

Multi-layered Citizenship and the Boundaries of the 'Nation-State'

NIRA YUVAL-DAVIS¹
University of Greenwich

ABSTRACT: The paper argues that citizenship needs to be understood as a multi-layered construct, in which one's citizenship in collectivities in the different layers - local, ethnic, national, state, cross- or supra-state - is affected and often at least partly constructed by the relationships and positionings of each layer in specific historical contexts. This is of particular importance if we want to examine citizenship in a gendered non westocentric way. The paper explores some of the central issues which affect contemporary citizenships, in particular those relating to the construction of borders and boundaries.

Citizenship is a contested concept (Lister, 1997:3). Historically, the notion of citizenship first appeared in cities – the Greek Polis – where it was defined by the Aristotelian notion of ruling as well as being ruled' (Shafir, 1998). Other models of western citizenship developed in the Roman Empire and in Medieval cities (Shafir, 1998). The association of citizenship with the 'nation-state' first appeared in the French revolution, although the connotation of the French word 'citoyen' is much wider than a formal right to vote or to carry a passport of a particular state. It depicts a more total relationship between the individual and society.

As Carole Pateman (1988), Ursula Vogel (1991), Rebecca Grant (1991) and others have pointed out, these 'individuals' were constructed in a specifically gendered way that originally, at least, excluded women. Other excluding dimensions of the construction of 'the citizen' concerned class and race. Pateman links the 'social contract' of the republican 'fraternity' with the sexual contract which gave men the right to rule – and represent – women and children in the public domain. However, it is important to note that in spite of the deeply exclusionary nature of citizenship, the actual couching of the discourse of citizenship in universal terminology would prove a lever that was later used by a variety of social movements of the excluded, including women. Such a lever would gain them at least partial citizenship rights in a growing historical trend which Charles Taylor (1994) has called 'the politics of recognition'.

1 The first version of the paper was presented at the conference 'Women, Citizenship & Difference' which took place at the Australian National University, Canberra, May 1998.

As Brubaker pointed out, however (1992), the construction of citizenship as a relationship between individuals and the 'nation-state' has not been universal. In the German tradition, for instance, the carrier of rights has been not the individual but the ethnic national collectivity. In the debate between the liberals and the republicans (e.g. Oldfield, 1990; Peled, 1992; Roche, 1987; Sandel, 1982) the argument has also been whether the collectivity's 'common good' should have priority over that of the individual's.

T. H. Marshall (1950, 1975, 1981) has given the debate a different twist. For him the question has not been whether the relationship between the individual and the state, or the collectivity and state should have priority. Marshall defines citizenship as the 'full membership' of the individual in the collectivity, which he calls 'the community'. Although Marshall in his own work did not question what he perceived to be the automatic overlap between the boundaries of civil society, the nation and the state, his definition enables the problematization of such an automatic assumption of overlap, as was pointed out by Hall and Held (1989).

Citizenship, this 'full membership in a community', expresses itself in terms of rights and responsibilities, as Marshall and others have argued. Therefore, to the extent that those rights and responsibilities are not determined by the state but by other polities and collectivities, citizenship cannot be understood exclusively in terms of the 'nation-state'. The hegemony of nation-state citizenship vs. citizenship in other polities would be historically specific to certain times and places. It is not incidental that people who have been working on the development of the EU, such as Delanty (1995) and Soysal (1994) have been particularly articulate in pointing out the limitations of conventional perceptions on citizenship as exclusively bound to nation-states. In a recent presentation, Bryan Turner (1998) differentiated between 'Fordist' and 'post-Fordist' citizenships, the first confined to the nation-state, the second, contemporary one, transcended it (see also Holton, 1998).

My own argument has been (1991a and 1997a&b) that citizenship needs to be understood as a multi-layered construct. One's citizenship in collectivities in the different layers - local, ethnic, national, state, cross- or trans-state and supra-state - is affected and is often, at least partially, constructed by the relationships and positionings of each layer to the others in specific historical contexts. This is of particular importance if we want to examine citizenship in a non-westocentric way. In many of the post-colonial states, the constraints placed on the state by local and traditional communities on the one hand and multi-national and international agencies on the other, would be even more noticeable than in the West.

The aim of this paper is to supply an overview of the main issues that need to be considered when analyzing multi-layered citizenship, especially in light of recent technological, economic and political developments. It shall therefore examine questions of territorial borders and collectivity boundaries in relation to the processes of mass immigration and settlement on one hand, and the rise of

indigenous people's movements on the other. These need to be evaluated on the background of the development of international and supranational political organizations and agreed moral and legal codes, as well as shifts in the construction of time/space which have occurred due to technological developments, especially in the fields of transport and communications. It is important to observe, however, that all these issues affect not only macro social relations in the public social and political domains, but also in the intimate sphere of people's bodies, homes and primary relationships. The paper concludes by examining some of the ways dialogical transversal politics, which has been developed by feminists and others as a substitute for 'universalist' politics on one hand and 'identity politics' on the other, can deal with some of the issues of equality and difference that the notion of multi-layered citizenship necessarily implies.

Citizenship, borders and boundaries

While some borders in various states are constructed along natural delineating phenomena such as the sea, a river or a mountain chain, other borders are established as a result of complex negotiations between states, which often do not even involve the states concerned, but rather the current superpowers. These borders were outlined as a result of a specific state of affairs and international relations at the particular point of time the borders were negotiated. Grievances and claims expressed by one state for bits of territory that have been included in a neighboring state are more common than not, and these tend to increase in intensity with any destabilization of the international balance of power. During the last decade, for example, there have been more than a dozen alterations of borders in Europe itself, mostly in the aftermath of the fall of the Soviet Union. Indeed, it is generally the case that the situation is particularly volatile around borders of 'nation-states' constructed following the disintegration of empires and post-colonial states, and in which significant national groupings reside that do not belong to the state's dominant national grouping. Even when explicit irredentist struggles do not exist, citizenship of people who belong to minority national groupings on the borders, or in specific regions, is related to membership in their own community or the neighboring nations as much as it is related to the states in which they live. Political changes, such as the development of the EU or the dissolution of former Yugoslavia, can accelerate such processes (Delanty, 1995). It is not incidental that the Scottish devolution is presently taking place rather than several years ago.

Sometimes the number of communities and states involved, and the boundaries of membership drawn, can become quite complex. This is illustrated in the situation I found existing on the bordering zone between Austria, Italy and Slovenia, when I was visiting a couple of years ago as part of an EU working group on national minorities. The German minority in Northern Italy had good relationships with neighboring Austria, especially the Carinthian region. The Slovenian speaking community, living in the same village, kept their distance from the German community and maintained a certain rival relationship, because

from the German community and maintained a certain rival relationship, because sometimes different members of the same family would define themselves as German speaking, or as Slovenian. The relationship between the two community organizations changed, however, when a few years ago a couple of priests from new-founded Slovenia came to the village and wanted them, as 'Slovenians', to speak 'proper' Slovenian and refrain from speaking in the local dialect. These days the main support received by the Slovenians in the Italian village comes from the Ministry for Minority Affairs in Austrian Carinthia, where most of the Slovenians who speak this dialect live. Describing the citizenship of these people living in the border zone, only in terms of the state in which they formally live, would be a partial story at best.

These small, regional minorities are remnants of the ethnic mix in the Austro-Hungarian empire and are officially recognized by law in these states. Unlike most Anglo-Saxon states in which multiculturalism is a formal policy, these states do not recognize the existence of diasporic communities within their borders, formed as a result of more recent, post-WWII immigrations. The recent rise to power of Heider's party in Austria may mean that political struggles centering around these issues have come to constitute the heart of political debates in these so-called 'nation-states'.

Mass migrations and settlement

The association of citizenship with 'nation-states' constructs an image in which the globe is divided into different territories, each of which belongs to a nation, which ideally has its own state. Reality, of course, is very far from such a fiction. There have always been waves of immigration of population from one country to another, as a result of wars, natural disasters, persecution of particular religious or ethnic minorities, and poverty.

Many people from countries under European rule, both before and after independence, immigrated to western countries. They, and other migrants from marginal European and Middle Eastern countries, were recruited to work in western countries in the post-World War II expanding economies, and became the new ethnic minorities from the 1960's onwards (Castles & Miller, 1993). The members of these new ethnic communities established themselves in new diasporic communities and their membership in their states of residence needs to be understood from their specific historical, cultural and often legal positions in the country, as well as in their relationships to their countries of origin (Brah, 1996). The demise of the 'iron curtain' and the many regional wars in Southern Europe, the Middle East and Africa, have added to and accelerated these waves of international migration of both laborers and especially refugees. The rise of new 'tiger economies' have directed immigrants to countries which traditionally were not used to recruiting external migrant labor.

As Castles and Miller point out, contemporary international migration tends to be globalized, to and from a broad spectrum of countries, it is growing in number and is led by a variety of motivations, skills and countries of origin. Women play an

are also gender specific types of migrations. These often place women in extra vulnerable positions, as is the case when women migrate without an independent legal position as dependants on their husbands or other male relatives and in the case of domestic servants, or the sex and entertainment industries, on their employers (Phizaclea, 1996). Women constitute the majority of world refugees, but in western countries political refuge is usually given to the men even if their wives were also politically active and persecuted, and, if the husband dies, they run the risk of deportations (Bhabha & Shutter, 1994).

Formal citizenship is normally associated with the right to carry a passport of a specific state, which normally identifies them as 'belonging' to a specific nation-state. One of the signals of the super-state nation building of 'Europe' has been the issue of a European passport for all EU members. While the formal intention has been to establish a 'borderless Europe', the transfer of responsibility of illegal immigration to the flight and shipping companies, has resulted in many cases with even more scrupulous checking of passports than before. An international system of stratification has been created, at the top of which are found western passports which can almost always guarantee their carriers the right of free international movements and at the bottom of which are those who have no right to carry any passport at all. In parallel, there has been an increase in the number of people who carry two, three or even more passports of different states. Interestingly, the practice of issuing passports, although so thoroughly 'naturalized', was initiated only about a hundred years ago and the use of passports as a way of controlling immigration, even later.

Norman Tebbit, an ex-minister in Thatcher's government, argued that British citizens of South Asian origin supporting the cricket teams of their countries of origin, proves that they are not loyal British citizens, much to their indignation and resistance. In many parts of the world there exist immigrant communities which are culturally and politically committed to continue to 'belong' to their 'mother country' - or more specifically, to the national collectivity from where they, their parents or their fore parents came from. At the same time they see their future and their children's future as bound with the country where they live.

The rise of these 'committed diasporas' and their effects on citizenship in both the country of residence and the country of origin needs to be explored (Cohen, 1997). Central to this is the question of 'group rights' vs. 'individual rights', as well as the wider interrelationship between citizenship rights and questions of 'culture and tradition'. Multiculturalism is a double-edged sword in this regard, especially in relation to women - offering an acceptance of diverse positionings on the one hand, homogenizing and reifying these differences on the other (Anthias & Yuval-Davis, 1992, chs 2,6; Yuval-Davis, 1997a, ch.3).

When examining issues of citizenship of these migrants, therefore, one must take into consideration their formal and informal status not only in the countries where they live, but in their countries of origin as well. The most important factor in determining this would most likely be the relationship between these two countries, and their relative positions of power in the international social order. A comparison

between the situation of, for example, an American student and a Somali refugee living in London, illustrates this situation most forcefully.

Indigenous movements

Another whole set of citizenship issues is related to indigenous minorities in Settler Societies. The age of western imperialism and colonialism has created 'settler societies', sponsored by European empires, in South and North America, South and North Africa, Australia and New Zealand (Stasiulis & Yuval-Davis, 1995). In these states the indigenous populations have often been persecuted, exploited, exterminated and, in some cases, until today have not received full citizenship rights. Moreover, indigenous peoples' movements have tended to challenge the whole basis of legitimacy of the settler societies states and see themselves as citizens in the communities of the stateless societies which existed in these countries before colonialism (e.g. Dickanson, 1992, Reynolds, 1996).

However, it is not only the case that in many societies indigenous populations have been very late entrants to the formal citizenship body of the state if at all, it is that if their claim on the country, in the form of land rights, were to be taken seriously and in full, this would totally conflict with the claim of the settler national collectivity for legitimacy. Attempts to solve the problem by transforming the indigenous population into another 'ethnic minority' have usually met with a strong and understandable resistance (de Lepervanche, 1989). Formal treaties, which would institutionalize and anchor, in law, the relations between what Australian Aborigines have been calling 'the imposing society' and the indigenous people, often create a complex situation in which there are two national sovereign entities over the same territory. One owns the state and one attempts to establish a sovereign stateless society within it. There is a need to explore the implications such conflicts have on the citizenship of both the 'indigenous' and the settler communities, both in relation to their own communities and in relation to the state. Of particular interest here are the implications on the voices of indigenous women. It has been argued (Vargas & Yuval-Davis, 1999), that the need for collective solidarity among indigenous groupings sometimes tends to silence dissenting voices of women within the community.

Somewhat similar, if less racialized, struggles are present in the many regionalist secessionist or irredentist movements which claim the right of national self determination vis-à-vis their states which themselves have been constructed as nations. Such movements can be found both in and outside of Europe [e.g. in Northern Ireland, the Former Yugoslavia, Quebec, Kurdistan, Northern Sahara]. The legitimacy and state of the struggle would determine the relationships between the citizenship of people in the two contesting collectivities. However, their fate might be determined more and more these days with the intervention of international NGOs [Non Governmental Organizations] and governmental agencies, which may alter the balance of power between the contending parties [e.g. in Kosovo]. Therefore, any examination of issues of multi-layered citizenship must also include an examination of the supra-national layer.

International and supra-national political organizations and moral/legal codes

Citizenship and human rights are often discussed in two separate arenas - the first as associated with the national level and the second with the international (Pateman, 1996). However, human rights discourse and legislation needs to be viewed as a specific layer of supra-national citizenship - a global one, which more and more progressively affects the national level and, most importantly, individual citizens. This is done both by political mobilization around human rights discourse and by increasing use of human rights litigations in regional [e.g. the European Court of Human Rights] as well as international [e.g. the International War Crimes Tribunals] judiciaries by individuals, 'class acts' and international agencies (Ramsbotham & Woodhouse, 1996). People's membership in supra-state politics is therefore, like in states, partly direct and individual, and, to a great extent, mediated by their membership in other collectivities and states.

The establishment of the League of Nations after the First World War and even more so the United Nations after the Second World War, have launched an era of supra-state institutions and legislations. These institutions have acquired a growing amount of moral and legal authority over individual states and provided important arenas for new, especially post-colonial, states, to make their voices heard while not obliterating the political reality of the unequal power relations of international politics. The growing visibility and affectivity of the Non Governmental Organizations in recent United Nations conferences - on the environment in Rio, human rights in Vienna, population policies in Cairo and women in Beijing, and most recently in the World Trade Organization in Seattle - have added an important element of the new social movements into international politics. This has had the effect of changing hegemonic discourses concerning a variety of important policy issues. Feminist activists who, for many years, have been part of autonomous movements are beginning to find they are being listened to, and are sometimes recruited by the UN, the World Bank, official aid organizations, etc. This has presented opportunities as well as dangers of incorporation and cooptation to these activists. However, it is clear that even if sometimes the change is only cosmetic, there has been a change of style, and occasionally of substance, in hegemonic discourses concerning a variety of important policy issues (e.g. the linkage of population policies with women's reproductive rights and health) (Vargas & Yuval-Davis, 1999).

At the same time, however, as Yasmin Soysal (1994) has pointed out, there is a certain paradox in the growing importance of the supra-national authority of human rights declarations and treaties. While they are aimed at controlling and guiding state agencies, the executors of these international codes of rights and the members of international bodies are still the states and no international agency has the right to 'interfere in the internal affairs' of their states. Nevertheless, given that most recent wars have taken place within states, between different ethnic/national groupings and not between states, and that the UN or other supra-state forces such as NATO have gone to these countries as 'peace keepers', even that accepted rule

seems to be crumbling. The viability of states as representing the only significant political frameworks of populations is crumbling along with it.

NGOs and networks of women have been very active in all these processes (Ashworth, 1995). It is probably not incidental that the new post of the UN Director of Human Rights is Mary Robinson, who, as a president of the Republic of Ireland, has done a lot to transform the nature of women's citizenship there. Women often benefit more than anyone else from the lever supra- and interstate organizations and funding can give them.

It is important to remember, however, that it is not only the UN and its associated organizations, NATO or even regional organizations like the EU or, much weaker ones, like the Arab League, for instance, which constitute the only international forums that affect people's memberships in their communities and states. International religious organizations/projects like the Catholic Church or the Muslims Khalifa have important normative as well as political projects which affect people's affiliations and ways of life. Constructions of womanhood often play central symbolic roles in the cultural reproduction of national, religious and other collectivities. They are seen as the embodiments of the collectivity, its symbolic border guards who, in their behavior, carry the collective honor of the collectivity as well as transmit its cultural heritage to the next generation (Yuval-Davis & Anthias, 1989; Yuval-Davis, 1997a:ch.3). As such, they are often central targets of the normative and political projects of international religious movements. This may have crucial effects on the nature of women's participation and membership in these collectivities.

The effects of supra- and transnational organizations and agencies have been enhanced as a result of revolutionary technological developments, especially in the communication and transport arenas which have transformed traditional notions of time and space.

Transformations of Time/Space

Globalization is not a new 'post-modernist' phenomenon. It has existed in a variety of forms and to a lesser or greater degree as a side effect of imperialism and international capitalism. However, modern technologies have enabled the transfer of people and goods in a fraction of the time that was once required before the age of the airplane. The development of mass communications, especially radio and then television, has also exposed a growing percentage of the global populations to similar images and messages. The development of cable TV and the CNN types of world news have had the effect of presenting events such as wars, famine and massacres in an immediate, supposedly unmediated, form which brought them into the daily agendas of people from societies and places located physically very far away. It also enabled immigrants and their children to continue to be exposed to news and films from their countries of origin.

The development of the Internet and the possibility of interactive communication in 'virtual communities' have accelerated that process in an unprecedented way. Bangladeshi people from East London have been telling how

they manage to keep in touch with all their village news in Bangladesh and to take part in the decision making processes there, thus continuing their effective citizenship in those communities. At the same time it has also enabled new communities to emerge in ways which transcend boundaries of time and space (*Geographical Review*, 1997). Some of these communities relate to political projects of existing 'imagined communities'. Others are created across such boundaries. The internet sites of women's networks, pre and post the Beijing UN conference, were highly effective (Rodgers, 1998) as is currently an internet site set up by UNIFEM to gather information on violence against women internationally.

Multi-layered citizenship, then, is able to cross boundaries more easily, as well as obtain a more cosmopolitan nature as a result of these technological developments. However, the transformation in time/space also has consequences of a different kind.

The counter-movements of defensive closures - 'fortress' states and fundamentalist movements

Until now I have discussed factors and processes which construct people's lives and citizenship in general, and women's in particular, in a diverse and multi-layered way. However, it is important to also mention that many people feel insecure and threatened by this complex and unstable social and political environment. While many celebrate the richness of multi-cultural societies, hybrid 'traveling cultures' and the ability to challenge authoritarian cultural and political traditions (Clifford, 1992, Gilroy, 1997), others look for ways to defend themselves from what they foresee as complete social disintegration and loss of cultural heritage and political autonomy (Stolcke, 1995). Majorities fear being 'swamped' by racial and ethnic minorities, and minorities fear assimilation and collective disappearance. In the context of the growing rate of mixed marriages among western Jews, the term 'demographic holocaust' has been known to be mentioned (Yuval-Davis, 1987). At the same time racism, immigration legislation and what the Canadian government calls 'visibility' of minorities, can often trap people in enforced identities from which assimilation, as a strategy of self defense, is not possible. If we accept Marshal's definition of citizenship as 'full membership in the community', the lived experience of such people often would be dominated by encountering the varying ways and measures by which they are excluded from such membership (e.g. Wrench & Solomos, 1993).

Ethnic and religious fundamentalist movements breed on such feelings of threat and helplessness (Sahgal & Yuval-Davis, 1992). People seek assurances in definitions of identities and cultures which are fixed and immutable, an inherent characteristic of people who belong to a specific community of origin. Anybody different from or external to the boundaries of the community thus defined would be perceived as inherently incompatible, and thus any mixing would inevitably end in disaster - in 'rivers of blood' to use Enoch Powell's famous [false] prediction (Barker, 1981).

This is the same Enoch Powell who is rumored to have defined a nation as

'two or more males defending a territory with the women and children'. Women often are constructed as symbols of the collectivity, its biological and cultural reproducers (Yuval-Davis & Anthias, 1989; Yuval-Davis, 1997a).

As such, women, their bodies and their behavior usually occupy central roles in fundamentalist rules and regulations. Processes of globalization often offer women autonomous access to the money economy for the first time, although usually in very exploitable and vulnerable ways (e.g. Pettman, 1999). At the same time these changes seem threatening to the traditional male domination and the traditional family. While changes in women's traditional roles often symbolize processes of modernization, their confinement to symbolic traditional familial roles are often at the heart of fundamentalist projects (Yuval-Davis, 1997a: ch.3).

Gender relations and the public/private divide are crucial arenas, therefore, for constructions and contestations of multi-layered citizenships.

Intimate Citizenship

In constructing citizenship within the realm of the political community, the traditional discourse on citizenship has excluded the 'private sphere' from the realm of relevance. This is one of the major reasons, as feminist scholars like Carol Pateman (1988) and Ursula Vogel (1991) have argued why women have been excluded from discourse on citizenship for so long. And yet family, kinship relations as well as friendships and 'old boys [and increasingly girls] networks' have played a crucial role in establishing access to citizenship rights and obligations. As mentioned at the beginning of the article, feminists who studied the welfare state, like O'Connor (1993) and Orloff (1993) have pointed out that the distributive function of the welfare state, as well as its caring facilities, which constitute the basis of much of what is known as 'social citizenship', has been dependent on gender divisions of labor within the familial as well as the public civil and state domains.

However, the relevance of the familial domain to issues of citizenship does not concern only issues of welfare. Queen Elizabeth justified her delay in coming to London and talking to the people after Princess Diana's death by her need to give first priority to her role as a grandmother comforting her grandchildren. In the British society in which children were supposed to be seen and not heard this was a significant change of public political discourse indeed. In Egypt, on the other hand, where women Ministers have to get the written permission of their husbands to be in paid labor at all, in the first instance, and additional specific ones before every trip abroad, prioritizing familial discourse to state discourse - at least where women are concerned - would be seen as a given.

Different states and societies [and the same society in different times] differ in the extent to which the institutions of family, the market and public administration have access to the state's decision-making processes (Yuval-Davis, 1999a: 78-83). At the same time, the actual delineation of particular spheres as private or public, civil or political, can vary widely among states, among different cultural and religious communities within the same states, and also among the

different classes (Joseph, 1997). Families of the poor and the unemployed usually suffer from much more scrutiny in their daily lives and intimate relationships than people of the middle classes.

Questions of sexuality, ability and reproduction play important roles in how communities and states construct the rules and regulations of membership. No consideration of contemporary citizenship can be complete without examining the varied and changing ways in which people's intimate lives, their families and their networks of friendship affect and are affected by their activities as citizens. The gendered body is often a site of multi-layered rules and regulations.

Technological developments have affected not only relationships between people and communities, but also the most intimate aspects of people's lives - their health, their sexuality, their reproductive capabilities and many other aspects of their bodies' appearance and functions (Plummer, 1995). What used to be considered as the private arenas of life are progressively being penetrated and constructed by state and trans-state agencies [albeit in different manners in various sections of the population and in different places]. These developments affect the people's rights and obligations to the different layers of communities of which they are members. One arena that is of particular importance to women's lives and reproductive health is the use of new and highly sophisticated methods of contraception (for example Depo-Pravera and Nortplan) for the purpose of population control. Familial, religious, ethnic and national positionings can affect not only women's access to these means of birth control, but can also construct, often in contradictory ways, what would be understood as their moral duty as citizens - to have as many children as possible, or, just the opposite - to have, at most, one child (Yuval-Davis, 1996). Another is the growing separation between the three components of motherhood - conception, gestation and rearing - as the practice of surrogate motherhood continues to spread. As Patricia Hill-Collins (1990, 1999) points out, this separation is constructed by racial and class divisions among women in countries like the USA. As Janice Raymond (1993) points out, however, this division of labor is not only intra-national, but also international. It includes many components, from mass adoption of babies from poorer countries [but with as light a skin color as possible] by western middle class couples to 'exporting' of babies and children's organs. As Bakan & Stasiulis (1997) point out, this international division of labor and 'trade' is crucially affected by the relations of power between the ethnic and national collectivities in which the women are members, as well as in their countries of origin.

Encompassing Equality by Difference – Multi-Layered Citizenship and Transversal Politics

As Gita Sahgal & I commented elsewhere (1992), some multi-culturalist notions of difference create a space for fundamentalist leaderships to rise and gain legitimacy as 'representing' the community. This is a result of the tendency of multi-culturalist policies to often homogenize minorities and to attribute to all their members the same relationship to their 'culture and tradition' (Anthias & Yuval-

Davis, 1992).

This clearly has to be rejected. At the same time, as Balibar (1990), Young (1989) and Kymlicka (1995) have shown, the classical liberal – and Marxist (1975) – notions of citizenship that adopt an individualist ‘universalist’ approach in which differences among citizens are seen as irrelevant, become, as a result, exclusionary and discriminatory. As discussed in the paper, people’s membership in a state, and their rights and responsibilities, are mediated by their membership in other collectivities and polities, sub-, cross- and supra-state. Therefore, their positioning in that respect, as well as in terms of their class, gender, sexuality, stage in the life cycle, ability etc, have to be acknowledged in any citizenship project that in principle, at least, would be inclusive and democratic. The Marshallian social welfare state catered for some class differences, but other modes of differences have been largely ignored (for further elaboration of this point see Yuval-Davis 1997a:ch.4 or 1997b).

In our introduction to the book *Women, Citizenship and Difference* (Yuval-Davis & Werbner 1999), Pnina Werbner ‘imported’ an anthropological theory by Dumont (1972) on ‘encompassment’. This theory points out that often (in the case of Dumont he was discussing the Indian caste system), contradictory value systems do not exclude each other socially, but rather encompass each other. Essentialist notions of difference, promoted by ethnic and religious fundamentalist movements, are very different from the notions of difference promoted by those of us who believe in the importance of incorporating notions of difference into democracy. In the first case notions of difference replace notions of equality – in the second case they encompass them.

Notions of difference that encompass notions of equality are not hierarchical and they assume a-priori respect to others’ positionings – which includes acknowledgement of their differential social, economic and political power. This is the basis for dialogical transversal citizenship (Yuval-Davis, 1994; 1997 a & b), the ‘grammar for democratic conduct (Mouffe, 1992:238). As the Italian feminists in Bologna taught us, such a grammar has to include ‘rooting’ and ‘shifting’ (Yuval-Davis, 1994) – acknowledgement of one’s own positioning(s) while empathizing with the ways others’ positionings construct their views of the world.

In transversal citizenship politics, therefore, difference encompasses equality, and perceived unity and homogeneity are replaced by dialogues that yield recognition of the specific positionings of those who participate in them, as well as the ‘unfinished knowledge’ (Hill Collins, 1990:236) that each such positioning can offer. Crucial to such an epistemological and political approach is the differentiation between identification and participation as well as between identity and positioning. Group identities – ethnic, national, racial – tend to repress or marginalize differences among the members of the groupings – whether identified as ‘us’ or ‘them’. However, the nature of participation – of the membership – of the citizenship of people in these groupings is thoroughly affected by their positionings – social, economic, political and legal.

Much of the impetus of the development of the identity politics social

movements, including the feminist movement, has been driven by such recognition on a national scale. The recognition being that nation-state citizenships are gendered, racialized, heterosexualized, as well as class differentiated – as was recognized in the previous generation. However, such differences exist – and they affect the mode of people's participation in other intersecting layers of collectivities in which people operate as well. And, as mentioned above, what affects people's citizenships in the nation state is affected not only by their individual positionings, but also by the positionings of the other collectivities in which they are members, whether these are other nation-states, local communities, cross- and supra-states. Religious codes can affect the lives of women just as much as – and often more than – state legislation, and soliciting the support of an international agency can sometimes be the recourse of women who are disempowered within their local communities. This is the reason why to continue and relate to citizenships only in terms of the nation-state and not membership in other collectivities/polities, makes the dynamics of contemporary nation-states citizenships themselves incomprehensible.

Transversal dialogue, therefore, is crucial for common political action. Transversal politics, nevertheless, does not assume that the dialogue is boundary free, and that each conflict of interest is reconcilable – although, as Jindi Pettman points out, 'there are almost always possibilities for cordial or at least tolerable personal, social and political engagements' (1992:157). The boundaries of a transversal dialogue are determined, however, by the message, rather than the messengers. In other words, in addition to differentiating between identity and participation, transversal politics differentiate between social identities and social values (Assitter, 1996:ch.5).

It is for these reasons that the discourse of citizenship, of multi-layered memberships in collectivities, with all the rights and responsibilities this involves, has become so attractive to feminists in the last decade, especially around and after the Beijing UN conference. It offers us an alternative to the discourse of identity politics that fragmented the women's movement. It offers us a relational contextual tool within which to situate specific campaigns on, for example, reproductive health, poverty or political participation. It also offers us a particular mode of dialogue and coalition building across at least three levels of difference – among women in different positionings within one country, among women's networks and NGOs in different countries and among women's movements and the state – local, national, supra-national. This latter issue has been the most important – and perplexing – in societies, for example in Latin America, where the women's movement has been completely autonomous from the state for many years, governed by military dictatorships. The gradual transition of these states into parliamentary democracies introduced fresh opportunities – and challenges – to the women's movements in these countries (Vargas & Yuval-Davis, 1999). However, the same basic questions of how to co-operate without being co-opted, to participate without stepping beyond the boundaries of compatible values – is common to feminist movements everywhere, as well as to all other new social movements, such

as the environmentalist movement.

To sum up, the paper argues that in view of recent political, social, economic and technological changes, citizenship needs to be separated from the state analytically as well as politically. People's citizenships have to be understood as multi-layered constructs in which the different positionings of people and collectivities have to be taken into consideration. Rather than dividing people into classes – as socialist politics used to do, or into homogenous social categories as identity politics do, the paper suggests the notion of transversal politics as the way to negotiate – when possible – questions of equality and difference within multi-layered citizenry.

References

- Anthias, F. & Yuval-Davis, N. (1992) *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour & Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*, London: Routledge.
- Ashworth, G. (1995) *The diplomacy of the Oppresses: New Directions in International Feminism*, London: Zed Books.
- Assitter, A. (1996) *Enlightened Women: Modernist Feminism in a Postmodern Age*, London: Routledge.
- Bakan, A. & Stasiulis, D. (1997) Negotiating Citizenship: the Case of Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada, *Feminist Review*, 57: 112-139.
- Balibar, E. (1990) Paradoxes of university, in D.T. Goldberg (ed.) *Anatomy of Racism*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barker, M. (1981) *The New Racism*, London: Junction Books.
- Bhabha, J. & Shutter, S. (1994) *Women's Movement: Women under Immigration, Nationality and Refugee Law*, Trentham Books: Stoke-on-Trent.
- Brubaker, W.R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brah, A. (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora*, London: Routledge.
- Castles, S. & Miller, M.J. (1993) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Clifford, James (1992) Travelling Cultures in L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (eds.), *Cultural Studies*, New York: Routledge.
- Delanty, Gerard, (1995) *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
- deLepervanche, Marie (1989) Women, nation and the state in Australia, in N. Yuval Davis and F. Anthias (eds.), *Women – Nation-State*, London: Macmillan. pp.36-57.
- Dickanson, Olive P. (1992) *Canada's First Nations*, Toronto: McClelland & Stanley.
- Geographical Review (1997) special issue: *Cyberspace & Geographical Space*, vol. 87, no. 2, April.
- Gilroy, P., (1997) Diaspora and the detours of identity, ch. 6 in Kathryn Woodward (ed.), *Identity and Difference*, London: Sage. pp.299-346.
- Grant, R. (1991) *Gender and International Relations*, Indiana University Press: Bloomington.
- Hall, S. and Held, D. (1989) Citizens and Citizenship, in Stuart Hall & Martin Jacques (eds.), *New Times*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hill-Collins, P., (1990) *Black Feminist Thought*, Unwin Hyman, Boston.
- (1999) Producing the Mothers of the Nation: Race, Class and Contemporary US Population Policies in N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (eds.), *Women, Citizenship & Difference*, London: Zed Books.
- Holton, R. J. (1998) *Globalization and the Nation-State*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Joseph, S. (1997) The Public/Private – the Imagined Boundary in the Imagined Nation/State/Community: the Lebanese case, *Feminist Review*, 57: 73-92.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Clarendon

- Press: Oxford.
- Lister, R. (1997) *The Exclusive Society: Citizenship and the Poor*, Child Poverty Action Group, London.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , (1975), *Social Policy in the Twentieth Century*, London: Hutchinson.
- , (1981), *The Right To Welfare and Other Essays*, London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Marx, K. (1975) On the Jewish Question, *Early Writings*, Penguin, pp.211-242.
- O'Connor, J. (1993) Gender, class & citizenship in the comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: theoretical & methodological issues, *British Journal of Sociology*, 44 (3) pp.501-518.
- Mouffe, C. (1992), Democratic citizenship and the political community, in C. Mouffe (ed.), *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*, London: Verso, pp. 225-239.
- Oldfield, A. (1990) *Citizenship and community: civic republicanism and the modern world*, London: Routledge.
- Orloff, A.(1993) Gender & the social rights of citizenship: the comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states, *American Sociological Review*, .58(June) pp.303-328.
- Pateman, C. (1988) *The Sexual Contract*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- , (1996) *Democratization and Citizenship in the 1990s*, Oslo: The Institute for Social Research.
- Peled, Y. (1992) Ethnic democracy and the legal construction of citizenship: Arab citizens of the Jewish state *American Political Science Review*, 86(2) pp.432-442.
- Pettman, J. J. (1992) *Living in the margins: Racism, Sexism & Feminism in Australia*, Allen & Unwin: Sydney NSW.
- , (1999), Globalization and the Gendered Politics of Citizenship. in N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (eds.), *Women, Citizenship & Difference*, London: Zed Books.
- Phizaclea, A. (1996) Why do Women Migrate?, a departmental seminar, Gender and Ethnic Studies, University of Greenwich, London.
- Plummer, K. (1995) *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*, London: Routledge.
- Ramsbotham, O. & Woodhouse, T. (1996) *Humanitarian Intervention in Contemporary Conflict*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Raymond, J. (1993) *Women As Wombs*, San Francisco: Harper.
- Reynolds, H. (1996) *Aboriginal Sovereignty, Three Nations, One Australia?*, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Roche, M. (1987) Citizenship, Social Theory and Social Change, *Theory and Society*, Vol 16, pp.363-99.
- Rodgers, J. (1998) Creating New Political Spaces?: NGOs and their use of Network Technologies, paper presented at the Colloquium on the Possibility of Transnational Democracy, University of Newcastle, September.
- Sahgal, G. & Yuval-Davis, N. (1992) *Refusing Holy Orders: Women and Fundamentalism in Britain*, Virago: London.
- Sandel, M. J. (1982) *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Shafir, G. (ed.) (1998) *The Citizenship Debates, A Reader*, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Soysal, Y. (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*, University of Chicago Press.
- Stasiulis, D. & Yuval-Davis, N. (1995) *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Ethnicity, Race & Class*, London: Sage.
- Stolcke, V. (1995) Talking culture: new boundaries, new rhetorics of exclusion in Europe, *Current Anthropology*, 16(1): 1-23.
- Taylor, C. (1994) Examining the Politics of Recognition, in A. Gutmann (ed.), *Multiculturalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.25-74.
- Turner, B. (1998) National citizenship and cosmopolitan virtue - some issues with globalization, a paper presented at a departmental seminar, University of Greenwich, November.

- Vargas, G. & Yuval-Davis, N. (1999) Latin American Feminism in the 90's - A Conversation with Gina Vargas in October 1998" in *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1:2, 299-322.
- Vogel, U. (1991) Is Citizenship Gender Specific?, in U. Vogel & M. Moran (eds.), *The Frontiers of Citizenship*, Basingstock: Macmillan.
- Wrench, J. & Solomos, J. (eds.) (1993) *Racism & Migration in Western Europe*, Oxford: Berg.
- Young, I. M., (1989) Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship, *Ethics*, 99.
- Yuval-Davis, N., (1987) The Jewish collectivity and national reproduction in Israel, in Khamsin (ed.), *Women in the Middle East*. London: Zed Books.
- (1991a) The Gendered Gulf War: Women's Citizenship and Modern Warfare, in Bresheeth, H. & Yuval-Davis, N. (eds.), *The Gulf War and the New World Order*, London: Zed Books.
- (1991b) The Citizenship Debate: Women, Ethnic Processes and the State, *Feminist Review*, 39, pp.58-68.
- (1994) Identity politics and women's ethnicity, in V.M. Moghadam (ed.) *Identity, Politics and Women*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- (1996), Women and the Biological Reproduction of "the Nation", *Women's Studies International Forum*, 19(1/2): 17-24.
- (1997a), *Gender and Nation*, London: Sage.
- (1997b), Women, Citizenship and Difference, *Feminist Review*, Vol 57, Autumn 1997.
- Yuval-Davis, N. & Anthias, F. (eds.) (1989) *Woman-Nation-State*, London: Macmillan.
- Yuval-Davis, N. & Werbner, P. (eds.) (1999) *Women, Citizenship & Difference*, London: Zed Books.