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This article challenges dominant narratives of colonial monuments and aims to problematize some local political initiatives and responses raised in the processes of renaming said monuments. We focus on a recent struggle in Barcelona, Spain, to highlight the unresolved tensions and multi-layered silences amongst groups who share the objective of revisiting their city space and its racial/colonial history. While city officials and mainstream anti-racist activists make appeals to universal human rights, communities of color emphasize continuities of racial/colonial injustice and contemporary implications. Erasure of colonial violence through memorialization is made visible by acknowledging the necessity for renaming. Yet we argue a second type of erasure occurs in the process of re-naming, where resistance by communities of color is equally neglected. Consequently, what is presented as progressive anti-racist responses and engaged commitment to diversity and tolerance rests on notions of a deferred politics of aspiration rather than a politics of action.

In July 2015, the Argentine city of Buenos Aires replaced a statue of Christopher Columbus with a statue of Bolivian war of independence heroine Juana Azurduy. The 25-ton, 16-meter-high (52-foot) Azurduy statue was gifted by Bolivia and culminated a contentious battle between Argentinian President Christina Fernandez and Buenos Aires Mayor Mauricio Macri, who defended the Columbus statue on the grounds it represented the local Italian community. However limited or symbolic, the decision to replace the statue of Columbus marked another victory in a long line of changes to both monuments and holidays in various places throughout the Americas. In some Latin American countries this has included the renaming of October 12 as Indigenous Peoples’ Day, as opposed to the long-standing celebration
of Columbus Day. Far from being about the diversity of Buenos Aires, the debacle is representative of much larger contestations over the collective history and memory of colonialism, as well as ongoing racism and the often contradictory responses to it through the discourses of multiculturalism, diversity, tolerance and inclusion.

The move in Argentina also came amid ongoing protests in the United States against Columbus Day, where dozens of cities have introduced resolutions to replace the day with Indigenous Peoples’ Day. Berkeley, California, was the first to make such change in October 1992, but it has taken two decades and the insistence of many such as the International Intertribal Treaty Council, to encourage other cities to follow suit: namely, Seattle, Washington, St Paul, Minnesota and Anchorage, Alaska. Similarly, in South Africa the Rhodes Must Fall movement has challenged the continued presence of monumental apartheid figures that still adorn public spaces, governmental buildings and university halls alike. In Germany, campaigns also have challenged the legacies of colonialism in the city space, as demonstrated in the Humboldt Forum case, or the successful re-naming of what today is the May-Ayim Ufer. There has been a significant scholarly focus on the colonial politics of memory enshrined and engraved in stone monuments or memorialized in public spaces and plazas, as well as critical responses to such practices (Bordo 1997; Phillips 2003). However, less attention has been afforded to intra-politics of renaming as a strategy: that is, the process by which diverse groups, each invested in challenging the continued violent legacies and colonial presents represented by such monuments and plazas, themselves engage in contradictory political decisions regarding the alternatives to memorialized colonizers. In this article, we focus on a recent struggle in Barcelona, Spain as a case in point highlighting the unresolved tensions and multi-layered silences that exist even amongst groups who on the surface both share in their objectives of revisiting their city space and its racial/colonial history, albeit towards different ends, which comes to the forefront when we examine, for example, their engagement with the discourses of anti-racism and diversity.

While Spain is nowhere close to questioning its relationship to Columbus as a ‘mythic’ figure, nor the narrative of discovery and racism, a small success was also achieved in 2015 as Azurduy was being raised in Buenos Aires. After much pressure from Espacio del Inmigrante (Space of the Immigrant) and Panafriacanist groups such as FOJA-Organización Juvenil del Movimiento Panafricanista (Youth Organization of the Panafriacanist Movement), Panafriacanos Spain, Panafriacanistas de Catalunya, Movimiento Panafriacista por la Reparación Africana y Afrodescendiente de Europa, as well as anti-racist organizations and civil society groups such as SOS Racisme and labor unions, the new municipal government of Barcelona finally agreed to rename the long-disputed Antonio López Plaza. The reason for the renaming, however, requires more consideration. In this article, we both challenge the dominant narratives of colonial monuments and problematize some of the responses from local political initiatives as well as anti-racist groups that have emerged in its wake. In particular,
we focus on the case of the statue of renowned slave trader Antonio Lopez y Lopez, the decision to remove the monument, as well as the current debate over its renaming. Suggestions put forward have ranged from renaming the square after South African freedom fighter Nelson Mandela, to renaming it Rana Plaza and other names linked to the Republican and Anarchist resistance movements within Spain. We argue these proposals, while benign on the surface, reveal how the white liberal left, as well as white anti-racist groups, continue to construct racism and colonial violence as detached from the Spanish and Catalan present, dislocating the conversation about racism to places like South Africa, or approaching resistance to racism as a question of abstract human rights and diversity. This dislocation becomes more evident when examining alternative names offered by the Afro-Spanish community. Unlike the suggestions above, their push to name the square after Afro-Spanish doctor and activist Alphonse Arcelin highlights continuities of colonial-racist violence, as well as the long-standing local resistance to it. However, this alternative is currently not being considered within the municipal government.

To reiterate, where the erasure of colonial violence in processes of memorialization is made visible, there emerges another type of erasure in the process of re-naming under the guise of tolerance and inclusion. Here, historical resistance to colonial violence, or resistance to its legacies in the present, are neglected. We scrutinize the process of renaming, and names advanced by mainstream civil society groups, as they starkly contrast with suggestions of the Afro-Spanish community and other communities of color. We thus seek to problematize such instances of ‘erasure’: while alternative names might function as aspirational acts of change, they do not necessarily address prevailing colonial continuities.

Narratives of discovery—Spanish self-representation and colonial monuments

In 2014, the campaign Monumentos Coloniales—Colonial Monuments (2014) was launched by a group of anonymous Barcelona-based artists and activists. The campaign calls for removal and renaming of four monuments commemorating historical figures involved in, or linked to, colonial violence in Barcelona and the Catalunya region more broadly. These include the towering Columbus statue in the Port of Barcelona, located at the end of the famous tourist corridor Las Ramblas; the General Joan Prim i Prats statue in the nearby Ciutadella Parc (known for colonial exploits in Mexico, Morocco and Puerto Rico); the monument to businessman and protectionist Joan Güell i Ferrer on the principal avenue, Gran Via de Les Corts Catalanes; and the monument to Antonio Lopez y Lopez nestled between the edges of the Gothic Quarter and the Barceloneta Metro Station.

Catalunya, which has been marked by contradictory moments of allegiance to the Spanish colonial project, is also in the midst of an independence struggle from the Spanish State (Cramer 2014).
According to Kathryn Crameri, while ‘Catalans have always tended to construct their national identity by categorising themselves as different from other Spaniards’ (2014, p. 10) so has the construction of Spanish identity been formulated through the conscious differentiation from Catalans. This appears to have been a rather ambivalent process, since much of the…

... Spanish nationalist rhetoric is based on a denial that there are any substantial differences, in order to argue that Catalans should accept that they are fundamentally Spanish and stop pushing for cultural and political recognition as a separate group. (Crameri 2014, p. 10)

Part of the rhetoric of distinction was a distancing from Spanish colonial history to the point where Catalunya is described as a colonized and oppressed nation (e-noticias.es 2013). While remnants of such logics remain among some Catalan nationalists, scholars inside and beyond Catalunya have challenged such notions by tracing the historical ties between Catalan merchants and colonial exploitation (Fradera and Schmidt-Nowara 2013; Martinez Shaw 1980 Oliva Melgar 1987; Ringrose 1998). The ambivalence is reflected in the public discourse. On the one hand, Barcelona celebrates Spanish colonial history and the conquest of the Americas in particular, while the involvement of Catalans in the colonial project remains in the margins. On the other hand, existing debates over removing and renaming colonial monuments, and addressing colonial history and racism, are situated within the past with little or no relevance to local racial politics today.

Barcelona’s celebration of colonial history is particularly manifest in how the city narrates and advertises the Columbus monument, exhorting his ‘exploits served an important cultural and economic function in the city, one that ought to be celebrated by locals and visitors alike’ (Azarmandi 2016, p. 59). Serving as a testament to Columbus’ public and historical persona, the statue commemorates his involvement in the colonial enterprise, as well as how his achievements in colonial ‘discovery’ and expansion involve Barcelona. The statue itself was constructed in 1888, a time in which Spain maintained an extensive colonial empire, including several countries directly colonized by Columbus himself. The inscription on the monument reads ‘in commemoration of the discovery of the Americas’. The intentions and motivations behind the erection of the monument, ‘as well as its current salience in regional and state portrayals of Spanish history, have a close relationship to the idea of discovery, voyage’ (Azarmandi 2016, p. 60). Barcelona is presented as having played a crucial role, what city advertisements claim to have been a ‘great feat’ (Catalunya.com 2015). The Columbus monument, and its framing within public discourse, orient the ‘discovery’ as a significant event in world history that simultaneously erases the violence on which the colonial conquest was based. The construction of the statue and the city’s self-representation erase the histories of violence by referring to the colonial encounter as a positive event to be celebrated by all.
The Columbus statue is one of many colonial references shaping Barcelona’s urban design. Several colonial figures have their names inscribed in the cityscape through streets or public squares named after them: Hernán Cortés, Francisco Pizarro, Juan Gines de Sepúlveda. Cortes and Pizarro were both Spanish conquistadores that led expeditions to the Americas. Cortes is known for his brutal conquest of the Aztecs in present-day Mexico, and Pizarro for conquest of the Incas in present-day Peru, including the capture and execution of Incan leader Atahualpa (Meltzer 2005). Sepúlveda was a Spanish theologian and philosopher who defended conquest and colonialism. Building on Aristotle, he claimed indigenous populations of the Americas were natural slaves because they were ‘hostile to natural law’ (Reiss 2005, p. 27) (exemplified through alleged acts of cannibalism and human sacrifice), and war against them was thus justified.

Incidentally, the other monuments listed by Monumentos Coloniales do not commemorate explorers or conquistadores as such, but rather are statues of local figures whose fame and fortune is premised upon colonial exploitation. The monuments dedicated to General Joan Prim i Prats (or Juan Prim y Prats) and Joan Güell i Ferrer are located in the Ciutadella Park and the Gran Via de Les Corts Catalans respectively. While Governor of Puerto Rico, Prim i Prats was responsible for the development and enactment of the código negro (black code), imposing harsh and restrictive measures on the enslaved population (Marley 2005). The Güell i Ferrer monument is said to celebrate a businessman’s achievements and his contributions to industrial development in the Barcelona region. However, as first President of the Circulo Hispano Ultramarino de Barcelona-CHUB (Hispanic Ultramarine Circle of Barcelona), Guell i Ferrer not only defended the interests of Spanish businesses in the colonies, but was also a member of the Liga Nacional (National League)—a body specifically formed to
influence and fight against abolition of slavery in the Americas (Rodrigo y Alharilla 2013).

Finally, *Monumentos Coloniales* (2014) identify the Antonio López i López statue, located in a public square of the same name, who like Ferrer was part of the Circulo Hispano Ultramarino de Barcelona (CHUB). All three vigorously defended slavery and formed part of institutions that politically led anti-abolition movements. Indeed, Spain was the last European country to abolish the Atlantic Slave trade in 1867, as well as slavery in its colonies (Puerto Rico in 1873 and Cuba 1886). Today, Antonio López y López is commonly known to Spaniards as the Marquis of Comillas, a Catalan businessman committed to the Spanish state who made his fortune in trade with Cuba. Before becoming a founding member of the CHUB, López y López had supported the Battalion of Catalan Volunteer fighters, sent to Cuba to ‘protect' sugar plantations from so-called attacks by slave rebels. López y López and other Catalan merchants would form alliances wherever possible to ‘put pressure on the authorities to uphold the colonial status quo’ (Rodrigo y Alharilla 2013, p. 194). What allowed Antonio López y López to acquire his wealth—and his later power—within the Spanish state, was his role in the trade of enslaved peoples.

Columbus, who unites colonial feats and local lore, played a crucial role in the conquest of the Americas and genocide of the indigenous peoples. Jack Forbes (1993) argues such indigenous peoples were the first victims of the transatlantic slave trade. However, it was not until the 1552 Valladolid Junta, in which the Church recognized indigenous peoples had souls, were considered to be subjects of Spanish colonial rule, and accordingly Christianized, that the decision to bring captives from Africa to enslave them emerged. While slavery was not new, it is in the process of conquest and genocide that markers of difference are introduced in order to create a system of social categorization that differentiated between European and non-European populations. Europeans ‘created’ race by means of differentiating themselves from the racial ‘other’. The colonial project, as David Theo Goldberg suggests, is the facilitating feature for racial discourse (1993). The distinction between the European White and the Non-White Other brings into existence a new world (Mills 1999); a world in which biological determinism is used to justify the social construction for the demarcation of white Europeans from the racially different other. Race is not simply what the non-European other is categorized through, but is the marker through which White Europeans come into existence as white subjects (Mills 1999; Hesse 2007; Goldberg 1993, 2006; Omi and Winant 1994; Winant 1994). The division of labour in the Americas was fundamentally marked through the relationships and divisions that were made possible through the concept of race, which consequently enabled the global racialized division of labour and precariousness for colonised peoples. The dispossession of indigenous peoples and the enslavement of Africans not only created the Spanish empire, but provided the foundation for the modern/colonial world and the mutually constitutive racial slavery and capitalism (Quijano 1998) that allowed Catalan merchants to prosper locally. As a campaign, therefore,
Monumentos Coloniales provides an analysis that only implicitly, if not inadvertently, recognizes the role of racial slavery as part and parcel of the colonial expeditions initiated by Columbus and the subsequent local successes.

On the one hand, the commemoration of Columbus, Pizarro, Sepúlveda, and figures such as Bartolomé de Las Casas are closely linked to an early Spanish colonial history in the ‘age of exploration’ and the broader narrative of ‘discovery’ of the Americas. The commemorations of Prats i Prim, Güell i Ferrer and Lopez y Lopez, on the other hand, are local to Catalunya and highlight the achievements of Catalan business merchants, albeit achievements made possible only due to Spain’s colonial enterprise. In both instances, the commemorations demonstrate the multiple ties that connect local history, national identity and collective memory. As John R Gillis writes in ‘Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship’:

Commemorative activity is by definition social and political, for it involves the coordination of individual and group memories, whose results may appear consensual when they are in fact the product of processes of intense conflict, struggle, and, in some instances, annihilation. (1994, p. 5)

Therefore, there is a clear relationship between the construction and reproduction of national identity and collective memory, as exemplified in the four monuments identified by the Monumentos Coloniales campaign.

In the case of Spain, memories of the colonial past transcend time and space and continue to shape national identity in the present. Here, memory cannot be reduced to a static and fixed object, but rather has to be understood as an active and flexible process. While the monuments represent actual historical figures and their individual exploits, as a process of collective remembrance, these histories become disembodied and omnipresent (Kantsteiner 2002). The bodies—physical and epistemic—that these monuments commemorate are White, male and imperial in nature, form and content: their concrete and metal structures, size, stature and overarching presence are meant to convey the presumed grandeur and endurance of Spain’s colonial feats. Such representations shape the visual landscape of the city in terms of how and what it was and is imagined as being, and who is and is not included in the making and maintaining of both the city and nation.

Whiteness as norm in the Spanish imagination

If commemoration is understood as a fluid cultural practice, the ways in which we engage such public remembrances allow different possibilities to interrogate the relationship between what is being remembered and how it is narrated for the construction of a national imaginary (Kuhn 2007; Leroux 2010). Darryl Leroux draws attention to the relationship between what happened and ‘our narratives about that
process’ (2010, p. 5) and the racialized (colonial) dimensions of commemoration. It is thus necessary to not only interrogate what is remembered and what is forgotten, but to ask who remembers, how and with what effects. Moreover, if the debate over re-naming said monuments is being done in the name of inclusion, tolerance and diversity, then we must further interrogate the contours of that debate to highlight who is being newly remembered and/or silenced in the current process.

While it has long been established that the narrative of discovery is a form of epistemological violence that is widely reproduced in academic disciplines (Alfred 2005; Churchill 1998: Smith 1999: Smith 2005), it persists and is reproduced in popular culture, such as in touristic advertising and the articulation of national identity. Today it becomes increasingly difficult to negate Catalunya’s involvement in the colonial enterprise, and colonial continuities in the form of public commemoration continue to be normalized. To problematize colonial history and acknowledge the legacies of violence, we cannot simply insist on a rejection of such a narrative through corrections to the historical record, nor can it be limited to a mere recognition of past crimes. It must of necessity also include attention to the popular or public sphere, where monuments and tourism—among other forms of remembrances—play a key role in reinforcing the colonial present. From the perspective of the colonized, those who have borne the brunt of racial/colonial violence, theft of indigenous land, genocide, and the kidnapping and enslavement of Black peoples, cannot be thought of as isolated historical events that occurred and ended in the past. The Columbus monument erases the legacy of violence, war and genocide which made colonization possible. In turn, Lopez y Lopez celebrates the profits of enslavement and continues to erase bodies which the colonial logic deemed disposable.

Thus, it becomes imperative that we recognize how colonialism continues to shape the socio-political realities for the formerly colonized in the present here-and-now. As such, to speak of legacies of colonialism would suggest it is merely the remnants of past injustice that linger in current society, when it is in fact a continuation and constant restructuring of long-historical colonial structures, which have maintained differential hierarchies of power and difference since the 15th Century (Goldberg 1993). ‘The basic and universal social classification of human society around the idea of ‘race’ as an organizing principle globally, yet with national and regional variations’ (Azarmandi 2016, p. 60) is what Anibal Quijano (1998) coined as the coloniality of power. The idea of race, then, originated in the process of Spanish encounters with the indigenous Other, alongside European colonial expansion as well as the emergence of capitalism as the dominant economic system. The resulting racial hierarchies continue to shape everyday realities of racialized minorities in Europe, and Spain in particular (Calvo Buezas 1990, 2001; SOS Racismo 2014, 2015, van Dijk 2003). Main targets of racial injustice in Spain today are people of African descent, Muslims, Latin Americans, Asians and Gitanos—groups who have largely also historically been marginalized and
oppressed by colonial domination. Consequently, the public representation of colonial figures cannot be separated from current racial realities or political claims.

These monuments erase both the violence of colonialism and the violence that continues to impinge on the contemporary racial other. As commemorations dedicated to the Spanish colonial enterprise, the memorialized figures shaped the course not only of the Iberian nation, but existing global hierarchies such as class and racial structures in the present. In the Catalan context, and the Spanish context more broadly, racial others continue to be black and brown bodies, whether as citizens or undocumented migrants, who are portrayed as intrusive others and whose belonging to the Nation is continuously questioned.

The erasure or silencing that colonial commemoration entails is not only simple ignorance of a distant past or a lack of knowledge of historical events, but also a multi-layered and simultaneous silencing of the current racialized political ordering of social relations. As such, sites of commemorations have to be reconceptualized as epistemologies of ignorance, as ‘practices of not knowing that are linked to and often support racism’ (Sullivan & Tuana 2007, p. 3). Only within a process of reconceptualization can colonial statues be rearticulated as sites of violence and erasure. Charles W Mills theorizes the phenomenon of ignorance and specifically white ignorance in order to ‘pin down … the idea of an ignorance, a non-knowing, that is not contingent, but in which race—white racism and/or white racial domination and their ramifications—plays a crucial causal role’ (2007, p. 20). Mills goes on to demonstrate how white ignorance is manifested and perpetuated by five dimensions of cognition: perception, conception, memory, testimony, and motivational group interest (Mills 2007). Mills’ treatment of racial ignorance in memory and testimony is helpful not only in questioning the existence of colonial monuments but also their re-framing and renaming. As Mills argues:

\[O\]n matters related to race, the Racial Contract prescribes for its signatories an inverted epistemology, an epistemology of ignorance, a particular pattern of localized and global cognitive dysfunctions (which are psychologically and socially functional), producing the ironic outcome that whites will in general be unable to understand the world they themselves have made. (quoted in Sullivan & Tuana 2007, p. 2).

With this in mind, the colonial monuments and their re-framing and renaming in public discourse highlight the knowledges that have been and continue to be (wilfully) ignored. The city’s response (within the municipal government as well as among dominant civil society groups) in renaming a colonial monument erase colonial continuities, as well as reinforce a notion of the Catalan nation as inherently white and colorblind. This is achieved by an impetuous insistence that renaming is in the name of universal human rights, inclusion, and equality indifferent of color. In both instances, however, the contextualization of race is missing, and universal notions of rights and equality are evoked.
as solutions to what are perceived as racial hierarchies and systematic injustice of the past; presumably no longer present.

In what follows, we turn to the contested re-presentations of the Antonio Lopez y Lopez monument and how the debate over its removal has been framed, before problematizing the question of the plaza’s renaming with a focus on two of the main suggested alternatives—Nelson Mandela Plaza and Rana Plaza.

The case of Antonio López y López and Spanish Antiracism

Unlike the other statues discussed by Monumentos Coloniales, the López y López monument has been criticized and come under scrutiny from anti-racist segments of the population for over a decade now (Beatriu, SOS Racisme BCN, 2015) and social movements have repeatedly called for its removal. The 2015 Mayoral election of Ana Colau, itself a victory for popular housing and anti-austerity movements that contributed to her ascendency, broadened a conversation that was initiated in part during the Movimiento de los Indignados and el Movimiento 15-M (the Indignants Movement and 15-M Movement, in reference to a call for public demonstrations and occupation of plazas on May 15, 2011). Whereas Colau had been the spokesperson for an organization challenging spiked mortgages and consequential evictions in the context of increased unemployment and austerity measures in Spain, the expanded popular unrest harkened back to the days of challenges to the Franco fascist regime. As such, monumental figures of the fascist period, as well as the remaining symbols of the Franco regime also came under attack. It is at this crucial intersection that Colau vowed to eliminate existing traces of Franquismo if elected Mayor of Barcelona, such as the re-erected Antonio Lopez y Lopez monument.

Critique of the monument emerged not only because of López y López’ overt links to the slave trade, but also because after anarchists first destroyed the original statue in 1936, a new monument was re-erected shortly thereafter by the fascist regime of Francisco Franco. The statue and the square thus symbolise a colonial and fascist presence in Barcelona’s cityscape. The renaming of the square is often framed as part of a broader political campaign to address Spain’s fascist—as well as significantly undemocratic—past (20minutos.es; Geli 2016; Nerin 2016), and as a return to the ‘radical and profound democracy’ of Catalunya’s history preceding Franco (Geli 2016). Inevitably, the question must be asked: does the decision to remove the statue and rename the plaza represent the same conversation for Colau that it does for anti-racist organizations who have spearheaded the challenge over the past decade? Is her agreement to remove it premised upon a challenge to kidnapping, transporting and enslaving of Africans, or to the fact it was re-erected by Franco after anarchists destroyed the original? Moreover, what will come to replace it? For it is here that we claim the history of genocide and enslavement and the continuation of colonial practices is being actively erased yet again
when we analyse the alternative suggestions, the process of renaming, and the different actors it involves.

Anti-racist groups have long criticized the monument and highlighted the connections between anti-racist struggles today and what López y López symbolizes to their various respective movements. The history of anti-racism in Spain is strongly centred on immigration and immigrants as particularly vulnerable to racial injustice. However, the concept of race itself is largely absent in mainstream anti-racist discourse in Spain (Azarmandi 2017), replaced with concepts such as ethnicity and culture. Immigration and non-whiteness are consequently often collapsed as one to the point where Spanish scholars invoke that ‘the concept of race is a social construction from a racist theory’ (Grau Añó 2010, p. 73) making whiteness even more invisible. The López y López statue, as SOS Racisme activists have highlighted, was often problematized and even often defaced during anti-racist rallies in the past.

Now, after several years of contestation, led by community organizers from anti-racist groups, immigrant movements and pan-Africanist groups, Ada Colau agreed to negotiations in July 2015 and has confirmed the statue will be removed and the square renamed. While the decision to rename the plaza is a welcome development, it is crucial to shed light on how this process of renaming has played out and analyse the reasoning behind the decision. For organizations such as Espacio del Inmigrante (Space of the Immigrant) or Panafrikanist groups such as FOJA, Panaficanos Spain, Panafricanistas de Catalunya, etc., this at first presented a preliminary success toward opening up a conversation about Spanish colonialism; the kidnapping, transport and enslavement of people from the African continent to the Americas; and the ensuing legacies of each, manifested in part in institutionalized racism and the systematic incarceration of undocumented migrants to this day. However, the ensuing debate and process, including the highly-touted suggestions of renaming the plaza after Nelson Mandela or alternatively Rana Plaza, proved their early optimism to have been more wishful thinking, or an act of aspiration to a nonracist future, than action directed at targeting the racism of the present.

**Alfonso Arcelin and the Pan-Africanist Challenge**

The Spanish Pan-Africanist movement is a central force in pushing for the renaming of the square after Alfonso Arcelin, a Haitian-born Spanish doctor. Arcelin first came to public attention when he led the challenge against the controversial exhibit ‘El negro de banyoles’ at the Darder Museum in advance of the 1992 Barcelona Olympics. In that exhibit, the body of a young Black man that had been mounted by the Verreaux brothers in 1830 was displayed through the 1990s without much incident until Arcelin’s intervention. Most likely from Botswana or southern Africa, the body was said to be of a ‘Betjuanas chief’, according to Verreaux, though later sources say the man may have
been part of the Batlhaping nation. Catalan naturalist Frances Darder had purchased the body from the Verreaux collection in 1888 and eventually had it placed at the Darder Museum. Arcelin called for its removal as an exhibition in 1992 and also demanded the remains be repatriated for reburial.

The resistance with which Arcelin’s fight was met is emblematic for both enduring racism, as well as rationales over what constitutes a critical reflection of the colonial past and, in particular, the dehumanization of Black people. During Arcelin’s campaign, residents of Banyoles reportedly wore T-shirts stating ‘Keep El Negro’ and ‘Banyoles loves you El Negro’ (Shyllon 2014). Banyoles residents also printed postcards and bumper stickers with the image of ‘el negro’ in their attempt to safeguard what was considered to be the town’s most important attraction. It was only through the 1992 Barcelona Olympics that Banyoles received significant international attention. Arcelin had petitioned the Olympic Committee, as well as the Olympic Commission of African Nations, and had even called for a boycott of the games by African nations were the exhibition not removed (Parsons & Kelo Segobye 2004; Ros 1991). As Dorothy Kelly explains, the Barcelona Olympics presented a crucial moment in the Spanish national project that sought to demonstrate Spain as the ‘very model of European democracy’ (2000, p. 34), while Catalan nationalists viewed the occasion as an opportunity to present and promote their own ‘difference’ (Kelly 2000, p. 34). Residents of Banyoles, pillars of Catalan nationalism, vigorously argued for the exhibition and the body to stay in their town. Elsewhere, ‘sources in Madrid hinted that barbarism still raged in the provinces’ (Martin-Márquez 2003, p. 205), in an attempt to dislocate racism from ‘Spain as a country’ to a matter of one anomalous ‘small town’.

Finally, after a six-year-long legal battle (and much public controversy), the museum removed the exhibit and the body was repatriated (Parsons & Kelo Segobye 2004; Shyllon 2014; Toasisje 2010). While Arcelin did succeed in removing the exhibition, the Spanish government only returned the bones of ‘el negro’ to Botswana, while the skin remained (though not on display) in the Anthropology Museum in Madrid (Antón 2004). For Arcelin the fight to remove the exhibition was due to its racist nature, as well as the dehumanisation of Black people, past and present. Nevertheless, much of the controversy and the solutions offered were aimed at addressing the appearance of racism, rather than targeting the problem of racism in Spain more broadly (Murphy 2005).

When the Pan-African movement in Spain (Movimiento Panafricano por la Reparación Africana y Afrodescendiente de Europa) launched a petition in 2015 following negotiations with the municipal government to rename López y López Square, they stated:

We, Pan-Africanists of Spain, members of the African and Afro-descendant community, we are responsible actors of this historical process. Since 1985 we have led in Barcelona and the rest of Spain
the process of promoting social struggles for dignity and the black reparations. During these 30 years of struggle for reparations we have had the ability to articulate ideas in a context of extreme criminalization of black immigration (negrophobia). (Change.org 2016)

They highlighted the continuities of racial injustice by making a direct link to reparations for slavery, modern Spanish racism in the case of the exhibition itself and the process of its removal, as well as the current criminalization of black immigration and increased marginalization of undocumented migrants. At the same time, the petition orient the voices and actions of local Afro-Spanish resistance in relation to past and present racial injustice. Arcelin, as a prominent Afro-Spanish activist and doctor, was invested in fighting institutional racism in Spain that linked racism today with its colonial past. His actions exemplified how one can recognize the persistent presence of colonial traces in the present, and its continuing impact on local communities without abstracting the issue to another place and time. Moving to the two currently debated options, Nelson Mandela and Rana Plaza, we can see how renaming—as suggested by mainstream groups—produces further erasures in its attempt to supposedly acknowledge a colonial past.

The Problem with Universalism and Mis-locating Racism

While the renaming of Antonio López Plaza and the removal of the statue mark an important step in the right direction, we should understand it was made possible as part of an overall campaign to remove traces of fascism from cityscapes. As members of a newly formed left-wing government, both Ada Colau and Manuela Carmena (the new mayor of Madrid) have expressed interest in removing all traces of the Spanish fascist past from their cities (Fernández 2015; Rivas 2015). The Carmena municipal government has created a list of thirty street names that will be renamed in the coming year, which have been identified as part of the implementation of the new historical memory law (ley memoria historica). Already in July of 2015, Madrid announced it would rename the Plaza Juan Vázquez de Mella, that honors the 19th Century monarchist ideologue, Plaza Pedro Zerolo, a socialist and LGBT-rights activist and politician who has recently passed away (Eldiario.es 2016; Publico.es 2016). In Barcelona, however, the demand to rename Antonio López Plaza and remove his statue is not new, but the changes in municipal government coupled with an increase in anti-racist mobilisations in the context of growing anti-immigrant paranoia and Islamophobia seem to have contributed to the final commitment to take down the statue and rename the plaza.

The movement to remove the statue of Antonio López y López has been supported by different civil groups. Yet it has been communities of color, in particular, who have been organizing for the past decade for its removal. The Union General de Trabajadores-UGT (General Workers Union) and Comisiones Obreras-CCOO (Workers Commission) advocated for the renaming of the square after Spanish
anarchist and educator Francesc Ferrer i Guàrdia in the early stages of the debate. Mainstream anti-racist organizations such as SOS Racisme have suggested renaming it after South African anti-Apartheid leader Nelson Mandela (Suñé 2015), heralded as an international fighter for justice. The latest proposal put forward by UGT, CCOO and Unió Sindical Obrera de Cataluña-USOC (Workers Trade Union of Catalonia) has been to rename the square Rana Plaza, in reference to the 2013 collapse of a garment factory building in Savar, outside Dhaka, Bangladesh.

The Savar building was also known as Rana Plaza and its collapse is considered the deadliest garment factory accident in history, as over one thousand people were killed and an additional 2500 were injured. It has been argued that one of the reasons for the collapse was the building was meant for shops and offices rather than the heavy machinery and the associated vibrations. So while it makes sense that labor unions would want to honor the memory of fallen workers that represent current forms of racialized capitalist exploitation, as López y López’ slaving enterprise represented in his days, the irony is that the exploitation and untimely death of the garment workers occurred in a building whose name is derived from the name of the owner Sohel Rana. In effect, the name of Rana Plaza would arguably also secure a place in history for the building’s owner, whose neglect and misleading insistence on the supposed safety of the building following previously expressed concerns is what led to the collapse.

As such, in what follows we will problematize the suggested names, which, at best, misplace or fail to connect processes of renaming colonial monuments to broader anti-colonial struggles and resistance. Resistance is thus not only as historically embedded in the various forms of responses to racialized exploitation and should be acknowledged accordingly, but also in the struggles of communities of color against the logics of colonial violence and its consequences in the present. In other words, symbolic gestures such as the Mandela and Rana Plaza proposals are commendable in that they are seeking to challenge what the López y López monument represents while bringing attention to colonial/racial injustice and exploitation writ large. Nevertheless, these efforts remain misdirected with regards to the perspectives of those that continue to bear the brunt of local histories of colonial violence in the present, displacing ongoing local struggles against racism in the name of an abstract universal justice.

The Limits of Mandela and Rana Plaza

Although 2015 saw the option of Nelson Mandela as a suitable replacement for Antonio López y López slightly fading into the background of the public debate, the usage of his persona in the European context is emblematic of State responses to discussions of racism in the present. There are, of course, many reasons why Mandela is so widely accepted and a celebrated symbol, given that he is an important figure in history whose name and legacy stands for
resistance against Apartheid. However, the invocation of Mandela in Europe is one usually posed in a positive light as that of a defender of equal rights, ‘who without revenge and rancor, worked for reconciliation’ (quoted in Medialdea 2014) and against ‘intolerance’ (Madrid.es 2014). In turn, the historical specificity of his commitment to dismantling an openly white supremacist and racist structure and ordering of power as a member of the Communist Party of South Africa (27 years before becoming a political prisoner), and which included protracted armed struggle as part of the recognized legitimate response, has faded into obscurity. In similar fashion to the sanitised memorialisation of the Reverend Dr Martin Luther King Jr's famous 1963 speech *I Have a Dream* (as opposed to his later fervent opposition to militarism and poverty), an ‘acceptable’ version of Mandela is mobilized as a response to racism or way of managing racial diversity within Europe. However, by looking at the motivations for commemorating Mandela, we argue that his actual persona is often disconnected from the struggle against apartheid as a white supremacist structure, becoming a symbol for diversity, human rights and, above all, reconciliation. In this regard, it also serves to displace ongoing struggles against racism in the present.

Barcelona is not the first city to name streets and squares after Nelson Mandela. A preliminary look yields well over a hundred streets and schools that have been named after him in cities across Europe and the United States. In Spain, the city of Madrid named a square in the Lavapies district after Mandela in January 2014. News outlets described the renaming as representative of the diversity and ‘mult-ethnic’ reality of the Lavapies district (Belver 2014; Medialdea 2014; Moya 2013; Telemadrid 2014). Diversity or ‘multiculturalism’ (Ibarra 2014), rather than anti-racism or anti-colonialism, as the reason for the renaming of the square, is similar to on-going debates in Barcelona, where the role of Nelson Mandela as a symbol of peace, a figure who fought for tolerance, diversity and reconciliation, is highlighted at the expense of his much more complicated trajectory in the struggle against apartheid. The Plaza Nelson Mandela in Madrid is often colloquially, though with clearly racist overtones, referred to as the ‘plaza de los negros’ due to the higher visibility of a Black population living in the district. The renaming was, therefore, meant to reflect the composition of the district and at the same time celebrate the presence of ‘different cultures’. Not mentioned in any of the self-congratulatory celebrations of the plaza on the part of city officials, however, was the increased presence of police and racial profiling that form part of everyday life especially for young Black and Brown men in the Lavapies neighborhood.

In *On being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Sara Ahmed notes how a practitioner, reflecting on the politics of ‘diversity as an institutional performance’, states that a key competence in ‘diversity work’ is based on writing and the ability to produce a ‘wonderful aspirational document’ (cited in Ahmed 2012, p. 101). Ahmed highlights the danger of the good document or policy becoming a replacement for action. The institutional work Ahmed is
problematizing points to the ability to perform engagement with the question of race on institutional levels, without ever having to engage in it on a practical level in everyday encounters with those in whose name it purports to act. The adoption of ‘diversity’ in European countries remains questionable, precisely because unlike the political commitments of a politics of diversity outlined by Davina Cooper, it does not include critiques of power and ‘different ways of being’ (2004, p. 7). Gavan Titley and Alana Lentin, for their part, argue ‘the elevation of diversity as the central mobilising metaphor for vexed and complex questions of identity, positionality and power may act to dissipate the key political concerns of diversity politics’ (2008, p. 12).

By focusing on a celebration of diversity rather than on systematic change and power-sharing in communities, the anti-racist response offered is no longer politically charged in ways that open the conversation about colonial continuities and racial injustice today, but rather serves as a means to close the chapter of a once-shameful past. What is presented in Barcelona as a response to anti-racist demands is instead a reduction of anti-racist practice to an aspiration of change that further derails any questions about the real nature of political intentions.

Rather, where the controversy about renaming the plaza was initiated and continues to be shaped by local resistance struggles, ‘what remains is a language of inclusion and shared struggle, which lingers while being stripped of content and meaningful action’ (Lentin 2011, p. 163). Failing to enact a politics of action, an anti-racism that ‘explicitly names the issues of race and social difference as issues of power and equity, rather than matters of cultural and ethnic variety’ (Dei 1996, p. 252), what is left is an aspiration to remove the visible markers of colonial violence and racism. In the process of renaming, therefore, the focus of resistance is shifted from its anti-racist and anti-colonial emphasis to a quest for universal notions of inclusion and tolerance that leave power structures and, above all, racial hierarchies in place. While a certain degree of ignorance of past colonial violence is admitted—Antonio López y López is declared unworthy of memorialization—a new ignorance and silence emerges in the process of renaming. The link between past crime and present reality and its resistance is broadly glossed over.

As a symbol, Mandela actively and precisely speaks to the aspiration of abolishing racism rather than taking action against everyday forms of racism, as his persona has come to symbolize the defeat of a racist, white supremacist system. As others have argued, Mandela’s image has not been ‘whitewashed’ and ‘sanitized’ (Milne 2013; O’Neil 2013) but has been made into a non-threatening symbol of racial reconciliation and ‘keeping the peace’ between the races. Absent in his invocation are ongoing critiques emerging from within South Africa regarding how anti-blackness continues to form an entrenched part of the post-Apartheid social structure. On one level, racism is presented as a problem of a different space and time (South Africa and the past
respectively). Racism is constructed as ‘solvable’ in the sense that its expression (apartheid) is constructed as a deviation from the norm (colorblindness). Racism is, therefore, not considered as endemic to western countries, constituting an inextricable link between colonial violence and racist presents, but presented as the exceptional state. There is a willful ignorance that, in turn, conceptualizes racist acts as exclusively linked to individual and explicit forms of direct violence and discrimination. Thus, racism is not thought of as a system of privilege that systematically disenfranchises certain populations while simultaneously benefitting and privileging others within Europe.

The western democratic state is imagined as being not-racist at its foundation, with discrimination being an exception (Lentin 2008) or an anomaly imported alongside the same migrants on whom it impinges. In this formulation, societies are said to experience racism in forms of extreme cases, such as apartheid in South Africa, while the Western State, as such, remains as a racially neutral structure (Bonilla-Silva 2004). We are left, instead, with what Ahmed calls ‘diversity as a politics of feeling good, which allows people to relax and feel less threatened, as if we have already ‘solved it’, and there is nothing else to do’ (2006, p. 33). This is precisely what emerges in the process of cosmetic renaming. In other words, while the act of renaming may sound wonderful and conjures optics of justice, instead inequalities remain intact and power dynamics unaltered. Those advocating for name change construct themselves—and by extension their city—as believers in progressive change. Their articulated self-imaginations rest on a belief in social justice and transformation, into which the recognition and tribute to Nelson Mandela is meant to materialize. The usage of Mandela speaks to the construction of the city (since it is officials agreeing with the suggested name change) as believers in progressive change—a shift from a white colonial self-imagining (if even acknowledged to begin with) to supporter of social change that recognizes the legacy of Mandela as a proxy to perform anti-racism.

The self-imagining of Europe as harbingers of civilization and social justice, is itself a historically contradictory claim, one Aimé Césaire’s Discourse on Colonialism (1955) rightfully challenged as a matter of European self-deception. While it is not necessarily the main issue herein, we must not lose sight of the blindspots or silences such view conveys. Not only has Europe attempted to justify colonialism as somehow bringing civilization and progress to presumed savages and heathens, but without a twist of irony Europe continues to, in effect, present itself as the ones who know best how to challenge said history of colonialism and the racism it has engendered. In other words, at the heart of the various European colonial enterprises, starting with Spain’s effort to Christianize those it encountered in the ‘New World’, was the premise that Europe knew best how other societies should ‘civilize’ or ‘develop’. Similarly, European countries now continue to tell the descendants of colonization how to best be ‘anti-racist’ in a way that is palpable to Europe by abstracting justice away from ongoing local migrants and other communities of color engaged in struggles against
If the effort is one that aims to tackle Spain’s colonial past, it is important not to dislocate the conversation away from Spain on to a broader debate on universal rights for all. While Mandela is a towering world-historical figure in his own right, critics (including many from South Africa) have nonetheless noted that memorializing Mandela often has served a dual purpose. On the one hand, such efforts simultaneously celebrate his achievements, yet also become a way of papering over the inability of various societies to grapple with their own racial and gendered colonial histories and subjects. By displacing local grievances onto the honoring of a global human rights champion, Barcelona would thus sidestep numerous existing struggles against racism within both the cityscape and Spain more broadly.

In a similar vein, the suggestion to rename the square after the Rana Plaza collapse also shifts the focus away from local issues towards another universalism—the imagined universally exploited worker-subject devoid of the racial dynamics that have informed both the conflicted history of Antonio López y López and the acceleration of global industrial exploitation in the non-European world. The reference to Rana Plaza fails to acknowledge racial capitalism today and erases how the Antonio Lopez plaza quintessentially celebrated and commemorated a genocidal slave-trader.

While Antonio López Plaza has been exposed for honoring a ‘traficante de personas’ and the colonial/racial aspect of his business endeavors is nominally revealed, the central issues of human trafficking and slavery have, in turn, been presented as matters of universal human rights abuses for which the renaming presents itself as an opposite pole. Mandela and Rana Plaza as replacement are meant to represent such opposite; that is, the abstract stand-in for universal human rights, reconciliation, tolerance. However, a number of questions remain: Why are local struggles seen unfit for memorialization or seen in the vein of the ‘universal’? To what extent is the re-naming anti-racist? Is the renaming of the plaza meant to invoke Mandela for his associations with universal human rights abuses, or with concrete, historically-specific manifestations of racism? Mandela is thus a defender of universal Human Rights rather than a figure who fought against white supremacy. As a defender of such rights, Barcelona situates itself as a bearer of this tradition, and in doing so, displaces the violent racial crimes of colonial exploitations as a project of the Crown, rather than one in which Catalunya was at various points equally invested. Moreover, the invocation of Mandela is also meant to illustrate how white anti-racists of Barcelona have transcended racism; they are indeed color blind, when in reality they remain blind and effectively silence the voices of Afro-descendants within the city who have actively advocated for a different vision of Antonio López Plaza.
Conclusion—Decolonizing memory

The anti-racist work of Alphonse Arcelin reveals the complexities and contradictions of Spanish and Catalan denial of the colonial past. His campaign to remove the Darder Museum exhibit managed to unveil racism as a product of various complex historical and symbolic processes that lingered overtly and at times more hidden in Barcelona’s midst. ‘El negro’ was removed and with him any reminder of Arcelin’s struggle—the Dardar museum closed, and a new museum was built with money the Spanish government offered Banyoles to agree to repatriation.

While the Antonio López y López monument is in the process of being renamed because of his history as a slave trader and colonial figure, re-erected under a fascist government, colonial continuities are left out of debate—together with the demand to remove all other monuments identified by Monuments Coloniales. If Spain continues to be both the beneficiary and perpetrator of an entrenched racial colonial present, then the people who continue to resist such violent logics should have a say in the current processes addressing the representation of history through the renaming of public spaces. In this sense, Alfonso Arcelin, for example, would be a fitting replacement for the Anonio López y López monument and plaza, as has been advocated by local Pan-Africanist organizations.

Nevertheless, the process should also involve discussions with the various other groups that have pushed for the renaming of the plaza and removal of the Antonio López y López statue. The process and decision for a re-naming should take into account all actors involved, from city officials and union representatives, to local grassroots initiatives by communities of color alike. History and memorialization in this sense can establish the status quo but historians and politicians equally have the power to expose what has been erased from our sight (and public sites). If we recognize the power of public spaces in producing and reproducing not only the status quo, but epistemologies of ignorance, it is a responsibility for all who claim to stand against the histories of fascism and colonialism to tear away at the monumental facades that continue to project colonial power. As such, Barcelona and Ada Colau have a monumental opportunity to be on the right side of history. Yet such a decolonial horizon of possibility will not be breached or even approximated if the white anti-racist’s vision, or the anti-fascist’s that now form part of the establishment, continue to deny the colonial history and voices of communities of color.

As long as cities keep referring to the colonial encounter as discovery, such narratives assume the ‘discovered’ place did not exist before it existed for Europeans. The unquestioned commemoration of colonial figures or celebration of figures whose fame was made possible through the exploitation of the colonial and racialized other reproduces the logic of discovery. Although challenges to such commemorations in Spain and elsewhere have increasingly begun to etch away at
entrenched narratives that continue to glorify Europe’s colonial encounters, it is imperative that the historical memory of such challenges go beyond the last 40 years and investigate the ways in which naming, un-naming, and renaming can mask and cover up current racial injustice within Catalunya and Spain.

If the mapping and naming of the city layout, monuments and plazas represent a colonial site that parallels the managing of bodies in the colonial past then it would be important to acknowledge this history. Sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos’ words, that this endeavour ‘expand[s] our sense of the present and contract our future’, are fittingly apropos (2006, p. 21). It is crucial that Barcelona, and Spain more broadly, recognize their significant roles in a history of fascism, slavery, and colonialism. Its self-representation, manifested through such renamings, should thus include the colonial histories and territories of the past 520 years.

Today, any antiracist praxis that maintains itself steeped in a wilful ignorance of the second order silences will instead do a disservice to the work of true justice and freedom. Moreover, it will rest on aspiration alone if the names and bodies of those who have resisted colonization and racism are constantly erased from Spanish and European memory. The commemoration of opposition to racism cannot be reduced to abstract human rights that are presumably exercised and at risk everywhere equally, when the history of colonialism has had very specific racial and gendered contours. It cannot be based on an erasure of the historical resistance to white supremacy and colonization, nor on an erasure of the continued resistance to its racist present without running the risk of reproducing new equally colonial-master narratives in the name of an anti-racism shaped by Europe. It must, by definition, allow the flourishing of voices of those that continue to be marginalized amongst the pernicious existence of white supremacist social structures and privilege.
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Notes

i Actor Toni Alba compared Catalunya with other ‘oppressed, colonized and exploited’ nations in the International Commission of European Citizens (ICEC) as part of a campaign to collect a million signatures in favor of the right to self-determination. See also examples of the 2013 speeches at the National Conference for a Catalan Republic of the Esquerra Republicana (Republican Left) party.

www.exteriores.gob.es/.../POR%20LA%20CONVIVENCIA%20DEMOCRATICA.pdf

ii Translation by author. Original: Y lo que les voy a proponer es una estrategia opuesta: expandir el presente y contraer el futuro.
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