnicity, Religion, Nationality, and Class in the Study of Migrants in Europe," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 47: 9 (2024), 1834–57.
[12] Gülay Türkmen, "Categorical Astigmatism."
[13] Patricia Hill Collins, *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019).
[14] Verne Harris, *Ghosts of Archive: Deconstructive Intersectionality and Praxis* (London: Routledge, 2020).
[15] Eric Ketelaar, "Recordkeeping and Societal Power" in *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, ed. Sue McKemmish et al. (Wagga-Wagga: Charles Sturt University, 2005), 280.
[16] J.M., Schwartz and Terry Cook, "Archives, records, and power: The making of modern memory," *Archival Science* 2 (2002), 13.
[17] Jacques Derrida, "Archive Fever. A Seminar by Jacques Derrida" in *Refiguring the Archive*, ed. Carolyn Hamilton et al. (Dordrecht: Springer, 2002), 64.
[18] Michel Foucault quoted in Ann Laura Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Acts of Governance", *Archival Science* 2 (2002), 96.
[19] For a discussion and definition of 'cultural archive' see Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994) and Gloria Wekker, *White Innocence* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016).
[20] Robin R. Gray, "Rematriation: Ts'msyen Law, Rights of Relationality, and Protocols of Return," *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 9:1 (2022), pp. 1–27.
[21] In *The Future of Dutch Colonial Past*, Caroline Drieënhuizen unpacks various terms that come to the fore in the debate. Repatriation denotes the return of objects to a nation or a state at the request of the government, whereas restitution means the return of cultural artefacts to an individual or community. They are both part of 'repair' that is seen as 'the disappearance of the [colonial] wound and its societal traumas caused by the injustice.' See Caroline Drieënhuizen, "Repatriation as a Means of Repair and Redress? Dutch-Indonesian Repatriation Debates, 1949-present" in *The Future of Dutch Colonial Past*, ed. van Bijnen et al. (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2024), pp. 250-256.
[22] An early discussion of repair concerning (audiovisual) heritage can be found in Stuart Hall's work, especially see Stuart Hall, "Un-Settling 'the Heritage', Re-Imagining the Post-Nation: Whose Heritage?"*Third Text* 13 (49), 1999, 3–13. Hall may not explicitly mention reparations, but he explores the ways in which heritage can be reconsidered in an inclusive manner. Although in this article Hall does not specifically engage with the archive, but more explicitly with heritage, these two notions are essentially bound: 'heritage provides the archive' (5). A recent discussion of returns is to be found in José Palacios, "Exile, Archives, and Transnational Film History: The Returns of Chilean Exile Cinema."*The Moving Image*, vol. 22 no. 2, 2022, pp. 29-58.
[23] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life."
[24] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 54.
[25] See Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Acts of Governance."
[26] Ketelaar, "Recordkeeping and Societal Power."
[27] Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).
[28] Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 26.
[29] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 58; emphasis mine.
[30] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 59.
[31] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 59.
[32] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 53; emphasis mine.
[33] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 53.
[34] Wekker, *White Innocence*, 55.
[35] For an in-depth study of HTKB's media tactics and their archival status, please see Asli Özgen, "Screen Memories: The Audiovisual Heritage of Turkish Migrant Women in the Netherlands Across Political Film, Video, and Television," *TMG Journal for Media History* 27:1 (June 2024), pp. 1–31.
[36] Pieternel Onderwater, "Maviye Karaman: Een Turks-Nederlandse marxistische feministe" in *Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis 29: Zenobia, Khadija en Dolle Amina's; Gender en macht in de islamistische geschiedenis* (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2009), 185.
[37] Pieternel Onderwater, "Maviye Karaman,"185.
[38] Özgen, "Screen Memories."
[39] "Gastarbeiders," *Canon van Nederland*. Last accessed 1 September 2024 https://www.canonvannederland.nl/nl/gastarbeiders
[40] See the following page to get access to all the content produced around the campaign: "ZMV-vrouwen," *Atria: Institute on Gender Equality and Women's History*. Last accessed 1 September 2024 https://atria.nl/tag/zmv-vrouwen/
[41] Nancy Jouwe et al. *Caleidoscopische Visies* (Amsterdam: Mazirel Pers, 2024).
[42] "Publications," *Archival Textures*. Last accessed 1 September 2024 http://www.archival-textures.com/publications
[43] Tabea Nixdorff, "Preface" in *Amplifying*, ed. Setareh Noorani and Tabea Nixdorff (Amersfoort: Wilco, 2024), 9.
[44] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 53.
[45] See for example Fiona Siegenthaler and Cathrine Bublatzky, '(Un)Sighted Archives of Migration—Spaces of Encounter and Resistance: An Introduction'. *Visual Anthropology* 34: 4 (Aug. 2021), pp. 283–95; John Sundholm, "*Ulkomaalainen/Utlänningen/Yabanci* (1979-1981-1983) – a most typical migrant archival object," *L'Atalante Revista de estudios cinematográficos* 34 (2022), pp. 103–114.
[46] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 53.
[47] Andrea Meuzelaar, "The Emergence and Persistence of Racialised Stereotypes on Dutch Television: Tracing the History of Representation of Muslim Immigrants along the Archival Grain," *VIEW: Journal of European Television History and Culture* 10, no. 20 (2021). Open access at https://viewjournal.eu/articles/10.18146/view.268/.
[48] Meuzelaar, "The Emergence and Persistence of Racialised Stereotypes on Dutch Television."

[49] Meuzelaar, "The Emergence and Persistence of Racialised Stereotypes on Dutch Television."
[50] Wekker, *White Innocence*, 19.
[51] 'Aesthetics' understood in the sense of a regime that seeks to regulate perception and experience; Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 53.
[52] Wayne Modest and Robin Lelijveld, ed. *Words Matter: Work in Progress* (National Museum of World Cultures, 2018). Open access at https://www.materialculture.nl/en/publications/words-matterβ
[53] Wayne Modest, "Words Matter" in *Words Matter: Work in Progress*, ed. Wayne Modest and Robin Lelijveld (National Museum of World Cultures, 2018), 15.
[54] See for more information the project page: https://pro.europeana.eu/post/address-bias-in-your-cultural-heritage-collections-with-the-de-bias-project
[55] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 62.
[56] Kader Attia quoted in Mischa Twitchin, "On Repair: Between Cosmopolitics and Decoloniality," *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts* 26 (2021), pp. 54-61.
[57] Vázquez, "Aesthetic and Epistemic Restitution for the Joy of Life," 62.
[58] The Dutch expression '*verloren banden*' translates as 'lost tapes' and 'lost bonds' simultaneously. See Jeftha Pattikawa, "Verloren Banden: Moluccan Footage, Articulating Perspectives in Postcolonial Netherlands" in *Inward/Outward: Critical Archival Engagements with Sounds and Films of Coloniality: A Publication of the 2020 Inward/Outward Symposium*, ed. Somers Miles et al (Hilversum: Inward Outward, 2020), pp. 60-64.