Linda Supik · Malte Kleinschmidt ·
Radhika Natarajan · Tobias Neuburger ·
Catharina Peeck-Ho · Christiane Schröder ·
Deborah Sielert *Hrsg.*

Gender, Race and Inclusive Citizenship

Dialoge zwischen Aktivismus und Wissenschaft

Springer VS

Gender, Race and Inclusive Citizenship

Linda Supik · Malte Kleinschmidt ·
Radhika Natarajan · Tobias Neuburger ·
Catharina Peeck-Ho · Christiane Schröder ·
Deborah Sielert
(Hrsg.)

Gender, Race and Inclusive Citizenship

Dialoge zwischen Aktivismus und Wissenschaft

Springer VS

Hrsg.
Linda Supik
Freie Universität Berlin
Berlin, Deutschland

Radhika Natarajan
Universität Bielefeld
Bielefeld, Deutschland

Catharina Peeck-Ho
Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg
Oldenburg, Deutschland

Deborah Sielert
Leibniz Universität Hannover
Hannover, Deutschland

Malte Kleinschmidt
Leibniz Universität Hannover
Hannover, Deutschland

Tobias Neuburger
Technische Universität Berlin
Berlin, Deutschland

Christiane Schröder
Leibniz Universität Hannover
Hannover, Deutschland

ISBN 978-3-658-36390-1 ISBN 978-3-658-36391-8 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-36391-8

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

Planung/Lektorat: Cori Antonia Mackrodt
Springer VS ist ein Imprint der eingetragenen Gesellschaft Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH und ist ein Teil von Springer Nature.
Die Anschrift der Gesellschaft ist: Abraham-Lincoln-Str. 46, 65189 Wiesbaden, Germany

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Editors and Authors

About the Editors

Linda Supik, Dr. phil. is a sociologist. She teaches at Freie Universität Berlin and was Visiting Professor for Gender and Inclusive Citizenship at the interdisciplinary Leibniz Research Centre "Center for Inclusive Citizenship" (CINC) at Leibniz University Hannover. Her research interests are discrimination, intersectionality, racism, diversity in post-migrant societies, and the representation of diversity in official statistics and social surveys. Major publications are *Statistik und Rassismus. Das Dilemma der Erfassung von Ethnizität* [*Statistics and Racism – the Dilemma of Capturing Ethnicity*] (2014) and *Dezentrierte Positionierung. Stuart Halls Konzept der Identitätspolitiken* [*Decentred Positioning – Stuart Hall's Concept of Identity Politics*] (2005).

Malte Kleinschmidt, Dr. phil. researches and teaches in the domain of Civic Education at Leibniz University Hannover. His research interests are decoloniality, globalisation, racism, post-migrant societies, radical democracy and citizenship studies, particularly in relation to civic education. Major publications are the books *Dekoloniale politische Bildung. Eine empirische Untersuchung von Lernendenvorstellungen zum postkolonialen Erbe* [*Decolonial Civic Education – an Empirical Research of Learners' Concepts of the Postcolonial Heritage*] (2021) and *Eurozentrismus in der Philosophie: Zur Machtwirkung ego-, logo- und ethnozentristischer Konzepte* [*Eurocentrism in Philosopy*] (2013).

Radhika Natarajan, Dr. phil., read German Literature and Linguistics at the University of Mumbai and taught for more than a decade at Max Mueller Bhavan Bombay, before pursuing her research at the University of Hannover on refugee women and their gendered negotiation of everyday life and the German language.

Currently, she is postdoctoral fellow at the Faculty of Education Science, University of Bielefeld, and visiting lecturer at the universities of Kiel and Wuppertal. Her teaching and research focus on German as additional language, multilingualism in the contexts of migration, diversity- and gendersensitive educational approaches for children and adults. She published her doctoral thesis in German titled *Sprachliche Wirklichkeiten der Migration* [*Linguistic Realities of Migration*] (2019) and has edited an interdisciplinary volume in German, *Sprache, Flucht, Migration* [*Language, Exile, Migration*] (2019) and a bilingual anthology, *Sprache – Bildung – Geschlecht* [*Language—Education—Gender*] (2021).

Tobias Neuburger is a sociologist, currently research associate at Research Institute Social Cohesion (Forschungsinstitut Gesellschaftlicher Zusammenhalt) at Technical University of Berlin. His research interests include Antigypsyism and institutional racism, urban sociology, and social theory.

Catharina Peeck-Ho, Dr. phil. is a sociologist and works as a lecturer at the University of Oldenburg. Her research interests lie in the fields of citizenship, migration and transnationalisation, as well as intersectionality and research methodology, especially feminist standpoint theories. Major publications include *Sicherheit, Geschlecht und Minderheitenpolitik. Kritische Perspektiven auf die britische Antiterrorstrategie* [*Security, Gender, and Minority Politics. Critical Perspectives on British Counterterrorism Strategy*] (2017).

Christiane Schröder is managing director of the interdisciplinary Leibniz Research Centre »Center for Inclusive Citizenship« (CINC) and a researcher in the focus area »Historical Democracy Research and Cultures of Memory« at the Institute of Didactics of Democracy at Leibniz University Hannover. Her research interests include women's and gender history as well as Lower Saxony's state and regional history. She is currently researching the Lower Saxon Protestant women's monasteries and their convents under National Socialism and in the second half of the 20th century.

Deborah Sielert is a PhD student and junior researcher based at the Institute of Sociology, Leibniz University Hannover. Her PhD is a comparative study of symbolic boundary-making and ethnically marked processes of heritagisation in three small cities in Northern Germany. Her research interests include: social theories, cultural sociology and critical heritage studies, as well as feminist theories and gender studies, especially in the discursive field around the notion of “care”.

The Authors

Douglas Ian Becker Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg, Germany

Maribel Casas-Cortés Dr. Universidad Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain

Lisa Doppler Dr. Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen, Gießen, Germany

Richard Heise Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany

Christian Hinrichs Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

Steve Kenner Dr. Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Malte Kleinschmidt Dr. Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany

Aleksandra Lewicki Dr. University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

Helma Lutz Prof. Dr. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Aoileann Ní Mhurchú Dr.. Manchester University, Manchester, United Kingdom

Radhika Natarajan Dr. Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany

Tobias Neuburger Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Catharina Peeck-Ho Dr. Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg, Germany

Alessandro Pratesi Prof. Dr. University of Florence, Firenze, Italy

Deborah Sielert Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany

Linda Supik Dr. Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Vanessa E. Thompson Dr. Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

Pinar Tuzcu Dr. Universität Kassel, Kassel, Germany

Katrin von Horn Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany

Larissa Weiss Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany

Mirko Widdascheck Dr. M.L.E. Hannover, Germany

Nira Yuval-Davis Prof. Dr. University of East London, London, United Kingdom

Conceptual Considerations: Citizenship and Intersectionality/Konzeptionelle Überlegungen: Citizenship und Intersektionalität

Gender, Race and Inclusive Citizenship as a Momentum Concept: An Introduction

Malte Kleinschmidt, Radhika Natarajan, Catharina Peeck-Ho, Deborah Sielert and Linda Supik

Abstract

In this introduction to the edited volume, we argue that citizenship is a "momentum concept" (Hoffman 2004, *Citizenship Beyond the State*, Sage, Thousand Oaks) which encompasses the potential to build up spaces for equality and inclusion. We aim to further develop the concept of inclusive citizenship, which is a common working base at the Leibniz Research Center for Inclusive Citizenship (CINC) at Leibniz University Hannover. Gender and race are two pivotal dimensions of inequality which have received public attention in recent years, for example, within debates on racist police violence in the USA and Europe, and in the care crisis, not only during the COVID-19 pandemic. In this introduction, we elaborate on our understanding

M. Kleinschmidt (✉) · D. Sielert
Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany
E-Mail: m.kleinschmidt@ipw.uni-hannover.de

D. Sielert
E-Mail: d.sielert@ish.uni-hannover.de

R. Natarajan
Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany
E-Mail: radhika.natarajan@uni-bielefeld.de

C. Peeck-Ho
Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg, Germany
E-Mail: catharina.peeck-ho@uni-oldenburg.de

L. Supik
Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

L. Supik et al. (Hrsg.), *Gender, Race and Inclusive Citizenship,*
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-36391-8_1

of acts of inclusive citizenship, linking debates on migration and racism in Germany with concepts from citizenship studies, explain the focus on gender and race of this collaborative publication project and embed it in the field of intersectionality research. We also present the four fields of discussion of inclusive citizenship in this volume: care, institutional racism, language and the digital sphere.

1 Introduction

Today's citizenship regimes are highly racialised and gendered. When we look at the ways inequalities are enforced in everyday acts and institutions, it becomes clear that they are ingrained in social structures in many ways. This may be partly due to the strong link that connects constructions of race and gender to the nation, which, even if it is questioned, is still the most potent and relevant anchor point for citizenship and imagined communities of solidarity. Although gender inequalities seem to have been diminishing and transformed in western societies, many improvements remain accessible only to an elite or only in paradoxical ways. An extremely gendered and racialised social division of work is still the reality for the vast majority of people. Its foremost expression lies in the division, as well as the recognition and valorisation, of care work. Care work has been described by Helma Lutz as the 'backstage' of globalisation (2018), a place where racialised persons, mostly women, take care of all the least valorised but most necessary work of cleaning and catering for those who are very young, very old or otherwise in need. A huge gap with regard to citizenship prevails between these carers and those whom they take care of. Similar processes can be observed when we focus on fields like racialisation processes inside state institutions and the role played by language, cultural representation and the digital code—machine language—as more than merely the symbolic 'infrastructure' for citizenship or the implementation of digital technologies. Looking at the ways activists and social movements address these developments, we can say that, in all these fields, people do resist and challenge these inequalities and subvert them in different ways. This, roughly speaking, is the field in which we intervene with our concept of inclusive citizenship.

In this volume, we argue that citizenship is a "momentum concept" (Hoffman 2004) which encompasses the potential to build up spaces for equality and inclusion. Simply understood as a status (a 'passport' held), citizenship grants

rights to citizens and denies them to non-citizens. However, if one takes a closer look at the associated practices and discourses, the situation becomes less clear. When Thomas H. Marshall made his famous distinction between social, political and civil citizenship (Marshall 1950), he pointed to the complexity caused by different forms of rights and obligations. More recently, authors (Yuval-Davis et al. 2006; Yuval-Davis 2011) have connected citizenship with different notions of belonging—an aspect that becomes even more relevant in times of global migration and increasingly pluralist and diverse societies. All these developments show how practices and discourses around citizenship cannot be reduced to questions of status. More importantly, an understanding is needed that allows the analysis of the complex dynamics of inclusion and exclusion arising within practices and regimes of citizenship—a project that has been undertaken in the field of citizenship studies (Turner 1997; Isin and Turner 2002).

Starting from this field, the book aims to further develop the concept of inclusive citizenship, which is a common working base for us at the Center for Inclusive Citizenship (CINC) at Leibniz University, Hannover. Our understanding of inclusive citizenship has been the result of intense discussion between several disciplines. The CINC was founded in 2017. Since then, researchers from the disciplines of sociology, history, political science, civic education, special education, the didactics of natural science, medicine, the German language and educational science have been collaborating in the framework of the theoretical approach labelled as inclusive citizenship. The CINC's discussion on inclusive citizenship and, due to the educational disciplines involved, inclusive citizenship education (Kleinschmidt and Lange 2020; Kleinschmidt et al. 2019; Kleinschmidt 2017, 2018, 2021, p. 53 ff.; see *Richard Heise* and *Steve Kenner* in this volume) is work in progress, and this volume aims to contribute to the progressive theorisation of the concept. In the field of civic education, the inclusive citizenship approach is based on the idea that education should not be understood as transmitting knowledge or skills from the academic sphere to the learners' minds. The profound and emphatic German idea of *Bildung*, instead of education (*Erziehung*), should be taken into account here for a better understanding. Instead of the idea of transmitting 'correct' knowledge, the subjective meaning, the concept formation of the learners, developed to a large extent before, without or independently from institutionalised education settings, is placed at the core of citizenship education. Learners work with these subjective concepts in their everyday life, orientate themselves in society and organise their social relations. Thus, instead of being a top-down process of transmitting, education is seen as an appropriation and reflection of the world and the self by the learning subjects. Here, the question of citizenship as regime and act becomes

pivotal to understanding these processes from the perspective of inclusive citizenship. Since this volume does not focus on educational issues, with some exceptions, i.e. the contribution of *Heise* and *Kenner*, we will not follow these traces now.

We focus on the dimensions of gender and race, and thus take up two pivotal dimensions of inequality which have received public attention in recent years, for example, within debates on racist police violence in the USA and Europe, and in the care crisis, not only during the COVID-19 pandemic. To what extent is citizenship a momentum concept directed towards gaining not only rights but equal rights, and towards combating patriarchy, sexism, hetero-normativity, gender binarism, colonialism and racism? Due to the topicality of these questions, it is our concern to consider them as not purely academic. We do not believe that there is a latent hierarchy between knowledge in academia and knowledge in social movements. We see a lot of important knowledge circulating among activists that is crucial when it comes to challenging current citizenship regimes and is necessary to widening or rethinking academic perspectives. Thus, this volume engages in a dialogue with activists as experts in the field. Of course, this approach requires a critical reflection of the power relations between academia and activism and the ways in which we contribute to them in the context of editing this volume. Even scholars who genuinely intend to act in solidarity with social movements can do more harm than good, for example, when they (unintentionally) reproduce racist, gendered or culturalist stereotypes in their work. Debates around research methodologies mirror this concern and deal with a range of contradictions resulting from power relations and ways of producing knowledge. For example, although knowledge is always situated and structured by power relations, this does not necessarily mean that scientific knowledge is fundamentally more valuable than that of social movements, or vice versa. In bringing different perspectives to this volume, we aim to take this into account. In contrast to more traditional methodologies, we further draw on methodological considerations from social movement research, especially the work of the anthropologists Alex Khasnabish and Max Haiven. These authors propose a strategy in which they understand research with social movements as an active attempt to create "spaces of encounter" to collectively analyse and imagine alternative knowledge (Khasnabish and Haiven 2012, p. 411; Sielert 2019; Peeck and Sielert 2019). We would like our volume, and the dialogue involved in the process of its making, to be understood as a "space of encounter" in this sense.

This volume promotes the conversation on citizenship, migration and belonging from an intersectional perspective, on the one hand (e.g. Yuval-Davis 1999; Werbner and Yuval-Davis 2005; Anthias 2012; Lutz and

Amelina 2017), and from an "acts of citizenship" perspective (Isin and Nielsen 2008) on the other. Not all of our authors situate themselves inside the intersectionality debate, while some do this very strongly. Similarly, some of the authors are very much at home in the citizenship debate, while others have parted ways with it or don't feel they belong there. As the editors, we therefore promote a constructive discussion among scholars and activists who draw on partly diverging, partly shared theoretical discourses and concepts like acts of citizenship (AoC) (Isin and Nielsen 2008; Isin 2009) or an understanding of citizenship as a regime (Jenson and Papillon 2000; Fourot et al. 2018) as well as on debates on intersectionality (e.g. Lutz et al. 2013). Taking up Engin Isin's notion of AoC, we are interested, on the one hand, in acts which transform citizenship so that it becomes more inclusive. On the other hand, citizenship regimes are, in many ways, exclusive, as they establish a status quo and can stabilise unequal distributions of rights and duties. From an intersectionality perspective, as many of the contributions in this volume reflect, race and gender are genuinely intertwined with other categories, among them class, religion, disability or sexuality. By demarginalising and centering gender and race, intersectionality helps us to understand and elaborate the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion within debates on citizenship.

As stated above, we regard citizenship as a momentum concept according to John Hoffman: "They [the momentum concepts] 'unfold', so that we must continuously rework them in a way that realizes more and more of their egalitarian and anti-hierarchical potential" (Hoffman 2004, p. 138). As a momentum concept, to us, the notion of citizenship summons an imaginary of a commonly shared good inside space, one that is attractive to live in for all. Therefore, inclusive citizenship promotes the idea of opening up this space, whether from the inside or the outside. The idea contains a utopian moment that serves to rethink the infrastructure of these spaces as well as the questions of inequality and participation. Inclusive citizenship as a momentum concept thus encompasses a normative perspective of dynamics towards power equality. On this basis, we understand citizenship not in the narrow sense of membership of a (nation) state. Although membership plays a significant role, we are more interested in how people appropriate rights and struggle for participation (Isin and Nielsen 2008). Closely related to the question of who can make use of rights are questions of belonging and the politics of belonging. Belonging refers to emotional attachments to 'home' and the notion of feeling safe in this space. Thus, we must raise questions such as: How is a safe home gendered? Who do the police help to feel safe? Against the background of the mobilisation of these feelings for political projects—the politics of belonging (Yuval-Davis et al. 2006;

Yuval-Davis 2011; the conversation in this volume)—the fundamentally political dimension of this category becomes evident. Questions of belonging and agency are negotiated and struggled for in local, regional, digital or transnational spaces as well as in the discursive space of language. In today's highly racialised and gendered citizenship regimes, belonging remains contested. The idea of inclusive citizenship does not describe an already existing reality but a project, or rather a plurality of efforts and struggles, and provides future perspectives.

As academics who mainly conduct research and lecture at German universities, in many ways, we are discussing gender, race and inclusive citizenship from a privileged position. We already live in a mostly good, comfortable inside space that is attractive to many others who are excluded from it. As Alessandro Pratesi writes in his chapter, it is those who live on the margins who are enabled by an 'edge effect' to see this privilege most clearly, which those most centred can so easily take for granted and may even be oblivious to. Even if we, the editors, are obviously not all positioned identically (and some of us are nearer to the edge than others in some respects), our perspective as editors is structurally restricted. We have tried to reflect on this, and our conviction is that dialogue, debate and discussion are crucial to changing the game. The language of citizenship is permeated with antagonistic terms, with struggles for freedom, against oppression or for equality. It shows that the fields we are discussing are not about negotiations between equally empowered groups or individuals enjoying equal treatment. Framing citizenship as inclusive from this stance always needs to reflect the fact that this debate, in many ways, derives from the privileged side of the social divide, or rather that exclusive inside space. In *Citizenship Beyond the State*, Hoffman argues for a concept of "inclusive citizenship" (2004, p. 154) which is not absorbed in a state-centred understanding as full membership in a nation-state, but rather makes egalitarian and emancipatory processes describable. Similarly, Naila Kabeer frames 'inclusive citizenship' as an approach to "different mechanisms of exclusion which consign certain groups within a society to the status of lesser citizens or of non-citizens" and a way of describing "the struggles by such groups to redefine, extend and transform 'given' ideas about rights, duties and citizenship" (2005, p. 1). These two authors are thus part of a shift towards a nuanced and more multi-faceted understanding of citizenship.

Our own understanding of citizenship oscillates between membership status and AoC (Isin and Nielsen 2008; Isin 2009). Status is closely connected to rights and entitlements which are part of the citizenship regime (Bickerton 2018). As Hannah Arendt famously stated, "the right to have rights" (Arendt 1986, p. 295) is often formally restricted to citizens and human rights are not equally accessible

to every human being (see also Turner 2006). AoC, on the other hand, involve the subversive potential to transform the rules of citizenship even for non-citizens. When activists claim rights, for example, in social movements, they can change the legal framework of citizenship. Isin (2009) thus attributes to these acts a subversive potential that can open up spaces of inclusion—a notion that we take up in our concept of inclusive citizenship.

For this bilingual volume, we should note that when transferring the anglophone concept and debate on citizenship into the German-speaking world some problems were encountered. The usual translation *Staatsangehörigkeit* (literally 'state membership') is not equivalent to what appears in the academic citizenship discourse, as it refers to the legal status of possessing a passport in the narrow sense. *Bürgertum* is very much associated with the bourgeoisie as a class antagonistic to the working class, and therefore transmits an elitist meaning, athough this may not be altogether inappropriate. *Bürgerschaft*, on the other hand, has been used by some authors (Lutz and Amelina 2017) to translate the term citizenship, with its associated meanings, to the German context. Others, partly from the CINC context, suggest that we need to differentiate between *Bürgerschaft*, *Staatsangehörigkeit* and *Staatsbürgerschaft* in order to be able to precisely grasp the associated notions (Bös and Schmid 2012). While *Bürgerschaft* is, in many ways, associated with practices of participation, *Staatsbürgerschaft* refers to the rights to which people have access. These are partly, but not entirely, connected to *Staatsangehörigkeit*, as some rights are held by non-citizens, too (e.g. some forms of social security rights which are bound to participation in the labour market). These accounts show that there is still certain potential to develop the concept further in a German-speaking context. As a consequence, the English term citizenship has mostly been retained in translations to take account of the variety of meanings associated with it.

On this basis, this volume sets out to discuss the project of inclusive citizenship along the two major social divisions of race and gender, with reference to the intersectionality debate. It aims to explore how to deal with social inequalities and strengthen perspectives of cooperation between academia and activism. The chapters started out as contributions by speakers invited to a conference programme at the CINC in Hannover, scheduled for September 2020, with speakers having confirmed their contributions; then, in early 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic started, and flights, travel and conferences were cancelled. The conversations and dialogue in this volume echo our wish to preserve some of the communicative quality and intensity of a live conference and transmute it into writing. None of the scholars involved in the making of this volume regard themselves as impartial distant observers of intersectional processes

of citizenship in the making. We engage in emancipatory projects ourselves, navigating between the idea that our academic work should make a contribution one day and a recognition that the divide between activism and research must not be underestimated. Examples of this double role can be found in many of the contributions, for example, in the conversation between Lisa Doppler and Catharina Peeck-Ho on their shared activist experience and research in Solidarity City contexts.

On a general level, an editing process can be regarded as an act of inclusive citizenship, as it can, to some extent, open up spaces for struggle, negotiation and debate which can subvert understandings of citizenship and belonging. This volume, following the rules of academic publishing, is nonetheless part of a largely privileged discursive space and is therefore relatively limited in terms of inclusion. From the perspective of inclusive citizenship, academic book editing is an activity carried out by an elitist circle trying to be included in a privileged discursive space—and, thus, being exclusive for so many others. Moreover, academic book editing processes go along with individualistic isolation, resulting in volumes as collections of separated monologues. Responding to both these problems, even if not solving them in this volume, we have attempted to find solutions to enable a dialogue. Every author contributing a chapter was also part of a written conversation or a group interview. There is a hierarchy between oral and written language that can be countered by carefully transcribing interviews and giving the spoken word equal weight.

We brought together activists, distinguished senior scholars and junior scholars to discuss a range of questions: What does inclusion in the context of societal pluralisation mean, and how is it related to citizenship? What is the role of discrimination, and how are different forms of discrimination interconnected? How do activists deal with inequalities, and what kind of strategies do they develop to fight for rights, especially when people do not formally have access to them?

In order to get closer to the answers to these questions, the volume contains, in addition to the kind of articles that are normal in a social science volume, a series of conversations and interviews that are intended to initiate and advance the dialogue on inclusive citizenship.

In the following sections of this introduction, we (2) elaborate on our understanding of acts of inclusive citizenship, linking debates on migration and racism in Germany with concepts from citizenship studies, and (3) explain the focus on gender and race that we chose for this collaborative publication project and embed it in the field of intersectionality research. We then present the fields in which we want to deepen our discussion of inclusive citizenship in this

volume: the fields of (4) care, (5) institutional racism, (6) language and (7) the digital sphere.

2 What Do We Mean by Acts of Citizenship?

We imagine inclusive citizenship as a commonly shared inside space, which creates and allows belonging for all. This idea, as an imaginary, involves a normative perspective on the ways society deals and should deal with power and inequality. Inclusion has become an influential paradigm in debates about disability (Kleinschmidt 2017; see also Hazibar and Mecheril 2013). The 2006 UN Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which was the result of long struggles by disability movements, pushed states to strengthen their efforts for equal rights and especially, but not exclusively, in educational sciences, led to renewed thinking about inclusion as a way of restructuring society and its institutions anew, so that it could accommodate the needs of all persons and make differentiating categorisations between them obsolete (Kastl 2018, p. 666; Bittlingmayer and Sarai 2017, p. 684). This notion replaced the older concept of integration that imagined structures and institutions as unaffected and only 'made a little space for persons with disabilities as well'.

Under the label of migration studies in Germany, a similar shift took place. Instead of treating migrants or the migrant others as the cause of a societal challenge or problem, the perspective was turned to problematising power relations and normalisation processes, and questioning the naturalised ideas of the nation and its mechanisms of belonging (Mecheril 2003). This shift of paradigm is what we want to take as a starting point: it is the mechanisms of exclusion, not the excluded, that are considered to be deficient. Although this shift of perspective is perhaps trivial, it breaks with hegemonic perspectives in several domains, particularly by assuming that neither the diversity nor the migration of people is the problem, but rather the nation state and European Union borders, and how society deals with those circumstances and structures accordingly. For example, in the debates about race and migration in Germany, our understanding of inclusion opposes the integration paradigm which—instead of being part of the solution—perpetuates the regime of racial and national difference and hierarchies. The dominant understanding of integration is the idea of adaptation, according to which the migrant other has to adapt culturally to the imagined homogenous national body—and prove their adaptation constantly. But from a critical perspective of migrant studies, the logic of the integration discourse is exactly the continuing production of the other, the current logic of racial othering

in Germany. This integration discourse can be understood as a disciplinary instrument, continuously reproducing regimes of belonging and difference (Castro Varela 2013; also Ha 2007; Bojadžijev 2006). This shift of paradigms and perspectives is exactly what we draw on when using 'inclusive' or 'inclusion' as a label for our perspective. It turns out that the concept of inclusive citizenship can by no means be reduced to being 'just' normative. Inclusive citizenship is also an analytical perspective emanating from this shift and drawing on ideas from citizenship studies.

To introduce our multi-faceted perspective on and inheritances from citizenship studies, we draw a landscape of three different understandings of citizenship from which we inherit our notion of inclusive citizenship: (1) citizenship as healing of inequality in a community, (2) citizenship as a regime which produces exclusion, not-belonging and inequality, and (3) a performative understanding of citizenship putting into question these regimes through acts. Nira Yuval-Davis values Thomas H. Marshall's (1950) understanding of citizenship "as a membership of the community rather than of the state" (Yuval-Davis 1997, p. 8) as breaking the liberal paradigm and opening the way to analytically encompass the multi-layered social relations in a society. Almost 50 years after Marshall's book was published, Bryan Turner criticized Marshall's framework for reducing the perspective on social division to class only (Turner 1997, p. 13). He aimed to extend the view of society and its divisions to other aspects like gender, ethnicity and age groups (ibid., p. 10) and, hence, to add to the understanding of citizenship as a legal status the "cultural identity of individuals and groups" (ibid., p. 8). As in Marshall's general framework, in which citizenship provides the cure for capitalist inequality by propagating the welfare state, in Turner's framework, citizenship is still seen as constructing social cohesion—to use a trendy word of current hegemonic discourse. "Citizenship provides a form of solidarity, if you like a kind of social glue that holds societies together which are divided by social class, by gender, by ethnicity and by age groups. The solidarity of the political community of modern societies is provided by citizenship which works as a form of civic religion" (ibid., p. 10).

Here, we have several objections to make. Yuval-Davis reminds us that "it is important not to view 'the community' as a given natural unit" (1997, p. 8). The framework used by Marshall and Turner does not address citizenship as a source of inequality because the community constructed by citizenship is not fundamentally questioned. "Collectivities and 'communities' are ideological and material constructions, whose boundaries, structures and norms are a result of constant processes of struggles and negotiations, or more general social developments" (ibid.). Rather than seeing citizenship as full membership of a community,

it is possible to see it as multi-layered, oscillating between the force to exclude, divide and normalise, and the force of interrupting these inequalities and advancing equality.

According to Étienne Balibar, this tension between acts and status of citizenship can also be understood as the simultaneity of the two opposing logics in relation to anthropological differences (Balibar 2017, p. 275). On the one hand, the self-narrative of modernity's concept of the citizen encompasses not only an individual's membership in a community, but also potentially everyone's access to a set of rights from which no human being can legitimately be excluded. This universalism, which is based on the fundamental equality of all human beings as human beings, is contrasted with a tremendous expansion of the project of classifying, categorising, and distinguishing all human beings (ibid., p. 275). The founding moments of political modernity, such as the French and US revolutions, are not coincidentally marked by the systematisation of these distinctions, like racism and the hetero-normative gender regime. The double movement of bourgeois universalism consists in the fact that the principled non-excludability of human beings from human rights leads to the exclusion from humanity of those who are excluded from citizenship rights: "Because the human and the political (the 'rights of man' and the 'rights of the citizen') are coextensive 'by right', the human being cannot be denied access to citizenship unless, contradictorily, he is also excised from humanity" (ibid., p. 276). The citizenship thus instituted leads to a "restricted community solely of 'normal persons', 'civilized men', 'responsible subjects', and so on" (ibid., p. 282). The others lose, with their civil rights, also the right to have rights, and are thus excluded from being human (or their humanity is qualified as deficient):

> "Therefore – and I apologize for the brutality of a formulation that is nonetheless all-too-relevant in reality because of past and present exclusions based on race, sex, deviance, pathologies, to mention only a few – the human being can be denied such access only by being reduced to subhumanity or defective humanity" (ibid, p. 276).

Balibar exposes the particularity of the propagated universalism. "[T]he particular characteristics of a narrow social group, such as being perceived as propertied, adult, male, rational, white, Christian, heterosexual, and able-bodied became the dominant universal characteristics in the modern state" (Isin 2017, p. 503). The flip side of this particular norm is then the exclusion of numerous groups: "These characteristics created various other social groups as subjects without rights: the poor, young, women, irrational, Black, non-Christian (Muslim, Indigenous, Jewish), ethnic minorities, queers (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender,

questioning, intersex), and disabled people were deemed not capable of fulfilling the duties of citizenship and hence acting as citizens" (ibid.). But the tension of particularity and universalism remains vivid, since this is exactly the field of struggles about citizenship. The project of 'truly' universal human rights has been restricted so far by the lack of a global jurisdictive institution. To claim your rights as a human effectively, you need to be a national citizen.

It is the duality of citizenship as act and status that we are interested in: "To put it emphatically, citizenship is a game of domination and emancipation that brings into play the struggles of those who want to protect certain privileges and the struggles of those against being caught in either second-class or non-citizen categories" (Isin 2021, p. 7). Instead of understanding citizenship in Marshall's (1950) sense as full membership in a nation state, in the sense of containers filled with citizens (Isin 2009, p. 370), Isin conceives of AoC as focusing on the performatively articulated rights claims that citizens produce. This performative understanding also works the other way round: it is not only the citizens that produce claims, but by making rights claims citizens come into being—not by being part of any polity or citizenship regime but by performing citizenship, which means by making rights claims. Thus, the actors of citizenship cannot be determined before the analysis of contexts and actions. This is based on a specific concept of the political, which cannot be limited to the already constituted territory or its legitimate subjects but rather, necessarily, goes beyond them. Against this background, Isin identifies the task of reformulating categories of analysis, for which he proposes the following:

> "The rights (civil, political, social, sexual, ecological, cultural), sites (bodies, courts, streets, media, networks, borders), scales (urban, regional, national, transnational, international) and acts (voting, volunteering, blogging, protesting, resisting and organizing) through which subjects enact themselves (and others) as citizens need to be interpreted anew" (Isin 2009, p. 368).

This can be understood as a performative notion of citizenship. Following speech act theory (Austin), the concept of performativity was fundamentally developed further, not least by Judith Butler, who—especially in relation to sex and gender—worked out how reality and the subjects acting in it are created through (also linguistic) practices (Butler 1990). In particular, by incorporating the concept of iteration (Derrida), i.e. constant but never quite successful repetition, she succeeded in reflecting on domination and liberation while having no recourse either a metaphysical system or a sovereign subject (ibid.). Performativity unfolds a "force of rupture" (Butler 1997, p. 148) precisely when a

claim is repeated that was not intended for the subject or context according to the script. "That break, that force of rupture, is the force of the performative, beyond all question of truth or meaning" (ibid.). Instead, the force of rupture derives "precisely from its decontextualization, from its break with a prior context and its capacity to assume new contexts" (ibid., p. 147). Rosa Parks did not have a right authorized by segregationist conventions to sit in the front of the bus; rather, the possibility of authorization arose as she laid claim to that right, it arose with the act of that "insurrectionary process of overthrowing those established codes of legitimacy" (ibid.).

In contrast to Bourdieu's understanding of performativity, according to which, performative power already presupposes the subject's authorization, Butler regards the power of the performative as being enacted within speech acts without prior authorization; these acts, while being performed, assume authorization and thereby transform and change the context for future receptions (ibid., p. 160). In reference to the squatter movement in Buenos Aires, she asks "what does it mean to lay claim to rights when one has none?" (Butler 2015, p. 57) and answers straight away that it means to lay claim to "the very power that one is denied in order to expose and militate against that denial" (ibid.). In the case she describes, people without homes move into an empty building. In doing so, they establish the grounds to claim a right to live there. From this perspective, power is not understood as something that can be 'possessed' prior to the act in order to enable someone to act, but is about "acting, and in the acting, laying claim to the power one requires" (ibid.). This is performativity as Butler understands it. Acts and status are thereby necessarily related to each other. Like Butler, Isin frequently conceptualises this relationship through the metaphor of rupture:

> "Acts of citizenship […] disrupt habitus, create new possibilities, claim rights and impose obligations in emotionally charged tones; pose their claims in enduring and create expressions; and, most of all, are the actual moments that shift established practices, status and order" (Isin and Nielsen 2008, p. 10).

The concept of acts does not necessarily imply denying the relevance of status. Rather, it is about the ways status becomes contested and subjectivities are (trans-)formed within processes of claiming rights (Isin 2008, p. 17). This shift in perspective leads to a focus on the contested field of "routines, rituals, customs, norms and habits of the everyday through which subjects become citizens" (ibid.). In this context, rupture is not understood as a systemic or total upheaval, but rather as a moment in which the future breaks through into the present, where possibilities of something different emerge (Isin and Ruppert 2015, p. 50).

In order to analyse an act of citizenship as a kind of rupture, it is necessary to understand what is being broken with. With Étienne Balibar, this connection can be understood as an antinomic relationship between citizenship and democracy that works as a driving factor for the transformation of the political (Balibar 2012, p. 2). He sees the political in the aftermath of the bourgeois revolutions as determined by something he calls 'equaliberty' (*égaliberté*), in the name of which, orders of inequality are legitimised and these inequalities are simultaneously challenged.

> "We can identify this influence as a continuing interplay or differential of insurrection and constitution, which constantly gives rise to the question of how the universal can be realized within the form (and limits) of a community that is organized by the state" (ibid.).

This differential of insurrection and constitution appears as another representation of the tension between act and status or order. Balibar also sees a shift in the perspective on conceptions of membership, which he makes clear in reference to Arendt's idea of the right to have rights:

> "It has shifted from a 'constituted power' (the right to rights is the result of belonging to an existing political community, particularly a nation-state) to a 'constituent power', the active ability to assert rights in a public space or, better yet, dialectically, the possibility of not being excluded from the right to fight for one's right" (ibid., p. 66).

Thus, performative citizenship means not only to speak about rights claims, but speaking about rights, claims, subject, community and membership from a different perspective. Karen Zivi writes, "to approach rights and rights claiming from the perspective of performativity means, then, asking questions not simply about what a right is but also about what it is we do when we make rights claims" (2012, p. 18). Performing rights or performing AoC means to create a space and the subjects which are constituted by the tension in the concept of citizenship itself, driven by the potential force of equality between citizens, second-class citizens and non-citizens, or by—to use Balibar's expression—equaliberty. With this performative concept of citizenship, we can analyse citizenship regimes and their inequalities and normalisation processes as always challenged. This concept shifts perspectives on agency and subjectivity and provides a tool to analyse citizenship in its multi-faceted, non-static and contradictory modes.

3 Why Focus on Gender and Race from an Intersectional Perspective?

The dimension of gender, understood broadly to cover aspects of identity, social recognition, sexuality, desire, the body and its enactment and performativity, attributions and imaginaries, remains entrenched in any social field relevant for inequality und social justice. Feminist perspectives, claims and research help to scrutinise and challenge power relations. Questions of gender and sexual identity have been motors of social change and claims to citizenship for a long time now, and the more gender and LGBTIQ* equality moves forward in many societies, the fiercer conservative antagonistic forces seem to become. Gender equality politics in Europe are increasingly being used as blueprints for race equality politics as well. At the same time, the relations between gender and LGBTIQ* issues, on the one hand, and race and migration issues, on the other, are interconnected in several and also problematic ways. The concept of post-liberal racism describes a current form of racism which uses "egalitarian ideologemes" (*egalitäre Ideologeme*, Pieper et al. 2011, p. 195) in equality policies as markers for racial distinction. Post-liberal racism constructs people as migrant, racial or cultural others by describing 'them' as culturally backward because supposedly 'they' deny gender and LGBTQI* equality (El-Tayeb 2013, p. 307). This dichotomous construction of the other at the same time makes it possible to produce a superior self. Since today, nobody, not even openly right-wing racists, wants to be called a racist (Lentin 2020), the new (and in its essence very old) form of racial superiority presents itself as more liberal and progressive than its racial counterpart.

Critical perspectives on race and racism are increasingly being put forward, named and spoken out loud in struggles over identity politics. This would not have been possible without relying on ideas like intersectionality and other concepts that developed in transnational Critical Race and Gender Studies, as well as in activist contexts. There is a certain urgency to address race and racism in depth, especially from a Germany-based or, more broadly speaking, continental European perspective. In German academia, work on racism, race, racialisation and institutional racism has for the most part been done under the label of 'migration' studies and research, a field that itself only really came into being in German social sciences in the 1990s and was boosted by the summer of migration of 2015. Although a great deal of excellent research on racism and related issues has been done in Germany and by German academics (Oguntoye et al. 1986; Kalpaka and Räthzel 1986; El-Tayeb 2001; Leiprecht 2001;

Karakayalı and Tsianos 2002; Mecheril 2003; Steyerl and Gutiérrez-Rodríguez 2003; Eggers et al. 2005; Ha et al. 2007; Bojadžijev 2008), we can say that the theorems of critical race studies have been regarded, by the German social sciences at large, as an import from the US. Fatima El-Tayeb states that the systematic ignorance towards voices of German academics situated as people of colour is caused by the white dominance of academic spaces. These voices have been pushing anti-racist knowledge in Germany for a long time, but to gain acceptance as academic knowledge—and not just as 'experiences' of 'victims'—it has had to be presented as ideas of white German authors (ibid., p. 41). As the editors of this volume and as a mixed but dominantly white-positioned team, we have to be aware of these tensions and pitfalls, since a huge part of our knowledge is based on and inherited from these preliminary works, mostly done by people of colour. As the title of this volume indicates, we mainly focus on the intersections between gender, racism and citizenship as they play a role in current debates on issues such as (forced) migration, institutional racism, digitalisation, care, and language policies. Within the last three decades intersectionality has become one of the most widely discussed analytical perspectives in feminist, critical race and cultural studies. Using the metaphor of the intersection to capture the interplay of social inequalities related to racism, sexism, nationalism, and capitalism, it aims to show how individuals and groups are discriminated against and privileged differently, simultaneously and sometimes in contradictory ways, in multiple dimensions within structures of power. In this regard intersectionality addresses difficult and sensitive issues of power, difference and epistemic struggles, problematic hegemonic appropriations and silences. The path the debate on intersectionality has taken, especially in continental Europe, itself mirrors power relations. The US feminist legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term intersectionality in a paper published in 1989 (Crenshaw 1989; see also Collins and Bilge 2020). The concept was taken up in European contexts as well, and in Europe it encountered a rich and entangled 'race class gender' debate that had already been going strong for some time, as *Nira Yuval-Davis* and *Helma Lutz* tell us in their biographical conversation in this volume (similarly, for the USA, Collins and Bilge 2020). When the term intersectionality was adapted from Crenshaw's work in continental Europe, women of colour and migrant women on the continent were in supposedly more marginalised positions inside the academy than they were in the UK and the USA (Bilge 2013, 2014; Lewis 2009; Tomlinson 2020). In continental Europe, a majority of white feminist academics enthusiastically took up a successful and helpful critical theoretical concept developed in another geographical context, a Black feminist one.

Questions of citizenship and belonging played a role at an early stage in European debates on intersectionality. In 1999, Nira Yuval-Davis and Pnina Werbner published their book *Women, Citizenship and Difference* (Yuval-Davis and Werbner 1999) and pointed to, among other things, the gendered dimensions of citizenship. Since then, a wide range of literature in the field of intersectionality has touched on the dimension of citizenship, for example, in the fields of sociology (Yuval-Davis 1999; Werbner and Yuval-Davis 2005; Lutz and Amelina 2017) and education (de Vries 2020). In addition to referring to gender as a dimension, this literature stresses the relevance of a perspective which is able to recognise the diversity of social positions and identity constructions. Studies have been published that focus on contexts of activism and participation (e.g. Rottmann and Ferree 2008; Erel and Acik 2019; Peeck-Ho 2020) and on people's everyday experiences (e.g. Cherubini 2011).

If we frame struggles and activism for civil rights as fights for inclusive citizenship, there is no need to explain why we emphasise the dimensions of race and gender, though we do not focus exclusively on these dimensions. This has not always been the case in continental Europe. Race and racism as relevant everyday problems for all European societies were not only silenced in political discourse and the social sciences in general, but also to a considerable amount inside the European feminist debate on intersectionality. The discursive explosion around intersectionality, the concept that had been taken over from US American Critical Race Theory, was strong and broad, but the crucial and irreplaceable role that race plays as a core dimension, next to gender and class, was marginalised or even silenced altogether. This led to a large number of publications with intersectionality in the title, but where the term race did not appear in the text at all. Even research that was utterly silent on race and racism was labelled 'intersectional', and as a result silence and denial as familiar strategies to stabilise racist normalities were reproduced (see *Weiss* in this volume). While Black voices and voices of colour are still underrepresented in academic discourse, white gender scholars who did not want to miss the boat now found the 'intersectional angle' in any field of research.

The work of Myra Marx Ferree has been pivotal in understanding pathways of democratisation and the gradual inclusion of more social groups in the citizenry (Ferree 2008, 2011). When looking at historically successful strategies of feminism in a trans-Atlantic comparative perspective, Ferree observes in her analysis that, in the USA, feminists during the twentieth century oriented their strategies on the example of the African American civil rights movement. Therefore, *gender worked like race* in the USA, and was best framed in terms of identity politics. In Europe, especially in Germany where Ferree conducted

her research, with no comparably strong or visible anti-racist movement around during most of the second half of the twentieth century, this was not a viable option, but the most prominent social emancipatory movement was the labour movement. Therefore, in Europe, *gender* best *worked like class*, and claims were put forward in terms of pay and the recognition of housework and child care as unpaid work (Ferree 2008). Today, by taking Ferree's observations one step further, we claim that we can see a new adaptation of strategies in emancipatory politics: we see that race can work like gender in Europe (see also Supik 2014, p. 133). To be sure, race can work like gender in continental Europe, but it works in ways other than in the USA. The Düsseldorf feminist Mithu Sanyal, in a feuilleton essay (Sanyal 2021), related how, when she sat on an all-people-of-colour (POC) podium discussion in a German context, a US co-panellist complained about the absence of POCs from the podium. Persons socialised in the USA, Sanyal pondered, could not read how, in Europe, even southern Europeans are not (really) considered white (enough)—a position reflected in the "color-line" (W.E.B. DuBois 1903) in the USA at the beginning of the twentieth century, when Irish and Polish Catholics were excluded on racial grounds. Today, careful attention must be paid to the positioning of East Europeans as well. Being seen as positioned as white, as Black or of colour, happens along different lines all over the world. In Central or West European contexts, a Turkish-sounding name, the hijab, a Russian accent, a Romanian licence plate or black hair can all be markers for exclusion and discrimination.

We have identified four topics in particular that we believe are central to addressing citizenship from an intersectional perspective: care, institutional racism, language and digitalisation. In all of these areas, struggles for equality have impacted citizenship. The connection between citizenship and intersectionality therefore provides a basis for the further development and critical discussion of the notion of inclusive citizenship.

4 Care as an Act of Citizenship

As an act of citizenship and as social practice, caring, care work and the thinking and politics of care surely are the paradigmatic gendered practice. The field of care and social reproduction has been profoundly transformed in Europe and the USA since at least the 1980s. These changes are best described by key words such as economisation, commodification, privatisation, dissolution and precarisation in employment relationships, withdrawal of the welfare state, transnationalisation of care, and ideological struggles around the bourgeois

nuclear family. The changes have been profoundly shaped by racist structures and the gender order, and are flanked by narratives about the crisis of social reproduction and a cost explosion in the health care sector (Fraser 2016; trouble everyday collective 2014; Winker 2013). The right to give and receive care and the rights of caregivers, specifically of migrant and illegalised domestic workers, are being renegotiated in this context (Casas-Cortés 2019). In their chapters, *Maribel Casas-Cortés* and *Alessandro Pratesi* develop the idea of care as a basis for (social) citizenship (Ungerson 1990; Knijn and Kremer 1997; Lutz 2011; Tronto 2013) and forms of intimate or affective citizenship.

The contributions in this volume by *Casas-Cortés* and *Pratesi* discuss processes such as when heterosexual norms are put to the test in everyday practices of gay parenthood (*Pratesi*), or when precarious migrant domestic workers join forces with feminist precarity activists in Spain for a care-strike and the demand to base citizenship not on the city (Spanish *ciudadanía*) but on the principle and practice of care (Spanish *cuidadanía*) (*Casas-Cortés*). Thereby, processes of gendered and racialised exclusion are made visible, as well as the role of invisible and unpaid care work as a basis for capitalism and as the condition of existence for the 'liberal citizen'.

As the Covid-19 pandemic has shown, especially to those of us who usually have the privilege of carelessness, care work is still an undervalued, ill-recognised and underpaid form of work. At the same time, care work is existential, indispensable, and life-enabling; it is the heart of the social. The practice of caring for one another has also been an aspect of our collaborative work as editors of this volume. The lockdowns hit those of us with caring responsibilities for children and elderly people hard, and we tried to support each other as best we could while keeping this project rolling. In this sense, the context of production of this volume, in each of our households, was a constant thematic companion to our online meetings.

There is an ambivalence in the ways in which care is structured in societies and in care relations themselves, an ambivalence which has long been a contested site of diverse feminist debates (Hughes 2002; Plonz et al. 2011). On the one hand, as already debated in the domestic labour debates of the 1970s, the ways in which care is organised can be profoundly oppressive and alienating for all those providing care, due to a lack of recognition of this work as productive work (Molyneux 1979; Ungerson 1990; Haug 2011; Fraser 2016). Furthermore, the disability, children's rights and Black feminist activist movements have also criticized the care relation as often deeply hierarchical and patronising from the perspective of those in need of care, thereby criticising any naive romanticisation of the caring relationship or essentialist tendencies (Duffy 2005; Graham 2007;