OK, welcome everybody. I'm very happy today to welcome Verena Erlenbusch-Anderson to our seminar – post-Kantian European philosophy seminar at Warwick. Verena is associate professor of philosophy at Syracuse University. She's a critical theorist whose work is situated at the intersection of Continental philosophy, political theory, history, and conflict, terrorism studies. Our primary research focus is the development of an account of terrorism that could be useful for contemporary analysis, and we will hear something about this tonight. On this topic, she is published in 2018 book titled Genealogy of Terrorism, Revolution, State Terror Empire for Columbia University Press. In addition to her work on terrorism, she's also interested in questions of methodology and political theory, with a special emphasis on archival, an interpretive methods, and she's written about various aspects of focus work and about diversity and inclusion in the Academy. The title of her talk today is contested legacies, constellations of terrorism in the post bellum United States, and after her talk. Our very own Quassim Cassam that I thank you very much for accepting to do this as generously accepted to give a response so we will have various talk. Seems response Verano's response to the response and that we will open up for the Q&A. Thank you so much Verena. The floor is yours.

Thank you and thanks Daniele. So thanks so much for inviting me to do this and also thank you to everyone who joined this call. I know that these are. Times and if you feel anything like me or kind of distracted and I'm sorry, I really appreciate you all being here. I'm going to try and share my screen. Arm. You should be able to see a PowerPoint slide with the title on it, yes? Alright, great, so before I actually get started I just wanna, you know, give you a heads up that I'll be talking about violence and there will be some pictures here that are meant to sort of evoke contexts of violence. I did not include anything that's like gory or explicit, but you know, sensibilities about this. Very so. Just a heads up about this. And I'm also going to be citing from source material from, you know, the. Late 19th century that contains outdated terminology, which is now mostly considered offensive. So what I'll be doing is I'll be showing you the original quotes on the slide, so you can read along. But when I read from those quotes, I'll be censoring. Alright, so let me start by setting up the problem that I want to talk about. Since the late 1980s and then, especially after 911, the term terrorism has been primarily associated with foreign threats in U.S. policy and public discourse, and you know also in UK foreign policy and, and more generally sort of globally any Association of terrorism and white supremacy was at least in the US for a very long time regarded as unpatriotic and. You know we could see this in 2009 when an assessment by the Department of Homeland Security was leaked, which emphasized the threat posed by white supremacist extremism. And there was massive backlash, especially

from conservative media personalities, which effectively shut down any debate about the danger that white supremacy posed to national security. But things changed, and so today the notion of white supremacist terrorism is virtually everywhere, especially after the capital siege on January 6th of this year. There was quickly a broad consensus among policy makers and a large Republic that what had happened was an act of terrorism that must be met with domestic terrorism laws and counterterrorism practices. And so I'm interested in how this previously unthinkable idea of white supremacist terrorism became so widely acceptable and I want to examine this by tracing the history of terrorism in the United States by examining. Not the kind of obvious examples, but by looking at subjugated knowledges of white supremacist terrorism and so in the larger project just to give you a bit of context, my primary archives are memories of racial terrorism of ****** violence of border control and family separation and also after violence, surveillance and disciplining of trans and gender nonconforming people. But today I want to look into a slice of one of these archives, namely the history of racial terrorism in the United States. So let me tell you what the sort of standard story is about this. Historians of American reconstruction frequently appealed to the vocabulary of terrorism to describe white backlash to emancipation. What's also known as white redemption and what they have in mind is particularly the violence of the Ku Klux Klan and the practice of lynching. And the language of terrorism is also used in debates about reparations to demand reparative justice as a corrective for what is the are described as state and state sanctioned terrorism against black Americans. And so this choice of words in those debates is typically justified in terms of semantic consistency and a rejection of the sort of duplicitous use of the term against racialized populations, but not against white perpetrators. But some historians have pointed out that. The fact that terrorism as a term is of comparatively recent vintage present some difficulties when it comes to applying the concept to the distant past, and so attention to how the language of terrorism was used in the past and what accomplishments it's use enabled is important. I think for two reasons. One, it helps us avoid confusion, conceptual confusion and anachronisms in our accounts, and second, it allows us to get a Fuller. What we might call with Co. Historical knowledge of struggles which give rise to our own historical present, and so in the full chapter you can see an outline here. I narrate the contestations around terrorism and struggles against racial violence and injustice in the century between about 1850 to 1915. I start with abolitionist appeals to the vocabulary of terror to show that the term was used in both the sort of traditional sense to describe feelings of fear in the face of awesome power. And also in a newer political register that comes to us from the French Revolution to denote a particular kind of tyrannical government and then over the course of the late 19th and early 20th century African American agitators against racist violence and

********** began to adopt the language of terrorism to articulate this political function of terror. And so two developments enabled the merchants and stabilization of this counter discourse of terrorism. The first one is the sort of gradual displacement of the more familiar use of terror as both fear and also a systematic mode of governing by a notion of terrorism as terror or fear, and as a method of intimidation. I am not going to focus on this today. What I want to focus on today is the Third Point here, which is the Association of Terrorism with anarchy. And so the primary point of reference here is the terrorism of Russian revolutionaries, about which I've written previously, and this got some uptake in the United States. But really, it was the what was caught. The philosophy of the bomb that was imported by Russian and European emigres and exiled anarchists that became the focal point of concern in the United States. I'm so the response to a spectacular acts of violence. Anarchist violence, like the Haymarket bombing or the assassination of President McKinley or the Wall Street bombing led to broad anti immigrant sentiment and restrictive immigration laws that were designed. And I'll cite President Theodore Roosevelt here that were designed to exclude absolutely not only all persons who are known to be believers in anarchistic principles or members of anarchistic societies, but also all persons who are of a low moral tendency or. Unsavory reputation. End of quote. These restrictions were deemed necessary against the anarchists who were described as the enemy of system and progress, and the deadly foe of Liberty who were hostile to all government, but they were not sufficient, so Roosevelt went so far as to define anarchy as a crime against the whole human race, and he demanded that this crime should be made an offense against the law of nations like piracy, and that form of man stealing, known as the slave trade. Progressive reformers like Jane Addams to portrait anarchism as terrorism and defined it as an attack against an official representative of law and order a crime against the government itself, and a method aimed at the violent overthrow of government. But Adams also warned against painting all recent immigrants and especially Russian Jews, as anarchists. Ann, she cautioned that drastic police measures against immigrant communities might actually drive them to the very terrorists. That these measures were intended to prevent, and so these interventions are already give us a sense of how in the United States the Association of Anarchy and Terrorism was modulated by a context of racial politics. And I want to show you today how concepts and practices of anarchism, terrorism, racist violence and political resistance interacted in complex ways. So these are sort of two pieces of the larger. Genealogical tree if I can call it that that I will fill out over the course of my talk. So first anarchists were integrated into American racial schemas, through discourses of racialism. And you know, phobia. I'm for Roosevelt for example. Anarchism was a distinctly foreign problem that was imported to the United States by what he described as uncivilized and

primitive Europeans. But then there was another piece to the puzzle, which were the works of the Italian physician phrenologist and criminologist Cesare Lombroso, which also helped create an understanding of anarchists as a particular human type which could be placed within the framework of American racism. So, uh, Lombroso famously developed the theory of the born criminal, which held that the source of crime were anomalies that lead individuals to regress to a more primitive condition of human development, and so he extended this theory to political criminals through a study of anarchists. And he argued that anarchists were either born criminals or insane, sometimes both, and they were marked by hereditary physical and mental anomalies, and so he lists, for example. Facial assymmetry enormous jaws developed frontal sinus, protruding ears, epilepsy and hysteria. By construing the anarchist as a hereditary criminal or insane type, these are his words. Lombroso's work enabled the integration of anarchists into US racial schemas as both foreign and deviant with respect to the normal, by which I mean white race. I'm so the pathologization of anarchists was therefore at the same time a mode of racialization, and so far as it brought anarchism into the orbit of what ***** calls a biological racism against the abnormal that has its roots in psychiatry and functions as a means of improving the health of the race. Branding anarchists is both foreign and insane, was part of a white supremacist rationality. I want to suggest which sought to protect an investor purity and vigor of the white race. Just of the race, through the identification, containment and elimination of abnormal elements that threatened from within and also from outside at the same time, and also depoliticize the actions of anarchists and displaced responses to their demands from the political arena to this fear of criminal medicine. So this elaboration of anarchism within the framework of white supremacy and US racial schemas also brought anarchists in close proximity to other racialized populations. As a consequence, white supremacists routinely portrayed African Americans as a threat to the political order and therefore as terrorists. But the Association of African Americans and Terrorism was not only construed in sort of blatantly racist terms. Pushing back against the transcriptions of adherents of a political movement into a hereditary criminal type, Jane Adams, for example, emphasized the social status of immigrants and black people, which he character, which he saw as a status characterized by oppression and exploitation, and so Adams warrant that immigrants and black Americans might turn to terrorism against their oppressors. So in addition to her opposition to the policing of. Immigrants, Adams pointed out that the Russian revolutionaries justification of terrorism as a method against the outrage is often autocracy might welcome to be used to justify this position to Americans with the statement that the number of violent executions in Russia do not in a given six months or a year equal the number of lynchings in America that it is only a question of

provocation before men will resort to it. Adams was not alone to protect, predict the turn to terrorism as a means of black self defense against racial violence. As early as 1883, the African American journalist T Thomas Fortune observed that black Americans were, and I quote him here, twitted for not taking the Irish dagger in our hand, for not placing the Russian dynamite under the statehouse, and quote and three years later, which was also the year of the Haymarket bombing, Fortune argued that quote the essential element in which Afro American character was most efficient. Was the dynamatic element that is the element of character, which represents an injury promptly and in a way most characteristic of the Lex Loki. Frederick Douglass to warrant that if the sudden outrage is on black people continue, they will become a chemist. Other men besides anarchists can be goaded into making and throwing bombs. This terrible thirst for the blood of men must sees in the South or as sure as night follows day. There will be an insurrection. Anarchists have not a monopoly on bomb making, and black people will learn to handle the terrible engine of destruction unless the terrible wrongs committed against MCS. So Douglas insisted that he was not encouraging to resort to violence, bombs, and dynamite by the black people of the South, but that what he said was hypothetical and was more in the shape of a prediction based on the logic of events than in the way of advice, counsel or countenance. It is simply describing the natural consequences of the prevalence of Lynch law, he said. So here we have a constellation in which African Americans were the ears of anarchist methods in their struggle against political ********** and I want to briefly talk about Dubois is 1928 novel Dark Princess as another representative of disposition. So this is actually Dubois is self declared favorite of his works, and it explores global solidarity and cosmopolitan justice as well as the entire ability of US racism and the desire for revenge in the face of segregation. And racist violence. So just to give you a quick summary, after the novel's protagonist, a man named Matthew Towns is unable to complete his education as a physician because of racist discrimination. He leaves the United States for Europe, where he makes the acquaintance of Princes, Catilia. The Prince is a champion of racial equality and global solidarity among people of color, and she sends Matthew back to make contact with a man called Paragua who is the leader of a clandestine movement. That's seeks to instigate an uprising of black Americans, and so driven by a desire to avenge the victims of racist violence. Perigal's plan and you have this here on the slide is to stop the practice of lynching with dynamite. For every lynching mob one Matthew objects that lynchings occur sporadically, seldom or never twice in the same place. Paragua insists that there is a lynching belt that needs to be blown to hell with dynamite terrorism. Revenge is our program. He says. And I think the boys is take on terrorism. Here is notable for at least two reasons. So one is that the boys explicitly rejects ableist scripts that already then adhere to those

like Paragua who embrace terrorism as a means of vengeance for injustice. So at an earlier point in the novel, Matthew describes Perrigo as a negativistic fool and an ignorant fanatic and as insane. But he quickly realizes. Said while Prego was certainly wild, irresponsible and impulsive, he had a brain and nerves that worked clearly and promptly, so by refusing to pathologize an advocate of terrorism is mad. Here the boys sort of politicizes violence as a political and strategic response to the violence is in exclusions of white supremacy. Terrorism for him is not the irrational, pathological, and unintelligible behavior of fanatics and Mad Men, but it's an expression of agency on the part of oppressed people who turned the violence inflicted on them back against the oppressors. So the boys's portrayal of Paragua invites us to reconsider both the denial of agency and humanity to anarchists, terrorists and black people, and also common notions of the symmetry of state and terrorist violence. And this, I think, is is the 2nd interesting point. Which is that the boys declines to consider terrorism within a framework of legitimacy or legitimate political violence, while he portrays his protagonist as torn between mere terrorism and mass murder. On the one hand, and the possibility of aligning ourselves with national and world forces as to gain our own emancipation through intelligence and forethought. Concentrated group action, on the other, the lynching of Matthew Towns is innocent friend. As well as a clan comeback in the rally in Chicago, present violence is the only effective means of black self defense. So at one point in the novel. The boys rights. What else appeals to Barbarians? But force, blood and war? The boys's rejection of the trope of them a terrorist makes it possible to restore the question of violence to its political context as an expression of agency which we might understand in Sabah moods. Terms here, as the capacity for action that specific relations of subordination create and enable. So terrorism here comes into view as a form of agency that is both enabled and required by segregation, discrimination and racist violence. It's the logical, even inevitable response to the murderous practice of lynching. But lynching itself was also a kind of anarchy and terrorism, and so this is the third constellation of anarchy, terrorism, and racial politics that I want to focus on, which is lynching as anarchy and terrorism. The precursors of this Association can already be seen in Roosevelt's likening of anarchism to the slave trade trade that I mentioned earlier, which served to brand anarchism as monstrous but also tapped into discourses that analogize chattel and wage slavery, and drew parallels between racist violence and anarchist terrorism. So, on the one hand, anarchists understood workers as slaves and portrayed themselves as the descendants of abolitionists. Famously, comparing themselves to the abolitionist John Brown, for example, on the other hand, the outrageous violence of enslavement and lynching was frequently connected to the spectacular violence of anarchist terrorism and dis in two different ways. So first, in his reflections on the Haymarket trial,

the socialist writer Adolf Hoeppner expressed his regret, and I'll quote here that the influence which the American usage of lynching had in the culture of anarchist tactics. Was not considered once during the whole trial and presented as an extenuation, and of course, so Hepner characterized the anarchists farm as Lynch law against the police who were engaged in a criminal act, and in doing this he argued that like the perpetrators of lynchings of black Americans, the Haymarket bomber should go unpunished, right? So I mean, that's one way of looking at things. I guess there was a second way which shared the identification of anarchism and Lynch law but. You know, emphasize the contrary implication. So anti lynching activists like John Mitchell Junior and Ida B. Wells for example suggested that because Lynch law was like anarchism, lynching was terrorism for Mitchell, the Historical Association of Anarchism. With. The nihilistic terrorism of Russian revolutionaries and the terrorism of the Bolshevists gave rise to a fairly nuanced understanding of Lynch law as a tactic of class oppression and capitalist exploitation. And Ida B. Wells invoked the language of anarchy, anarchism and terrorism to denounce the practice of lynching. And so I want to spend a little bit of time looking at how wells reworked the notion of terrorism from its prior uses as a synonym of fear. As well as the term denoting practice of intimidation and a crime against the state and humanity into an ocean or an understanding of terrorism. As the violent disclosure expression of the political rationality of white supremacy. I'm so. Wells occasionally at carefully placed use of the language of terrorism, cannot be understood in isolation from the form and political function of her work, and I'm going to spare you the detailed analysis here. But what I want to note is that her attack on lynching PO radically engages the conventions of the time to exploit them from within, and I'm drawing here on Barbara Goldsby's work in particular, so her work, Southern horrors, for example, is written in the form of an autobiographical eyewitness account, which was known at. The time as a stunt and this allowed Wells described conventions of grammaticality and evidence in favor of personal testimony. And you can see here that there is an image of her on the title page which indicates already that we're getting you know this person's point of view here. By contrast, a red record parodies the norms of social scientific accounts of lynching to question notions of objectivity and rationality by showing that even ostensibly neutral statistical facts acquire meaning in a particular context, and so the subtitle already gives us a glimpse of that which is tabulated. Statistics and alleged causes of lynchings in the United States. So what's important is that wells is porotic use of the norms of the genre. Made them available for critique, revealed the news media's role in shaping public knowledge, and also encourage new ways of thinking about lynching. And so this porotic repetition of stylistic conventions also extends to the vocabulary of terrorism. At least that's what I want to suggest. And that's what gives Wells's work, its

explosive force and reveals its strategic function in political struggles because it allows her to draw attention to the context dependent meaning. Of terms like terrorism and anarchy, and it allows her to reveal their complicity in constructing a fairly narrowly circumscribed and biased public knowledge about violence, law and order in the United States. So while this invocation of the language of terrorism serves to capture the function of lynching as an expression of and, the means for enforcing what she calls the unwritten law of white supremacy, so she describes this as follows. It is not the creature of an hour. The sudden outburst of uncontrolled fury, or the unspeakable brutality of an insane mob, but the cool, calculating deliberation of intelligent people who openly avowed that there isn't. Unwritten law that justifies them and putting human beings to death without respect for the legal process. Wells trace the history of this unwritten law to the practice of frontier justice during Western expansion. Role in July was adopted in absence of a legal system to social order. So she argued, though, that one civilization spread into the territories and the orderly process of law took its place, the unwritten law of lynching disappeared from the West, but it survived in two areas. One is among the lawless classes, where it was transformed from an instrument of justice into a mechanism of vengeance and crime. At the second one was in the South, where it asserted its way in defiance of law and established legal procedure. So Wells argued that wears the Reconstruction amendments had abolished slavery had guaranteed equal protection under the law, and prohibited disenfranchisement on account of race. The social and political order of the South relied on this unwritten law that directly contravened the new legal order and actually reversed the legal achievements of Reconstruction as a means of enforcing this unwritten law. Lynching made explicit the white supremacist foundations of an ostensibly neutral political order. There is not a form of punishment for ostensible violations of the law, but it was the violent manifestation of a nation organized by unwritten laws, which kept the black man down as she put it. And we can see this in detail, for example, in her analysis of the standard justification of lynching as a punishment for ****** assault, more specifically as a punishment for a black men who ostensibly had assaulted white women, and, well shows that, contrary to common justification. Lynching was not a means of punishment, but actually had the purpose of striking terror into the hearts of other black people. So people other than the person who was lynched so on her account right rib served as a pretext for lynching an actually obfuscate it. It's real function, and as a means of maintaining white supremacy. And so lynching was not a practice that was perpetrated by just a small number of extremist individuals, but it was a form of collective action that income passed and also was made possible by all structures of society. From local authorities to the media to the criminal justice system. By drawing our attention to the systematic and structural function in enforcing and

maintaining white supremacy while still set the stage for understanding lynching as a form of racial terrorism, so its target were not individuals but a whole class of people. Its purpose was not punishment but subjugation through intimidation, and it was executed not by a few bad apples, so to speak, but it was upheld by an entire social structure that was built on the idea of white superiority. And Wells argued that this also distinguished this particular practice of lynching from ostensibly similar uses of ions as a practice of frontier justice. She says that, in contrast to Frontier Lynch law, which served as an extralegal and reactive act of punishment in times of emergency and an absence of a legal system, and that actually primarily targeted white people in the South, lynching has been along the color line and spread a reign of terror. That had proactive an also preservative purpose. So in 1913 she explained that the lynching mania so far, and it affects black people, began in the South immediately after the Emancipation Proclamation 50 years ago had manifested itself through what was known as the Ku Klux Klan. Armed bodies of masked men, who during the period between 1865 and 1875 killed black people who tried to exercise their political rights, conferred on them by the United States. Killed by such terrorism, the South regain political control. For awhile, Stan terrorism was a practice of political ********** and racial control. It was a set of measures that serve to reestablish white dominance over a newly emancipated enslaved population whom the Recon formerly enslaved population whom the Reconstruction amendments had granted basic political rights. An lynching was terrorism on this account because it was quote a system of anarchy and outlawry, and of quote that relied on collective and calculated violence. Against an entire class of people that was enabled by the entire society and intended to enforce white supremacy. So we can see here I want to argue how wells parodies the terms terrorism, anarchy and outlawry, as epithets to denounce the violent overthrow of the government. But in so doing, well, it's not only suggested that lynching was a crime against the state, but that it would eventually lead to the nations fall. So as a carefully calibrated and deliberate practice, by which quote the mob did what the law could not be made to do. Unquote the Reign of Terror under which black people lift was the result of the implementation of unwritten norms that guaranteed white ********** but ultimately represented a corruption of American values and institutions that endangered all citizens, so she warned that attacks on the life, Liberty, and happiness of any citizen or class of citizens are attacks on distinctive American institutions that threaten the foundation of government law and order, too. Amplify the explosiveness of this charge. She also summoned the judgment of the foreign press, and I'll just remind you here. If the animus against foreigners and the connection between terrorism and foreignness, so she invoked the judgment of the foreign press by reprinting as what she called a friendly warning. The London Times assessment, that

mob violence against African Americans was a serious obstacle to the success of the South and industry. For even now black labor, which means it best inefficient labor must be largely relied on there, and its efficiency must be still further diminished by spasmodic terrorism. So the claim here is right that if why it's aren't moved by the torture and death of their black compatriots, perhaps the threat that mob mob rule post to their economic prosperity, their moral character, and also their national honor would persuade them to put an end to lynching. Alright, so let me return here and you see that. The the trade here has filled out a little bit. So Well's description of lynching is terrorism draws attention to the threat that it poses to everyone, including whites in virtue of its corrosion of law, government and morals. Like anarchist bombings, it was a method of political coercion in the crime that imperiled the state. But well, this hyperbolic repetition of these terms also re signified terrorism as a form of state sanctioned rather than anti state violence. An an expression of the white supremacist norms that constitute the real obvious unwritten foundations of the nation. Nevertheless, and this is, I think, an interesting aspect here. It was not just the lynchers who engaged in the throwing of bombs, figuratively speaking, so by describing her own work is Dynamatic wells, actually like interprose to those explosives hurled by anarchists in Chicago and elsewhere. She dared by not only emphasized the destructive potential of her rating, but also sort of signals her kinship with the anarchists, opposition to illegitimate government, an she affectively positions her work as a form of terrorism as it was understood in mainstream parlance at the time, namely, is a method of anti government agitation. So while this work I think offers a glimpse into multiple constellations of terrorism in the context of US racial politics at the turn of the century. Its conceptual heritage and tactical reverse ability meant that terrorism was compatible with a range of political positions. One the parallel drawn drawn between anarchists and lynchers enabled an understanding of both lynching and anti lynching activism as terrorism. Second, insofar as they posed a threat to a white supremacist political order, both the anarchists and black people were portrayed as terrorists and 3rd in their struggle against illegitimate ********** and violence. Black people were seen an importantly also saw themselves as the ears of anarchism and terrorism. Alright, so let me return to the beginning. What does this tell us about the question with which I started? Which is, you know how the seemingly unthinkable notion of white supremacist terrorism became widely acceptable over the course of the past decade. So I hope that it has become clear that I sort of set a trap, right? The question relies on presuppositions that are informed by a cultural heritage that following Walter Benyamine is really the legacy of pillage and barbarism of the victors of history. That we should be unable to contemplate without dread. For whom was the notion of white supremacist terrorism unthinkable, right?

So you. I'm just showing you some pictures too, you know. Sort of get you to think about some of the contexts that I talked about and for whom has it just now become acceptable and in what way? So beneath this victory parade that leads today's rulers over those who today are in the ground to quote Benjamin and that would make us think that this notion of white supremacist terrorism is knew or newly thinkable. There is a different knowledge that not only allows us to know history differently, but also the present. And that might open up the possibility for imagining a different future. Uhm? By shifting our attention to subjugated knowledges of political violence and the strategic function of terrorism in histories of struggles against racial injustice, it becomes more difficult to understand white supremacy as an extremist ideological movement that championed by alone individuals against the state and of which only the most virulent expressions constitute constitute terrorism. But it also makes it harder to dismiss invocations of white supremacist terrorism as either playing into the hands of a white supremacist state, or as sort of hysterical and hyperbolic over reactions on the part of oppressed people. And instead it might allow us to acknowledge that they are tactical operations in coalitional struggles against white supremacy, because these tactical operations are part of the same discursive terrain as the practices against which their mobilized. The language of terrorism, of course, remains susceptible to dismissal or recuperation, or, worse, it might actually reinforce and extend harmful practices of counter terrorism, which you know as we know. Predominantly target populations of color and especially Muslim and Arab people. But it also indicates at least that's what I want to argue. Unrealized possibilities. And it invites us to recognize and rethink what we know and don't know about as well as what could become of white supremacist terrorism in the United States. Close here. Stop sharing my screen so I can see you. Thank you.

Thanks for that. So first of all, thanks Verena. That was so wonderful. Wonderful talk. I've been given the impossible brief of responding to you in 10 minutes. Your paper is just far too rich for that to be realistic, but I'm going to have a go at extracting some bits of the paper that I myself found interesting. So here are some slides. Coming up in a second. OK, well hopefully you can see these slides. Alright, so this is how this is how the paper starts. So so Marina says since the late 1980s, and especially after 911, the term terrorism. Is primarily associated with foreign threats. But more recently, especially in the wake of the Capitol siege, the notion of white supremacist terrorism has become widely acceptable. So of course it's very striking, but Joe Biden described the siege of the Capitol as domestic terrorism, and this was in many ways a dip Archer from the previous practice of not using the word terrorism in relation to the activities of white supremacists or the extreme right in the in the US. So very nice

question. One of her questions is how is this happened and how how? How has what was previously unthinkable become thinkable? Now of course in the end, but there's a. There's a sense in which this is a trick question, but that's how the discussion discussion starts. I'm just a kind of historical point. I mean Interestingly, back in the mid 1990s. Timothy McVeigh carried out the Oklahoma City bombing. This was this was a like a white right winger attacking a federal building and interesting. The book was published in 2001 about McVay, which you may or may not see called American terrorist, so that so that is an example of the term being employed. More widely as long ago as 2001. Nevertheless, very nice, obviously correct that that it would be. It looks like a dip Archer to use the term. To describe, for example, the people attacking the capital. So my question, the question I want to ask is this, is it actually helpful or appropriate to use the label terrorist to describe those who laid siege to the catledge laid siege to the capital or perpetrators of white supremacist violence? OK, that's the question I want to ask. He states it might be true that Biden called called the Storming the Capitol and after domestic terrorism, we might want to call white supremacist actions terrorism. But is this is this is this helpful? Now that depends of course on how you define terrorism. So. He is a. He is a kind of standard thing that people say in the philosophical literature on terrorism. So, so one thing that seemingly almost every terrorism scholar accepts is that terrorism is fundamentally a form of political communication. It's communicative violence and this distinguishes it from other kinds of violence, and indeed from other kinds of political violence. So here's a representative quotation from Richard Jackson who's a very eminent terrorism scholar. So Jackson says terrorism is a form of political communication, an act of exemplary or symbolic violence designed to send messages to a range of audiences, including the wider society from which the targets were selected. So here's one question then, that arises when you think about something like the storming of the Capitol. Was it an act or a form of political communication? Now it's not clear to me that that that it was. I mean, I think it perfectly reasonable to describe it as an insurrection. As as as essentially in an attempt to overthrow the result of an election and to overthrow effectively, and it a duly elected president. But it doesn't appear to me to be a form of political communication or primarily for political communications. So then the question is going to be well in that case, should we still describe it as an act of domestic terrorism? Yeah, similarly if you think about lynching must appalling. But at one point, common practice in the states. It was lynching, a form of political communication. If you think it was a form of political communication, then the question is what is the message? And who are the intent? What was the intended audience? Now I I just I'm just raising. This is a question I don't think knowledge to this question is at all obvious, but let me just give you kind of three options here on these on this issue. OK, so one option

would be to say look, we really shouldn't be using the label terrorism for lynching or for the for the storming of the Capitol. And the reason we shouldn't use this label it is that these were not fundamentally communicative forms of violence. So if you think about lynching that there's a very striking description of it from this paper where she or someone she quote describes it as subjugation through intimidation. Uhm? So maybe we should be looking to describe it in those terms rather than terrorism, because it's potentially misleading to call it terrorism. A different perspective, option two would be to say no. Head on Lynching is a communicative act. It is actually it is a form of communication. Intimidation is a form of communication. So this would be the second option, which would be to say that countries what I've just been arguing actually, if you if you have a, if you have a kind of broad conception of communication, then all these things that brain that talks about are actually forms of communication. So that's option 2. OK, option three is to say, alright? Well, let's just agree that maybe maybe these acts aren't communicated or they aren't fundamentally communicative. But maybe there are other reasons for calling it terrorism. OK, so this whole problem of how to label these? Lynching, for example, only arises if you accept the Jackson stipulation that terrorist violence is communicative funds. But maybe we shouldn't accept that stimulation stipulation. I mean, maybe there are other reasons for calling lynching terrorism. So, for example, you might say lynchings are terrorism because they are intended to provoke terror. I mean, isn't that the basic idea? That's what lynching is. That's what lynching is fundamentally about. It doesn't matter whether it's intended to communicate anything or not. I mean, maybe provoking terrorism form of communication. But the important point is that it's about provoking terror. But well, that might be the right thing to say, although it would raise it would raise a question about whether this is making the label terrorism too broad. So if you think about, you know domestic violence. You know, think, think, think, think of. Think of a domestic situation where. 1. Partnered terrorizes. There, there you know their other partner. I mean, that's domestic violence may involve physical violence, but it's not clear that we wanna call that terrorism exactly. Maybe I mean, I don't know. Maybe we should call it terrorism, but it it it? It's not clear that is terrorism. And yet, domestic violence, in its most extreme forms, certainly is intended to provoke terror. So I think the issue what's really coming into focus here is just how difficult it is to say what we're talking about when we talk about terrorism. And I think we can. We can be pulled in different directions by these different examples. So moving on. Uhm? Something else that that Verena discuss is in her paper is the idea of terrorism as black self defense. So this is the idea that terrorism can be understood as an expression of agency on the part of oppressed people who turned the violence inflicted on them back against their oppressors. So terrorism here comes into view as a form of agency made possible by racist

violence as a response to it made possible by lynching as a response to it. Now again, I think there's a question here about whether we should call this sort of what I would call defensive violence as terrorism. Is it an act of terrorism to defend oneself against? Something like lynching? Again, the issue is, well, you know what's really going on here? Is this all about sending a message or simply about defending oneself? So maybe what starting to emerge from all this is that is that is, you know once again that the notion of terrorism is very unclear. In all of this. Now that got me thinking about Verena's book on on terrorism, which is very fun, very interesting and actually. As some of you may not have read it, I'll just quote a couple of things that she says in the book, but I think there on her talk today. So first of all, she says there is no good reason in my opinion, privilege, particular definitions of terrorism over the understanding operative in social, political, legal, military and other practices. You know, reading that you might think that you know one of the problems that well, the problem. I've been having it in in deciding what to say about these examples. Uh, is that is that, you know, if you privilege a particular definition like Jackson's definition, then you get into trouble in particular cases, 'cause it seems not apply smoothly in all of these cases. But maybe we shouldn't do that. Maybe we shouldn't privilege a particular definition. So how should we go about studying this phenomenon? Sovereen's proposal in her book is is to is to. Go for a kind of genealogical approach and this is how she says as she puts it. Rather than prioritizing or even universalising contemporary modes of understanding terrorism. Genealogy attends to the historically specific conditions under which terrorism emerges, as well as the contextual specific modes of understanding those phenomena we uncritically identify as terrorism. So here that the shift is. Away from I kind of definitional obsession towards towards a genealogical approach. So this is about emergence, the emergence of terrorism. But there again, I mean, it seems to me that it isn't possible to study the emergence of something unless we know what The thing is that we are studying. So we. Surely need at least a working all the revise aghbal definition of terrorism to carry out the genealogical project. And then we're back with the question of whether a specific feature such as having a community communicative function should or should not be included in the definition. So, so that question still remains, and the question still remains. What is the conception of terrorism on which lynching is terrorism? And is it? Is it is it? Is it the correct or a correct view? I want to end by just saying something about about the whole issue of. Nikki and Anarchism, which takes up quite a bit of rain. This paper so the as I understand it, what she? What you suggesting is is a connection between. Anarchism and race or racial politics. A man and she talks about the pathologizing of anarchists. As you know, abnormal in some way or another. But since anarchism was seen as a European import, what exactly is the connection with racism? I

mean presumably. European means white so. Even if anarchists were seen as having a kind of criminal personality, or is being weird in one way or another, is that former pathologising in and of itself a form of racialization? Or rather, is it something else that's relevant here which, which Verena mentions in passing, which is the perception of Russian anarchists, particularly as Jews and anarchism, is a Jewish phenomenon that would give you a kind of. Racial perspective on anarchism. So my so I mean my question, here is what actually is the role of anti-Semitism in all of this? Which which? It is sort of beneath the surface, I think in very honest discussion, but not. Explicit and my last question is just. What, whatever I mean, whatever you know, various American presidents thought about the relationship between anarchism and terrorism, effectively identifying them. How should we think about the relationship between them? And it seems to be that we shouldn't identify them because anarchism is an ideology whereas terrorism is a tactic and they seem to be too quite. Are two quite different things. OK, so that's it. So just a range of questions, therefore for discussion.

First of all, thank you very much. This is very helpful and I think you know you're asking really important questions and questions that people tend to press me on a lot. When I when I present this kind of work so. What do I start with? I guess I wanna start with the question of should you know, should we appropriate the term in this way? And I guess my response is that I'm not really interested in telling us what we should do. I'm more interested in what actual people have actually done so so the normativity. I guess of the project isn't the kind of prescriptive normativity that you know as philosophers like. Where we sort of tell people how they should be using terms. I'm more interested in. I'm really taking seriously how people have used the term in order to do certain things and and then I want to figure out, you know, given that they used the term in this way, what is it that they actually mean by it? So in a sense, right? If you're looking from for definitions. My hope is that the definition will emerge from the sort of empirical work rather than, you know, we philosophers come up with a definition and then sort of tell people you know you're using the term wrong and you're using it right. And this is how we should understand it. So that's one point. I also think there are sort of concerns of epistemic injustice. You know, if we want to tell, especially oppressed groups, that they shouldn't be using a term in this particular way, I think that you know people have used the term for a long time, and. It in a way, right? It's taking away some interpretive resources that that has allowed people for a long time to make sense of, and name injustices perpetrated against them. And so I think there are sort of epistemic reasons to be cautious about about that. Uhm? So there was also a question about, you know our our definitions and so. The the value of definitions right? I guess like one thing I want to say is that

I'm not opposed to definitions. Sort of as a general claim. I think definitions can be really useful if we're talking about legal action, right? So Timothy McVeigh legally, right, was was. Tried and convicted under airlake terrorism statutes, and I think that's useful. I also think there was interesting. Interesting how his actions were reported in the news, right? So it was initially reported as an act of terrorism on the FBI. I think. Was assuming that that it was actually like Islamic groups who perpetrated it. But then when it when it came out that it was this, you know, white? White supremacist American. Very quickly the terrorism term was sort of dropped, at least from like public discourse and media representations. And so that's what I'm interested in, right? Like regardless of how we define the term, like, what does it actually allow us to do in these sorts of debates and discussions? Alright, so I also wanted to. Say something about the question of whether we can study something when we don't know what it is that we study and. I mean, I think that to me that's a really important and difficult question, and maybe it's something that we can sort of all discuss together in the Q&A part of this. So my. My cop out in a sense is that I'm really focusing on the word itself, right. When have people used toward terrorism and how are they using it and why are they using it and what are they trying to do when they're using it in this way? And so I think that by doing it that way around it, really. You know challenges this idea that we can know once and for all what terrorism is. Come and. Yeah, like I think that that goes back to you know to to my sort of skepticism about definition of projects that you also mentioned. And then the last question was about, you know disconnection of racism, anti-Semitism, anarchism and so on. So when I talk about racism, especially in this paper, what I have in mind is fuko's account of racism, which is really sort of counter intuitive in some sense because he doesn't mean a sort of, you know, ethnic racism against racialized people. What he means by racism is. A range of mechanisms that are intended to protect. At the integrity and purity and health of the race, the human race against its abnormal elements and so those abnormal elements can be anything. That's not, you know, sort of like properly weighted. So it includes disabled people. It includes Jewish people. Of course, it includes racialized populations. It also includes anarchists, right? So it includes people who who challenged a sort of health and. Integrity of a particular sort of idealized image of the human race. Is that? Did I forget something? There is just so much to say, but I don't want to take up too much time. I'd rather sort of open it up, but.