

#1

Omit:

Academia

What I found most fascinating from Thursday was the “Imperial Courts” web-documentary. The whole project had been done with such visible care, in no way did it feel like the people in the documentary were being museum-like displayed. The neighbourhood wasn’t fetishized, it wasn’t approached from the point of a spectator, a fly on the wall; instead, you were immersed in the neighbourhood, treated as a respectful visitor.

On the about page of Imperial Courts, they describe the project as aiming “to build an online historiography of which the residents are both protagonists and co-authors”. As a humanities student, this sentence struck me. I am used to seeing historiographies in an academic context, I have had to write one myself for one of my courses. The form that took was a standardized apa college essay. Then, seeing this project being contextualized as a historiography challenges the very structures of academia. What happens when historiographies are not written, but freely composed?

Whiteness

Friday was familiar. In a good way. “Whites, Jews and Us” was a book I had discovered fairly recently when the PDF was gifted to me along a very personal and intimate note, its content of radical love had seemed fitting. Radical love is an idea I strongly believe in, and one which I have carried with me ever since reading bell hooks’ “All About Love”. But Bouteldja’s writing is quite different, her words are sharp and cut through whiteness itself.

To the white people: Be like Genet. Betray your whiteness. I will expect nothing less from you. That is the radical love I offer you.

To myself: You are not them. Your proximity to them relies on their crimes. Your proximity to them rests in a wound. Don’t forget that.

Bibliography

Bouteldja, Houria. *Whites, Jews, and Us: toward a Politics of Revolutionary Love*. Semiotext(e), 2017.

Lixenberg, Dana, and Eefje Blankevoort. *Imperial Courts*, www.imperialcourtsproject.com/.