



Relocating Whiteness' in Nordic Media Discourse

by Bolette Benedictsen Blagaard

Act 5: Denmark, Finland, Norway & Sweden, November 25, 2006

Introduction

The field of critical studies of whiteness takes its starting point in American critical race theory in the early 1990s. It is a theory which recognizes phenotypes as a structure of power rather than neutral biological incident, and it is a theory which brings attention to the naturalized power structures still at play in Western societies. However, as a highly grounded and political theory, critical studies of whiteness display nuances according to the historical, social, geographical, cultural, ethnical etc. contexts, they are played out in.

The work of American scholars into the contextual and historical background of slavery and segregation laws, turns around the axis of black and white. European whiteness studies also find justification in the multiplicities of nationalisms, border politics, colonialism and migration within and among white phenotypes. Because of similar historical experiences, American and European critical studies of whiteness also converge in, for instance, a notion of Western slave trade, which was perpetuated by both European and American populations. In addition the field is informed through diverse scholarly disciplines. American analyses of white hegemonic expression began in literary studies, while succeeding European scholars are situated within the sociology and history departments of the universities. However, both American and European academics are flourishing in new inter-disciplinary areas such as gender, media and cultural studies.

What I will be arguing in this paper is that the Scandinavian context for exploring these issues provides a set of new coordinates (which builds on both American and European critical work on whiteness) through which the field of study can be developed. The Nordic region, in particular, is in several ways the epitome of whiteness in the Western and Nordic European consciousness. Such whiteness easily becomes simultaneously the “norm” as well as something invisible – everything and nothing² – an attitude that is then reflected in journalism and other

media representations. Still, it may be premature to speak of a Scandinavian field of critical studies of whiteness. In a Scandinavian context the question of the colonial past is only just starting to emerge. It is significant that conferences and projects such as the present *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* (Kuratorisk Aktion), or *Denmark and the Black Atlantic* (Department of English, German and Romans Languages, Copenhagen University, Denmark), and *Postcolonialism in Norden?* (Institute of Women's Studies, Åbo University, Finland) have all been realized in 2006. In this paper I shall attempt to open up a space for Scandinavian critical studies of whiteness grounding my analysis specifically in the context of media discourse. I will also be drawing on the broad theoretical framework provided by American and European scholars, introducing the already existing debates to this "new" context.

My approach is partly based on postcolonial theory, partly on critical race theory and feminist epistemology. In such an interdisciplinary approach it is important to understand the processes, debates and disciplines, which lead to the identification of the new coordinates. Through a preliminary outlining of the American angle on the discipline I will be arguing that, although it was the American scholars and thinkers who gave life to the field and to new ways of thinking, their work is not in itself sufficient to inform the field in a European context. Secondly, I envision the European critical studies of whiteness to be distinguishable from the American field by its emphasis on multiplicity, due to the historical, cultural and linguistic differences between the two continents. Finally, through discursive analysis of the media I will argue a grounded and relocated understanding of whiteness in a Scandinavian context. An analysis of Scandinavian whiteness in media discourse must be based on the information or connotations that are omitted or ignored. I will be looking to Toni Morrison's work³ for support, because it is particularly helpful in the area of journalistic discourse. Like literature or the sciences, journalism is thought to be neutral. Journalism is, however, not contextless but embedded in culture, which in this case is Western and predominantly white. Unfortunately, this is for the most part invisible to the receiver of journalistic narration and news, who is likely to be submerged in the same culture. However, contrary to Morrison's field of analysis, this is not necessarily a matter of binary positions of black and white supporting each other, rather, my analysis will focus on tracing the multiple narratives and discourses left out – relocating the discourses to forgotten or omitted contexts. I must also point out that my position is informed by analyses of scientific knowledge. I will be referring to international newspaper articles, documentaries, Danish articles as well as websites in my efforts to illustrate my point. More on this later.

I

American race scholars in the early 1990s⁴ developed two main points of critical discussion: the notion of a dynamic power relation structured around a centre and a periphery – relating the Hegelian master/slave dichotomy to the race discussion, and the question of what to do with this relation in order to create an anti-racist society.⁵ Literary analysis made it possible to tease out the hidden structures of power as it is represented in the work of authors. Toni Morrison⁶ eloquently expressed the discourse of critical studies of whiteness, attacking the unspoken assumptions embedded in American literary history, and laying bare the hegemony of white America. Morrison deconstructs the literary canon and points to omissions and silences in the master works and classics. Her groundbreaking work directs attention to the way literature is written, read and taught in American society, exposing the strong claim of white normativity in the literary canon, which presents itself as “neutral knowledge”. Morrison believes that whiteness is crucial to the Americanness of America. She states: “American means white”.⁷ Adding to this, the American phenomenon of whiteness is a subjugation of black people. Whiteness is a power tool to work on – originally – African slaves in order to establish and maintain power, as well as an exclusion and inclusion mechanism in the sustaining of white supremacy and white hegemony. What Morrison is identifying through her literary analysis in *Playing in the Dark* is rooted in the fight for equal rights, started by the Civil Rights Movement decades before, and is traceable in every corner of our Western societies, and thus has a highly historical and reality-based claim.

White as well as black scholars in the United States have taken up this line of work on whiteness following Morrison. However, given the fact that the main target of analysis is the schism between black and white people’s experiences or knowledge claims, and that this very analysis is grounded in personal experience, tension around the question of who produces the best and most trustworthy knowledge is a continuing site of debate between African-American or European-American scholars. Meanwhile, the field is further informed by, among others, Latin American⁸ and Asian American⁹ scholarship and disciplinary approaches differ both between and within the groups. What they have in common, though, is the portrayal of the Other as central to the dichotomous racist structure of white hegemony or white supremacy. The Other is necessary for a Self to be sustained, whether the Self is projecting its own unwanted qualities onto the Other, or fixing the qualities of the Other in order to say something about the Self. To a large extent in American critical studies of whiteness, the Self and the Other are colour-coded respectively white and black. Though the Other is diversified and divided

into degrees and expressions of Otherness, the white Self is perceived largely unified in the analyses.¹⁰ The quest of the scholars in this field is to deconstruct, in one way or another, the structure of white hegemony in order to (re)construct an anti-racist society. Some of the critical studies made on whiteness explore the construction of whiteness in social, historical and genetic discourse,¹¹ others explore the dynamics of the construction and the sustaining of the racist society¹² whilst others still look into migration structures¹³ or problematize the “knots” of the debate, taking different angles on the issue.¹⁴ One of these “knots” is the question of what to do with this power relation and subjugation of black people by white people. That is, how to realize an anti-racist society. Morrison calls for a visibility of whiteness, and an analysis of “the impact of racism on those who perpetuate it.”¹⁵ The question that follows is whether to abolish whiteness all together¹⁶ or transform white hegemony¹⁷ into anti-racist structures of thinking of the Self. This is both a methodological and a strategic political question.

This divergence in the field is strongly mapped out in a recent publication from African American scholars, where philosopher George Yancy¹⁸ equates ontology of whiteness with an (un)intentional form of racism. Through historical construction and social ontological performance, whiteness has “profound, pervasive, and systemic oppressive consequences for nonwhite people.”¹⁹ Thus:

*“Abolishing whiteness is not to be confined to the psychological sphere. It is not about feeling comfortable with one’s whiteness. It is not about confession. An effective form of white abolition must involve the self-conscious deracination of interconnected and synergetic political, cultural, economic, semiotic, psychosocial, intra-psychological, and inter-personal sites of white supremacy.”*²⁰

Awareness and good will is not enough. Rather, whiteness should be re-appropriated into a negation of itself in order to lose its supremacy and hegemony in the American society. Like hooks, Yancy argues, that whiteness as a structural hegemony can only be subverted through the black ontology position and the politics of experience. However, this radical solution seems to deny white people the right to a group identification and belonging.²¹ Lucius Outlaw,²² moreover, rejects the idea that abolishing whiteness is a necessity, on the grounds that abolishment would only come about through “full-scale racial cleansing or equally full-scale enforced cross-racial breeding.”²³ White people are a reality – it is the way they are *thought of as being* white, which makes the difference. Outlaw believes in reworking and rehabilitating whiteness through “reversal of symbolism”. The meaning of black has been successfully reversed from a marker

of inferiority into a sign of positive empowerment, he claims. Similarly, the meaning of white can be reversed from a marker of structural privilege to a site of anti-racist critique of its own privileges. Furthermore, Outlaw holds that the younger generations of white Americans are the first generations to feel the full weight of identity politics, and they see themselves and their interests as distinct racially. Finally, Outlaw finds it “disrespectful – even antihuman” to demand of white people that they eradicate *all* identity and hereditary connections in terms of ethnic/racial whiteness while repudiating supremacy. Whiteness should be rehabilitated through “clear commitment to exploring and adopting the real prospects and possibilities for renovative reconceptualizations and revalorizations of racial whiteness as an identity-setting aid to group formation and culture making *without aspirations for White Racial Supremacy or hegemony*.”²⁴

The two positions sketched out above have consequences for the view on the racial diversity of academics working within the field of critical studies of whiteness: though they both draw on the theoretical work of past African Americans, Yancy does not trust white people to take on the job of changing the notion and the political ramifications of white hegemony without aspiring to white racial supremacy. In contrast Outlaw relinquishes completely the project of revalorizing white identity to white academics, though he offers his experiences of racism and of subverting symbolism as an informative guide. What seems to be played down in the debate is what Curry²⁵ notes as *praxis, interaction* and *contact* – an everyday lived experience of each other in a racially heterogeneous society, which can lead to re-imagining of whiteness as well as a transformation of economical, political and social white hegemony. The debate of abolition versus rehabilitation leaves fairly untouched the fact that few people are purely white or black genetically, historically, symbolically, socially or culturally. The categories are ever-changing constructions²⁶ within which nuances persist. The debate too easily categorizes blacks and whites, which has consequences for the attempts made to deconstruct the structures of power.²⁷

In the early critical studies of whiteness, whiteness is a set of privileges that subjugate politically, psychologically and culturally nonwhite people. It is inherently a power position, which may come with stereotypical characteristics such as a tendency to Protestant guilt, consciousness, scientific reason, and industry.²⁸ But, for the most part whites are not endowed with a collective identity or long common history.²⁹ “Before domination, whites did not exist as whites but in relation to other group identities”,³⁰ however, though whiteness today may seem transparent and invisible in all its normativity, it is important to remember that this norm is created

via a history in which whiteness is the visible and self-conscious marker of white supremacy³¹ in all its violent reality. Like Outlaw, Linda Martín Alcoff suggests a way of re-imagining whiteness without aspiring to white supremacy or hegemony, but which holds on to both the positive and the negative aspects of the white cultural history in order for white people to redefine whiteness constructively in a multicultural and racial world. However, it would seem difficult to deconstruct, abolish or rehabilitate an entity that is not identifiable as one. When the settlers of the “New World”³² entered the Americas, they brought with them culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds, which they identified with as well as positioned themselves against.³³ But the feeling of white American identity and belonging is no longer rooted in ethnic or cultural identities from the “Old World” such as that of Italian Americans, Irish Americans, and Scandinavian Americans.³⁴ The ethnic diversities have not been exchanged for any common cultural legacy of white people³⁵ rather whiteness has become the unnoticeable norm. As I see it, the lack of common history and collectivity – before the meeting with the Other and of domination of the Other – poses a methodological problem to critical studies of whiteness as it has been discussed here. The lack forces a reliance on an unstable notion of undefined European ancestry, which is in need of transformation in relation to a very real non-European American experience. The conclusions become ideas of “third voices”³⁶ and “double consciousness”,³⁷ both inspired by poststructuralist feminism and postcolonial scholarships. But rather than attempting to see whiteness as one I want to argue particular whiteness grounded in specific geographical, demographical, cultural, political, historical, and ethnical discourses.

II

To address the specifically grounded Nordic situation, then, another notion of whiteness is necessary. Racial identities must be recognized as being multi-layered, shifting and turning according to historical and social contexts, while acknowledging the persistence of white hegemony and racialized structural inequalities.³⁸ The theories coming out of the United Kingdom (UK) are very helpful on this point and have had a great impact in the development of critical studies of whiteness in a European context. However, the UK field is dominated by the discipline of cultural studies and sociology and by the history of the British Empire examined in the field of postcolonial theory. These conditions tend to carry over unquestioned to the continental works on whiteness. Thus postcolonial theory to a large extent is still dominated by analyses of Indian and Asian writers rather than African writers for instance³⁹ or writers from the former Danish colony, Iceland, or indigenous literature from Greenland⁴⁰ for that matter. Furthermore, the literary

discipline seems to carry most of the weight in ways of methodology. Scholars such as Vron Ware,⁴¹ Paul Gilroy⁴² and others move the field of study into the political and social sphere: a move that emphasises the consequences and the reality of racial and national exclusions and inclusions in socio-economic terms. Ware⁴³ recognizes the limitations of the United States (US) framing of the issue of whiteness and develops a grounded theory within a UK context. With Les Back,⁴⁴ Ware works with whiteness as a racial category, whose political and cultural meanings are intersected by social divisions and antagonism, in particular gender, class, and sexuality.⁴⁵ Also noteworthy are Ware's⁴⁶ earlier analyses into the structural importance of white femininity as a factor that keeps racist relations intact, grounding the critical studies in a UK colonial and imperialist setting. Ware takes a comparative approach to the results of her American colleagues⁴⁷. She furthermore takes a strong abolitionist stand, which seems to counteract the quest for grounding whiteness as a racial category and identity. It would seem that in order to fulfil an abolitionist project, Ware posits whiteness entirely as an oppressive power relation and normative structure. The issue of how to deal with dominant categories – such as whiteness or masculinity – has been central to the debate on the politics of postmodern methodology and deconstruction since the 1970s. Recently, this critical approach has also been applied to the analyses of minorities such as “femininity” and the “Others” of dominant subject positions.⁴⁸ These analyses introduce a much-needed distinction between quantitative and qualitative notions of margins and centres. I shall return to this in section V. In this paper, I am arguing for an affirmative grounding and empowering mode of critique.

III

Gilroy⁴⁹ begins his highly praised and reprinted book *Between Camps*⁵⁰ by stating the century of the colour line has passed, though racial hierarchy persists. Thus, Gilroy contemplates this paradox using European history as his guideline, while believing that by working through history's extreme events and gruesome uses of scientific reasoning, a non-Eurocentric society can be achieved. Noticeably, Gilroy takes a step away from the vocabulary of anti-racism and dichotomous structures – though his social and political aim is still to reach an anti-racist society.

I agree with Gilroy in that European whiteness cannot be analyzed without taking a close look at the historical periods of colonization and the time of Nazism and fascism. I want to suggest that bodily experience and reality of white hegemony is crucial in understanding the importance and the urgency of critical studies of whiteness. Unfortunately, the scholarship in a European context is limited and scarcely visible when the focus is on the Nordic region, Scandinavia, and in

particular Denmark. It is also in Scandinavia that the non-memory of whiteness seems to flourish. Journalistic and public discourses rarely touch upon the issue of Nordic phrenology and racial hygiene in Sápmi,⁵¹ displacements of Greenlandic children away from their parents to foster care in Denmark,⁵² or Viking representations' connection to Nazi Germany. The idea of recognizing oneself as part of white power relations and then working towards re-imagining oneself as white does not have a strong hold on the northern European theorists and academics. The field of postcolonial theory slowly emerges in Denmark as of the beginning of this century⁵³ and the question of whiteness within the field, which calls for analyses of symbolic blackening and whitening of peoples,⁵⁴ is even less explored.⁵⁵ As stated in the introduction, conferences and projects on the colonial past have been realized in 2006, following journalistic endeavours on the legacy of the former Danish colonies in the Caribbean.⁵⁶ The academic fields in which these investigations take place are modelled on the US and UK predecessors: mainly literature and anthropology. Yet, early attempts at building a new awareness through interdisciplinary studies and projects such as *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* and to an extent *Denmark and the Black Atlantic*, have proven very successful. However, while the cutting-edge academics and curators are struggling for academic, public and media attention, the representation of white Scandinavia in non-Scandinavian media is forcefully implementing a stereotypical social imaginary of Scandinavian whiteness. In particular the social *genetic* imaginary⁵⁷ as a new way of seeing life, identity and social practices spurred on by new technologies is being used. It remakes nature as technology in parallel to earlier times' remake of nature into destiny and identity. And as I will show in the following it is widely communicated through mass media.

The *New York Times*⁵⁸ published an article on the Danish sperm bank Cryos International, the world's largest sperm bank, telling the story of 10,000 pregnancies worldwide by Danish college boys under the heading "Spreading Viking Genes, Without Boats."⁵⁹ Despite the piece's modest size it calls attention to several interwoven factors related to whiteness, which I will attempt to recount here. Narrating the story of how come Cryos International is the largest sperm bank in the world, journalist Alvarez draws on a linguistically and visually expressed imaginary of brutal Vikings as well as the idea of intelligence being genetically hereditary. Thus, she begins her story by imagining

*"If, suddenly, children in some corners of the world look blonder and taller, if they feel oddly at ease on a bicycle or juggling three languages, there may be an explanation: Arhus and its university men."*⁶⁰

Three things are immediately made available in this opening paragraph: (1) the idea of a centre versus a periphery or “corners of the world”, (2) the idea of biology determining talents and mental qualities such as language skills and interests in bicycling and connecting them to the notion of “university men”, thus, a conflation of hereditary markers and learnt behaviour, and (3) the linking of a certain “blonder and taller” physicality and appearance to the Nordic region of Europe. These three strands run through and intermingle with each other throughout the entire piece. The centre-periphery strand (1) is sustained by a number of hints towards worldly spreading of genes by the company and by college boys as well as through the emphasis on international Nordic descendants’ “demand” for “pure Scandinavian spare parts” and the “aggressive” marketing and “industry” involved. There is an imagined centre from where the genes flow out. Moreover, the centre-periphery is marked by well-known dichotomous ideals. Forty countries are the receivers of the 10,000 pregnancies and among those are Middle Eastern countries where sperm donations are considered “taboo”, it is added. This taboo is in stark contrast to the Danish culture, which is portrayed as “famously secular and sexually liberal”. It is underlined that the centre, from where the strong genes come, is pure Scandinavian, whereas the backwards Middle East, as well as other less blond countries, belong to the periphery. A narrative, which has a long imperial history of “the white man’s burden” and of educating the world in the white man’s image.

(2) The idea of genetic hereditary qualities is clearly expressed in the answer given to the *New York Times* by the managing director of Cryos International Ole Schou: “It’s not that people want superchildren...It’s that they want someone like them, someone they can relate to.”⁶¹ Relation in this sense is equalled to sameness or common ancestry, which is thought to give a common frame of reference outside time and space. The denial of the future parents’ desire for a “superchild” is strongly negated in the donors’ many academic and physical talents listed in the article as well as on the website along with their height, weight, eye colour and ethnic origin. However, Cryos International is the largest sperm bank in the world today, and somehow it would seem plausible to think that others besides Nordic descendants must demand this genetic coding and feel related to the Viking ancestry in order for this to be the case.⁶² It is the social genetic imaginary,⁶³ or, in Anthias’ & Yuval-Davis’⁶⁴ terms, a social “ontology of collectivity or belongingness...postulated through common origin or destiny”,⁶⁵ which is at stake here. The risk is of course that the ability to choose a future child’s ancestry and the idea of a perfect life embedded in the genes will have social consequences and lead to discrimination “against difference at the point of origin of life.”⁶⁶ Due to the social structures of most Western societies today white

children may be seen as having a better opportunity at a more perfect life than a nonwhite child. Thus, an African Italian woman chose to give birth to a white child by artificial insemination “because she believed that a white child had a better future than one of mixed race.”^{67,68} This is not to say that the world would be white if we could all choose to have white babies. But it is not an altogether unfamiliar thought in the history of sperm banks to have “social reasons”, such as improvement of the white race, for choosing artificial insemination. Consider the American millionaire Robert Graham, who created a sperm bank for intelligent people in the early 1980s urging Nobel Prize winners to make deposits.⁶⁹ Graham’s idea was that the white American race was intellectually deteriorating and needed a boost of “intelligent genes”. The sperm bank created over two hundred lives before Graham’s death and the closing down of the bank in 1999. The idea of the sperm bank as we know it today was born with Graham and his so-called “The Repository for Germinal Choice”, and its origin is thus not entirely innocent but rather connected to the eugenics of the colonial era, the Nordic eugenics and the Nazi’s “Lebensborn” project.⁷⁰ Berkowitz and Snyder⁷¹ thus suggest a regulation, which limits infertile couples making use of artificial insemination to make “a selection of a race which...reasonably approximate the respective races of the mother and father.” This is obviously a problematic assertion in several ways for instance when it comes to homosexual couples or single women, who wish to become pregnant. In addition the view of the gene as a fixed entity determining everything from IQ to size of feet and cultural preferences, and which can be transferred unaltered through generations, has been criticised extensively by, among others, Evelyn Fox Keller,⁷² who draws attention to the dynamic structure of the genome. Rather than a fixed identity the gene is ever evolving with the “evolution of evolvability” as a driving force. Multiplicity is the structure. However, dominant ideas die hard, and the idea that you can design a baby in your own white and blue-eyed image dies even harder. It is not the knowledge of the genetic functions which guide the media discourse on ancestry and genetic relation, rather it is the “cult of the gene”⁷³ and genetics as “the modern and secularized form of fate: a totalizing explanation of all the ills in the world.”⁷⁴ I may want to suggest that this idea circumscribes female participation in the tracing of ancestry. Women are mere wombs or containers, which help the male hygienic reproduction. The fascination is with the cloning of the Same, Le Breton asserts. It is, thus, the imaginary of ancestry and relations which inform us through, for instance, journalism and media in general.

Through the genetic imaginary of the Viking the common past of the Nordic people is constructed as a self-identity apart from other peoples' identity when referred to in the international media. It is ur-Scandinavian, and it is masculine. It is the construction of the Scandinavians and the Scandinavian culture as ancient and therefore pure. These journalistic representations latch on to the social genetic imaginary, which in turn is an extension of early genetic research such as eugenics and racial, mental and able-bodied population control. It is a naturalization of genetic destiny. The colonial era and the raciology which followed and sustained the colonies, have received much attention in recent years in European scholarship. Much of the driving force behind the colonization of today's "Third World" is founded in the same theories of eugenics and racial hygiene, which supported slavery in the colonies as well as in the Americas. It was the idea behind the quest to prove the white man's superiority with all means necessary. I would argue that this idea is embedded in the idea of Enlightenment. The rationality in scientific research sustains an idea of progress on whose peak the white man stands. An example of this construction is the field of eugenics where, in the 19th century, scientists tried to scientifically prove the conflation of physical appearances and personality traits and specific racial qualities.⁷⁵ What was visual on the body was thought to mirror the mind and character of people, and what would appear to be arbitrary characteristics were linked to black or white skin, flat or pointed noses, brown or blue eyes – that is to say "them" or "us". This gave rise to the now abandoned phrenologic studies where craniums were measured and assessed and the races were ranked.⁷⁶ This was of course done in the colonies, but in Scandinavia also on indigenous people such as the Sámi people in North Norway, Sweden and Finland, and the Inuit in Denmark.⁷⁷ Not surprisingly, the white, male "scientists" ranked themselves – the white race – at the top of the list, white women and black people of both sexes followed further down the list. The ranking was thought justifiable through the rational dissection and classification of physical features, which in turn sustained the white masculine superiority. Of all the physical features on the black body in particular, the female genitalia and buttocks caught the attention of the white "scientists".⁷⁸ The polygenic argument, that there are several human "races", which stem from different geneses, was sustained through metonymic and sexually charged representation of the African female, supported by "rational science". Eugenics and white "scientific" work done to disclose differences between races were invoked primarily by controlling reproduction and sexuality in the European colonies⁷⁹ as well as in Scandinavia.⁸⁰ Fear of degeneracy is linked to a notion of *purity* of the genes and the races, and in this sense the "enemy" becomes the uncontrollable sexuality, which in turn is

placed with, firstly, the Other; the female body, then the black body and finally the non-human; the animal. Further than that, sexual violence and rape becomes a means of implementing ethnic cleansing.⁸¹ Otherness is also situated within the hegemonic whiteness, and so in colonial discourse the “science” of eugenics extended into the whites as different races as well. And these different shades of pale were ranked in hierarchical order similar to the ranking between Africans and Caucasians.⁸² In the latter half of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century, the white Caucasian race was subdivided into Anglo-Saxons, Celts, Teutons, Jews, and southern Europeans or “brownish races”.⁸³ In addition a hierarchy of classes among whites persisted and was kept in force by the means of eugenics and control of reproduction. As a pivotal player in the game of reproduction, white women could likewise threaten the white masculine order. Not any white woman would do for the job of procreating the white male, only women of domesticity, bearer of family values and future colonial conquerors were eligible for insemination, and so prostitutes, African women, and white single women were all seen as a threat to the wholesome family icon of colonialism.⁸⁴ Or, expressed differently: they threatened the control over reproduction, which was held by the white man.

Reviewing this short historical account of eugenics and racial discrimination, fascism and the Nazi’s use of eugenics and medicine can come as no surprise. Robert Proctor points out⁸⁵ that Germany was not alone in praising the “science” of eugenics and racial hygiene when the Nazi’s were elected into power in 1932. Like Gilroy, Proctor suggests that the reasons for the Nazi’s to support the “science” of eugenics were quite similar to that of the colonial powers as laid out by Stoler (and to that of Graham when he began his work with *The Repository of Germinal Choice*,⁸⁶ I would add). The Nazi’s saw their race as degenerating after the First World War and used medicine and racial hygiene to secure its survival and superiority.

IV

With the genetic social imaginary defining Scandinavians as Vikings and Vikings as a certain breed of babies with certain genetic qualities, eugenics seems to have gone mainstream. And as most mainstream culture it is both followed by and productive of very convincing visual effects.

In the *New York Times* article (3) the physicality and aesthetics of the blond and tall offspring of Danes are obvious in the Viking metaphor hinted at in the headline as well as used throughout the piece. The accounts of the sperm donors in the

sperm bank catalogue moreover describes the college boys as physically active in four kinds of sports and measuring 1,9 meters. On top of which the success of the sperm bank is said to be partly due to “a high success rate in producing offspring.” Thus, the virile Danish college boys of the 21st century are populating the world just like during the Viking Age, only less violently – and as the heading says: without boats. The Viking imaginary is furthered on the American website for Cryos International and by documentaries examining Viking lives and raids such as the BBC production “The Blood of the Vikings”.⁸⁷ This imaginary is introducing the Viking as a man with long blond hair and a fierce look in his eyes and on the world. As the Online Etymological Dictionary states it, a Viking is a “Scandinavian pirate”,⁸⁸ a war-loving Wildman out to spread his seeds. But it is an admired “Wildman”; admired for his longships,⁸⁹ craftsmanship and technical knowledge, as well as for his fierce fighter instinct. In “The Blood of the Vikings” the Vikings are portrayed purely in war battles, and the narrator, Julian Richards, meticulously describes their fatal wounds, deaths and killings. There is a kind of fascination with the violence the Vikings produced and the vision they had of their own worth combined with their talent for the more technical side of war. It is a fascination, which can be paralleled with what Susan Sontag⁹⁰ identified as the love for and the aesthetics of the Noble Savage in fascist imaginary.

“Fascist aesthetics include but go far beyond the rather special celebration of the primitive to be found in The Last of the Nuba [Book by Leni Riefenstahl 1976, BB]. More generally, they flow from (and justify) a preoccupation with situations of control, submissive behaviour, extravagant effort, and the endurance of pain; they endorse two seemingly opposite states, egomania and servitude.”⁹¹

To underline the parallel between the fascist aesthetics of Riefenstahl and that of today’s documentary, “The Blood of the Vikings” is divided into five episodes of which the last is called “The Last of the Vikings”, echoing Riefenstahl’s book mentioned above. Sontag also argues the circumscription of female importance underlined in Riefenstahl’s fascist artistic photos. The “fascist ideal: a society in which women are merely breeders and helpers, excluded from all ceremonial functions and represent a threat to the integrity and strength of men”⁹² is also visible in the Viking representation in “The Blood of the Vikings” when the narrator, Richards, takes it upon himself – with the help of scientists – to track Viking DNA in contemporary male Britons’ veins, and thus once again is tying together genetics and masculine identity.

Again this imagery has a history worth noticing. In addition to the lurid “science” of racial hygiene the colonial and the Nazi ideas of race and raciology have the

visual representations in common. The commercialization of whiteness selling purity through soap commercials and other imperial products during the height of colonial regimes⁹³ is comparable to the fascist admiration of white skin and strong health and (male) bodies. Richard Dyer⁹⁴ elaborates on this visual and filmic history of the white, male body in the book *White*. In this visual iconography and narrative, as in the colonial eugenic discourse, whiteness is equated with masculinity, which in turn finds its favourite position between deity and humanity. This is evident in Riefenstahl's documentary "Triumph of the Will" (1935) in which Hitler is seen as a descending god from heaven both sustained by filmic aesthetics (lights, angles and the opening sequence following Hitler's plane's way through the clouds) and the Nuremberg rally content (the cheering crowds, adoring faces) carrying sexual undertones.⁹⁵ In Hollywood productions, the super-human white man is personified in characters such as Tarzan, the Terminator and Rambo – all portrayed by athletes and bodybuilders. Dyer draws further attention to the "pemplum" movies of Italy 1957-1965, which depict heroes of classical antiquity in mythical and Biblical stories.⁹⁶ The genre displays the "built body and the white values it carries."⁹⁷ The relationship to fascism is complex, Dyer argues, and is suggested through the iconography of strong, white, male bodies, which are part of the audience as well as larger than life (again Riefenstahl's portrait of Hitler as well as BBC's fighting Vikings come to mind). This iconography is a continuance of the fascist imaginary featuring Mussolini in the place of the athletes and muscular men. It is moreover recognisable in the Nazi representations of the Aryan soldiers and Hitler. Thus, fascism is the "explicit politics of whiteness."⁹⁸ Or as journalist and documentary theorist Brian Winston puts it in BBC's "The Late Show Special: Leni Riefenstahl"⁹⁹ in which Riefenstahl's aesthetic expressions are debated: fascist aesthetics are the dark side of European tradition – we want to treat it as a virus, but it is a part of us.

V

The realization of white hegemony in a Scandinavian context, thus, calls for a discursive analysis of the omitted, and for such an exercise European scholars' perspectives grounded in an awareness of multiplicities and specific history prove helpful. Looking at the field from the other side of the channel, the field of critical studies of whiteness adds to the British theories of racism and nationalism, multiple histories of fascism and anti-Semitism, as well as other forms of cultural, religious and gender discriminations, which have guided the continental history. I have shown that the field of critical studies of whiteness leaves not just one trail of slavery and subjugation of one Other by another, but rather it leaves multiple

crossroads stretching across continents, time and gender, which encompass a Scandinavian history and representation. The dichotomous whiteness debate coming from the US is insufficient to deal with the multiplicity of the European context due to diverse historical,¹⁰⁰ linguistic¹⁰¹ and migration¹⁰² patterns. This is likewise realized by Griffin & Braidotti¹⁰³ in their text on European whiteness in which they identify the racialization of cultural differences to be at the root of European nationalisms. They argue that we need to consider the notion of *difference* in the field in order to break down the dichotomous “them” and “us” thinking, and take full account of intra-group differences.¹⁰⁴ The necessity is illustrated further by Liliane Kandel,¹⁰⁵ who sketches out ways in which feminists have helped omit, relativize, and legitimize anti-Semitic discourse. The rub is still as Griffin & Braidotti, following Gilroy, state: “can one be European *and* Black or Muslim?”¹⁰⁶ that is: is European by definition white? The question returned with a vengeance in the controversy over twelve cartoons portraying, in accordance with Muslim faith, the irrepresentable Prophet Mohammed, published in 2005 in a Danish newspaper. The publication sparked the question once again, and the answer (as it was pronounced in the European press and public debates) was “no”.

As Ponzanesi states, “Europe is also the continent where the distinction between civilization and barbarism was invented. The fear of the stranger is strongly rooted in the European mentality.”¹⁰⁷ Gilroy¹⁰⁸ connects this fear of the Other to the notion of identity. In modern political culture identity is, as Gilroy states, “a thing to be possessed and displayed”, and as such it calls for sameness and differentiation. Gilroy argues that identity is being mistaken for subjectivity, and sameness is taken to mean intersubjectivity, thus, otherness is perceived as a threat. In recent work, Braidotti¹⁰⁹ places the European whiteness in the current context of the European Union (EU) arguing that EU as a post-national project provides the ground for a relocation of whiteness by introducing a disjunction between the traditional European cultural identities and the notion of a new European citizenship.¹¹⁰ Braidotti wants to detach whiteness from the dialectics of power and force it to confront itself, so that white Europeans can make a “conscious retreat from imperial fantasy.”¹¹¹ To Braidotti too, then, European whiteness needs to be identified outside the constant binary of “them” and “us”. Self-reflexivity is key. It becomes pivotal to engage in a pan-European project to critically assess the diverse contents of European whiteness. The fascist imaginary and iconography may be revealed as a common trademark of critical studies in European whiteness, and it may reflect differently in individual European regions.

So why are the Danes so quiet when it comes to investigating their own identity in connection to whiteness? The *New York Times* article reached the Danish newsrooms and a Danish version of the story followed. Though the American media, such as The Today Show on NBC¹¹² followed up on the story about Cryos International, cautiously interrogating the racial implications of the sperm bank's functions, in the Danish version of this *New York Times*' article¹¹³ an ironic angle is chosen so as to poke amicably fun of the Americans' impressionability evoking a popular Danish stereotype of the naïve and superficial American. The article in *Jyllands-Posten* is published as a story about the story that a big international newspaper (the *New York Times*) has "discovered" Denmark and the Danish sperm bank. The article adds an explanation of the Viking connections and the names of Nordic gods, which are used as codes for the anonymous sperm donors. The Danish version of the story underlines the commonality between the Danes as the Nordic people of ancient Vikings, which is being re-discovered by a dominant culture's newspaper, and thus downplaying the race question. Thus, Danish in this sense is the minor culture. Minor culture – or minoritarian culture – is a term borrowed from Deleuze & Guattari's *Kafka Toward a Minor Literature*¹¹⁴ and developed in a Danish cinematic context by Mette Hjort.¹¹⁵ However, Braidotti¹¹⁶ connects the concept of minor (minoritarian) culture to the painful experience of consciousness-raising and to a notion of becoming, which is a qualitative rather than a quantitative shift in thinking. It is awareness and a way of experiencing the Self rather than a question of which language is spoken or how many inhabit a certain cultural group. In the light of this insight, I am arguing that there is per definition nothing minoritarian about the Danish Western European culture as a whole. Hans Hauge,¹¹⁷ in the context of postcolonial studies, has pointed to the fact that Denmark's political and social status differs depending on the context of colonial discourse, because of the history of the Danish southern colonies in the Caribbean, which were sold off before the end of the era of colonial power, and because of the Nordic colonies and their particular historical relation to Denmark.¹¹⁸ The tendency to see themselves/ourselves in the role of minority and unique nation may be what keeps us from seeing the power we held in the colonies and still hold in the function of being the epitome of whiteness and its connections to white supremacy. However, it is also that idea which keeps us from becoming minoritarian in the Deleuzian sense, because we do not dare to face up to our selves as anything but non-influential and innocent.¹¹⁹ I am not suggesting that Scandinavians ought to see their/our geographical and cultural past as fascist. Rather I believe much would be gained if Scandinavians were to face the fact that the representation of their/our past fits in with a dominant structure of power, which can and will be used in a fascist imaginary as well as in thoughts of white

supremacy and white cultural hegemony. I am arguing for a re-memory of the Scandinavian history – another way of recalling the past – which potentially shows another picture on which the Danes may base their/our self-imaginary. I am also calling for interdisciplinary and critical academic, artistic and journalistic work to be done on the topic.

When Morrison¹²⁰ asks what domination and cultural, social and political hegemony have done to the minds of the colonizers, Danes will be tempted to point to the US, the UK or even Belgium, Portugal, France and other European colonial powers. One commentator, commenting on a debate about the Danes and the Other, expressed it clearly in the Danish Christian online debate and news forum connected to the national newspaper *Kristeligt Dagblad*. He wrote that the Danes do not feel the same collective guilt towards former colonies, because the Danish colonial past seems further away and less bloody, and because it is not a Danish cultural trait to feel collective guilt. Thus, “the Danes do not feel guilt towards Africans as white people or as Europeans simply because other white people or other Europeans have abused African slaves.”^{121,122} This is, of course, only one man’s opinion and an example of a highly selective memory – if not downright ignorance – of the Danish self-identification and colonial history, but an opinion, I would claim, not far from the assertion of Danes in general if they/we are made to think about their/our colour and its afflictions.¹²³ An opinion like this underlines the necessity to rethink – rather than abolish – the historical narrative so as to include Danes and Scandinavians as a whole in the categories of “white people” and “colonizers”. To make visible the white hegemonic power, which is currently invisible to us.

Conclusions

In this paper I have been arguing for a need to relocate critical studies of whiteness so as to develop a grounded theory specific to a particular area. This particularity is necessary, because the dichotomized racial deconstruction does not fit a European context’s many facets. Using a strategy of re-membering multiple historical accounts and myths of origin, I have argued for a critical re-appraisal of whiteness in the Scandinavian context. I have shown how the media representation of Scandinavian culture and peoples works within frameworks, which can be traced back to the eugenics and fascist aesthetics and all the sexist and racist notions they entail. My choice of method and data is based on the assumption that critical studies of whiteness are grounded and politically dealing with embodied experiences and consequences in our Western societies. This materialist grounding of the problem includes discursive practises of theoretical

as well as visual and imaginary representation.¹²⁴ Moreover, I have made a call for self-reflexivity in the Scandinavian countries, which I believe is of the greatest importance. I acknowledge the sensitivity and difficulty accompanying this call. As our national and cultural identities are likely to be conflated with our subjectivity and citizenship, it would seem that I am asking Scandinavians to abandon their/our cultural norms and social rights along with subjectivity. This is not the case. However, I am asking Scandinavians to face their/our own whiteness in order to – in Braidotti's¹²⁵ words, “make a conscious retreat from (perhaps unconscious) imperial fantasy.” In this last section of the paper I have stressed, in accordance with Lucius Outlaw, that abolition is not the answer to the problem of whiteness. Rather I have been arguing for a many rooted re-membering and critical relocation of whiteness, which in the context of Scandinavia means a revision of the narrated past and its consequences for a globalized and technology-driven present. I have argued that in a European context whiteness does have many common cultural pasts and histories, which cannot – and should not – be abolished, but which are in dire need of re-thinking!

Notes

1. White and Black are used here as representing symbolic notions as well as stereotypes of human beings physical appearances, descending respectively from European ancestors, including Scandinavian ancestors and African ancestors. However, as this paper will show, the boundaries are nebulous and so people of Jewish or Irish descent might be discursively Black in certain time periods and certain geographical places. Sometimes I will be using the terms “white” and “nonwhite” to further illustrate the power structure of the symbolic meanings of the terms. This definition is supported by the work of Rosi Braidotti & Gabriele Griffin; Gabriele Griffin with Rosi Braidotti, “Whiteness and European Situatedness”, in Gabriele Griffin & Rosi Braidotti (eds.), *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*, London & N.Y.: Zed Books, 2002.
2. Richard Dyer, *White*, London & N.Y.: Routledge, 1997.
3. Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark, Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*, New York: Vintage Books, 1993. I am working with Morrison's landmark book *Playing in the Dark* in this piece. Hence I am not taking the notions of whiteness she brings to the field through her likewise important fictional work such as *The Bluest Eye* and *Beloved* into account.
4. bell hooks (1992), “Representations of Whiteness in the Black Imagination”, in David Roediger (ed.), *Black on White*, N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1998; Morrison, *op. cit.*; David Roediger (ed.), *op. cit.*; etc.
5. These are of course only two points of the many in African American critical race theory. However, they are the two most important points to the following argument. Theorists like Kimberlé Crenshaw furthermore developed “intersectionality”, which posits multiple axes of oppression such as sexuality, gender and class and not only the racial category (Kimberlé Crenshaw, “The Intersection of Race and Gender”, in Kimberlé Crenshaw, *Critical Race Theory. The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, N.Y.: The New Press, 1995). However, the racial category remains to a large extent black/white.
6. Morrison, *op. cit.*
7. Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 47
8. Linda Alcoff, *The Whiteness Question?*, 1998, on www.alcoff.com/content/whiteque.html, 2002.

9. Eugenia Kaw, "'Opening' Faces", in Nicole Sault (ed.), *Many Mirrors. Body Image and Social Relations*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994; Kathleen Zane, "Reflections on a Yellow Eye: Asian (Eye)Cons and Cosmetic Surgery", in Ella Shohat (ed.), *Talking Visions. Multicultural Feminism in a Transnational Age*, N.Y.: MIT Press, 1995.
10. Migration studies are looking at whiteness as a diverse field, though.
11. Ruth Frankenberg (1993), "White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness" in Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (eds.), *Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997; Roediger, *op. cit.*
12. hooks, *op. cit.*
13. Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, N.Y., London: Routledge, 1995.
14. George Yancy (ed.), *What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question*, London & N.Y.: Routledge, 2004.
15. Morrison, *op. cit.*, p.11.
16. hooks, *op. cit.*
17. Peggy McIntosh, on www.cwru.edu/president/aaction/UnpackingTheKnapsack.pdf#search='Peggy%20McIntosh, 1990; Blanche Radford Curry, "Whiteness and Feminism: Déjà Vu Discourses, What's Next?", in George Yancy, *op. cit.*
18. Yancy, *op. cit.*
19. Yancy, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
20. Yancy, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
21. Anthias & Yuval-Davis describe "belongingness" as a fundamental part of cultural self-imaginary in Floya Anthias & Nira Yuval-Davis, *Racialized Boundaries*, London & N.Y.: Routledge, 1992. Also Martin & Mohanty discuss the meaning of "home" in relation to whiteness in Bidy Martin & Chandra Mohanty, "Feminist Politics: What's Home Got To Do With It?", in Teresa de Lauretis (ed.), *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
22. Lucius Outlaw, "Rehabilitate Racial Whiteness?", in Yancy, *op. cit.*
23. Outlaw, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 167-8.
25. Curry, *op. cit.*
26. Outlaw makes the point that despite the leaky boundaries between what is considered white and what is considered black – or perhaps even because of them – white people are likely to uphold white hegemony out of fear of the cultural Other; Outlaw, *op. cit.*, p.167.
27. This outline is not meant to be an exhaustive account of the American theoretical field. Theorists and activists such as, for instance, Audre Lorde and Angela Davis provide examples of more diversified analyses and work within the American context. For further discussions on the relations between the American and European notions of whiteness see also Philomena Essed, "Gender, Migration and Cross-Ethnic Coalition Building" and Gloria Wekker, "'After the Last Sky, Where Do the Birds Fly?' What can European Women learn from Anti-Racist Struggles in the United States?", both in Phoenix Lutz & Nira Yuval-Davis (eds.), *Crossfires. Nationalism, Racism and gender in Europe*, London & East Haven, CT: Pluto Press, 1995.
28. Richard Brookhiser, "The Way of the WASP", 1991, in Delgado and Stefancic, *op. cit.*

29. Alcoff, *op. cit.*
30. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
31. Outlaw, *op. cit.*
32. This paper leaves out the problematics of the Native Americans' displacement by the settlers. See for instance Richard William Hill (*Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* 2006) for further details on the representation and history of the Native Americans, and the role they play in the identification of white America
33. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, London, N.Y.: Verso, 1991.
34. Charles A. Gallagher, "White Racial Formation: Into the Twenty-First Century", in Delgado & Stefancic, *op. cit.*
35. Except, perhaps, for that of the WASP (Brookhiser, *op. cit.*), which in itself is connected to a rather specific group of ethnic identity (white), geographical belonging (Anglo-Saxon) and religious practises (protestant).
36. Curry, *op. cit.*
37. Alcoff, *op. cit.*
38. Anthias & Yuval-Davis, *op. cit.*; Nira Yuval-Davis, "The 'Multi-Layered Citizen'. Citizenship in the age of 'glocalization'", in *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, no. 1, 1999, pp. 119-136.
39. Sandra Ponzanesi, *Paradoxes of Post-Colonial Culture*, doctoral dissertation Utrecht University 1999.
40. Within the field of postcolonial theory, of course, the debate on which peoples and countries to include in the term postcolonial, and to what extent, is extensive. Here it is suffice to note the continuous debates and fluid boundaries of the field.
41. Iron Ware, *Beyond the Pale*, London, N.Y.: Verso, 1992; Ware & Les Back, *Out of Whiteness*, Chicago & London: Chicago University Press, 2002.
42. Paul Gilroy, *After Empire – Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* London & N.Y.: Routledge, 2004.
43. Ware, 2002, *op. cit.*
44. Ware & Back, *op. cit.*
45. *Ibid.*
46. Ware, 1992, *op. cit.*
47. Ware and Back, *op. cit.*
48. Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature*, N.Y.: Routledge, 1991; Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects*, N.Y. & Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press, 1994, and *Transpositions*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006; Gilroy, *op. cit.*
49. Paul Gilroy, *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race*, London & N.Y.: Routledge, 2004.
50. Gilroy, *Ibid.*
51. Paul-Anders Simma, "Give Us Our Skeletons!", film, 1999 and Katarina Pirak Sikku's "Dollet" (Grasp) (2006), an art installation made for and first shown as part of *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism: A Postcolonial Exhibition Project in Five Acts*, 2006; curated by Kuratorisk Aktion (Frederikke Hansen & Tone Olaf Nielsen) for NIFCA, Nordic Institute for Contemporary Art.
52. Randi Broberg with Tine Bryld and Helene Thiesen, "I den bedste mening" (With the Best of Intentions), video film, 2006.

53. Hans Hauge, "Postkolonialisme" in Johannes Fibiger et al. (eds.), *Litteraturens Tilgange*, Copenhagen: Gad, 2001; Jón Yngvi Jóhannsson, "Scandinavian Orientalism" in Malan Marnersdóttir et al. (eds.), *Nordisk Litteratur og Mentalitet*, Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparferlag, 2000.

54. Both Kristin Loftsdóttir and Jóhannsson talk of the Icelandic/Danish connection, which bears resemblance to the Orientalism of which Said (1978) spoke, though the colour-coding of the Icelandic people is symbolic rather than visual within respectively the anthropological and literary field of studies. Kristin Loftsdóttir, "Shades of Otherness: Representations of Africa in Nineteenth-Century Iceland" (forthcoming); Jóhannsson, *op. cit.*

55. Kristin Loftsdóttir, "Never Forgetting? Gender and racial-ethnic identity during fieldwork" in *Social Anthropology* vol. 10, 3, U.K.: 2002, pp. 303-317; Loftsdóttir, forthcoming.

56. Alex Frank Larsen, "Slavernes Slægt 1-4", Vallensbæk Strand, Medialex Film & TV ApS, 2005.

57. Sarah Franklin, Jackie Stacey & Celia Lury, *Global Nature, Global Culture*, London: Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2000.

58. Reprinted in the Dutch newspaper *De Volkskrant*, October 9, 2004.

59. Lizette Alvarez, "Spreading the Viking Genes, Without Boats" in *The New York Times*, reprinted in the Dutch newspaper *De Volkskrant*, October 9, 2004.

60. *Ibid.*

61. *Ibid.*

62. Cryos International has two different websites: One for *American customers* and another for (undefined) *customers*. This is because of the difference in how the countries deal with artificial insemination: through health care officials or through personal contact. However, only the American website, which speaks directly to the customer, includes a page about the Vikings: <http://www.scandinaviancryobank.com/vikings.aspx>

63. Franklin, *op. cit.*

64. Anthias & Yuval-Davis, *op. cit.*

65. Anthias & Yuval-Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

66. David Le Breton, "Genetic Fundamentalism or the Cult of the Gene", in *Body and Society*, vol. 10, no. 4, December 2004, p. 8.

67. Her partner was white and a child produced by the two of them would have been of "mixed race" (William and Hawkes in *The Times of London* 1993, quoted in Jonathan M. Berkowitz & Jack W. Snyder, "Racism and Sexism in Medically Assisted Conception", in *Bioethics* vol.12, no. 1, Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.

68. *Ibid.*

69. David Plotz, *The Genius Factory*, N.Y.: Random House, 2005.

70. *Ibid.*

71. Berkowitz & Snyder, *op. cit.*

72. Evelyn Fox Keller, *The Century of the Gene*, Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press, 2000.

73. Le Breton, *op. cit.*

74. Le Breton, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

75. Sander L. Gilman, *Difference and Pathology. Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985; Stephen Jay Gould, "American Polygeny and Craniometry before Darwin:

Blacks and Indians as Separate, Inferior Species”, in Sandra Harding (ed.), *The “Racial” Economy of Science. Towards a Democratic Future*, Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993; Marita Sturken & Lisa Cartwright, *Practices of Looking. An Introduction to Visual Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

76. Gould, *op. cit.*; Nancy Leys Stepan & Sander L. Gilman, “Appropriating the Idioms of Science: The Rejection of Scientific Racism” (1991) in Harding, *op. cit.*

77. Simma (1999).

78. Gilman, *op. cit.*

79. Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

80. Nils Roll-Hansen and Gunnar Broberg, *Eugenics and the Welfare State* (1997), East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1996.

81. Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will*, N.Y.: Fawcett Books, 1993.

82. Stoler, *op. cit.*, Gloria A. Marshall, “Racial Classifications: Popular and Scientific”, in Harding, *op. cit.*

83. Marshall, *op. cit.*

84. Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather. Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*, London & N.Y.: Routledge, 1995; Stoler, *op. cit.*

85. Robert Proctor, “Nazi Medicine and the Politics of Knowledge”, in Harding, *op. cit.*

86. Though obviously the Nazi death camps and colonial violence were incommensurable with the idea of a sperm bank based on individual choices of the donor and parents-to-be.

87. Julian Richards (narrator), “The Blood of the Vikings”, BBC Production, 2001.

88. Though the word simply comes from the meaning of “people coming from the creeks or fjords.” (<http://www.etymonline.com>)

89. A Viking longship is a particular kind of ship developed by the Vikings and feared as the fastest warship in the sea at the time.

90. Susan Sontag, “Fascinating Fascism”, in *Under the Sign of Saturn*, London & N.Y.: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1980.

91. Sontag, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

92. Sontag, *op. cit.*, p. 90

93. McClintock, *op. cit.*, Gilroy, *op. cit.* (*Between Camps*)

94. Dyer, *op. cit.*

95. Sontag, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

96. A revival of the genre can be said to take place in television series such as “Xena – warrior princess”, “Hercules” and “Young Hercules”.

97. Sontag, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

98. Dyer, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

99. Brian Winston on “The Late Show Special: Leni Riefenstahl”, BBC Production 1992.

100. Anderson, *op. cit.*

101. *Ibid.*; Uli Linke "‘There is a Land Where Everything is Pure’: Linguistic Nationalism and Identity Politics in Germany", in Donald S. Moore, Anand Pandian & Jake Kosek (eds.), *Race, Nature, and the Politics of Difference*, Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2003.
102. Ponzanesi, *op. cit.*
103. Griffin & Braidotti, *op. cit.*
104. Griffin & Braidotti, *op. cit.*, p. 231.
105. Liliane Kandel, "Feminism and Anti-Semitism" in Griffin & Braidotti, *op. cit.*
106. Griffin & Braidotti, *op. cit.*, p. 234.
107. Ponzanesi, *op. cit.*, p. 212.
108. Gilroy (2004), *op. cit.*
109. Rosi Braidotti, *Transpositions*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.
110. Braidotti, 2006, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
111. Braidotti, 2006, *op. cit.*, p., 75.
112. "The Today Show" on NBC 6/2005
113. Jens Grund, "Sædbank: Vikingerne er på nye togter", in *Jyllands-Posten*, October 7, 2004. The following year *Jyllands-Posten* also published the twelve drawings of the prophet Mohammed, which ignited the international crisis between Denmark and parts of the Islamic world.
114. Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, *Kafka Toward a Minor Literature* Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
115. Mette Hjort, *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema*, Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
116. Braidotti, 2006, *op. cit.*
117. Hauge, *op. cit.*
118. Iceland was the only colony, which claimed independence from the Danish rule and achieved it in 1945. Greenland and the Faeroe Islands are parts of the Kingdom of Denmark today with certain rules of self-governing, and as before mentioned, the colonies in the Caribbean were sold to the United States in 1917 for \$25 million (wikipedia.org).
119. The image of innocence has been somewhat shattered by the controversy of the Mohammed drawings; Lars Erslev Andersen, *Den Tabte Uskyld*, Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2006.
120. Morrison, *op. cit.*
121. Anders Ellebæk Madsen, "En Karikatur af Danskerne", 2006, available on <http://synspunkt.religion.dk/importfolder/2006-02-15.1564020438/view?searchterm=dansk%20identitet>
122. <http://www.religion.dk/religionsdebatten:ktg=kristendom:aid=281303>. My translation from: "Danskerne føler sig ikke skyldige som hvide eller europæere over for afrikanere, bare fordi andre hvide mennesker eller andre europæere har mishandlet afrikanske slaver"
123. Significantly, this opinion was published in a Christian debate forum. The role of the Lutheran Protestant religion in the Nordic countries and its connection to the notion of whiteness in a European context is another point of discussion, which for the time being goes beyond the scope of this paper.

124. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, London: Penguin Books 1991.

125. Braidotti, 2006, *op. cit.*