Introduction: Citizenship

Catherine Neveu *LAIOS (CNRS-EHESS) France*

This thematic section originates in a session organized for the May 2004 CASCA (Canadian Anthropology Society/Société Canadienne d'Anthropologie) conference in London (Ontario).[1] While the aim at that time was to question contemporary practices of "local democracy," the articles assembled here, all based on localized research, have expanded the discussion to encompass the full scope of the central topic of the conference, "Citizenship and Public Space."

In a recent article, Ong (1999) underlines what are, according to her, the two main contributions of anthropological reflection to citizenship debates. She notes, on the one hand, research concerning rights and minorities and the link between equality and differences; and on the other, a problematization of the spatial dimensions of citizenship, since contemporary economic and political evolutions have stretched the otherwise largely illusory isomorphism between nation-state, populations and cultures (see Gupta and Ferguson 1999). As rightly noted by Werbner, if anthropology can contribute to an analysis of citizenship, it is not only "because anthropology studies the impact of the state on the local, or the meanings of grassroots activism, but because theoretically, anthropology's subject matter has always been "difference" and "identity," the particular in the universal, the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion" (Werbner 1998:6). It is indeed around such themes that the articles collected here propose a series of reflections: questioning the capacity of the Australian state to incorporate indigenous groups; regimes of citizenship at work around the Cape Town District Six Museum; and the grounds for ethnicization processes in two European cities.

Anthropological Approaches to Citizenship

If one had briefly to compare anthropological and other approaches to citizenship, what would certainly best characterize the first would be a willingness to look carefully at the social and political "manufacture"[2] of citizenship

and to destabilize citizenship theories using a critical and empirically grounded approach. In political science, citizenship has been the topic of a considerable literature: retracing historical conditions of appearance of older or modern versions; analyzing actual modalities of implementation or how it is exercised at different times; and, defining its contours from a political philosophy point of view. Déloye reminds us that legal sciences, since they consider citizenship first and foremost as a status, mainly study the criteria for gaining access to it and the content of the rights and duties attached to this status; that political theory is mainly interested in the conditions of civic obligation and in the links citizenship maintains with "neighbouring" concepts of nation and democracy, while history would examine the events that supported the progressive extension of such a social role (Déloye 1994). But despite this variety, political science and history nevertheless privilege normative and theoretical approaches with little empirical research. Citizenship, in most cases, is considered both as a status vis-à-vis the state and conformity to a given social role.

One of the first anthropological contributions to a more complete understanding of citizenship processes thus relies on the discipline's capacity to root analysis in empirical observation and to do so by both enlarging the focus and relying on a diversity of levels of observation—most notably through attention paid to the point of view of "the governed." But as is often the case, far from being limited to adding some "flesh" to an object problematized (or not) or conceptualized by others, the anthropological approach to citizenship allows for a critical re-evaluation of citizenship theories as well as of the way its "borders" are determined.

Anthropologists' interest in citizenship processes is a relatively recent one, and it has to be acknowledged that research does not develop at the same pace, nor raise the same level of interest everywhere. If research in France on this topic is notably scarce,[3] a variety of approaches are found in the literature in English. Some researchers consider citizenship from the point of view of its relationship to culture, either, in a rather classical manner in the discipline, to assert their indissociable links (Nic Craith 2004), or more dynamically, to analyse the extent to which citizenship is "informed" by culture (Rosaldo 1999). Others deny the relevance of a "culturalist" approach and explore models of citizenship implemented through public policies (see, among others, Bénéï 2005; Shore and Wright 1997), or more generally proposed by states (Ong 1999). It is within a framework linking these two approaches that Macdonald's contribution falls: she inquires, by analyzing Wiradjuri practices, to what extent can the (liberal?) Australian state accommodate a diversity of cultures without contradicting its own ethos.

It should come as no surprise that the question of the complex relationships between citizenship and culture stands as a central topic for many anthropologists. Such an approach does indeed deal with one of the issues that has long mobilized the discipline: the cultural dimensions of social phenomena. Indeed as Leca (1991) has rightly noted, citizenship, like nationality[4] and ethnicity (one of anthropology's favourite topics), is an arbitrary social construct, and as such, can be subjected to empirical enquiry. Werbner (1998) thus invites us to explore how discourses of citizenship and social and political processes are linked. To locate the multiple tensions and contradictions between dominant discourses (and theories) on citizenship on the one hand, and actual, both social and institutional, representations and practices on the other, thus constitutes an important element for grasping the multiple ways through which a given, historically situated conception of citizenship can go along with—support or on the contrary be an obstacle to—political and social movements in any given society. My own research with local associations of French youth of postcolonial backgrounds (Neveu 1998, 2003) has shown the extent to which using and referring themselves to the notion of citizenship can be both an obstacle and a resource. It is an obstacle when referring to citizenship allows state authorities to maintain them in the limbos of an always to be accomplished "integration" and a resource when it allows them to rely on the discourse of undifferentiated equality to claim actual equality and recognition. Discourses on citizenship are thus "inherently cultural process[es]" (Nic Craith 2004) to the extent that they carry sets of representations about the "real citizen," here not so much in terms of "good practices" one should adopt in order to be recognized as such, but in terms of social and political visibility. This type of "cultural citizenship" is then closer to Rosaldo's analysis (1999) when he explores the extent to which the exclusion Latinos are confronted with in the U.S. flows from denying their full and entire belonging to the "community" of U.S. citizens.[5] But contrary to Nic Craith, who tends to reduce the question of culture to that of ethnicity—and a "culturalist" version of it—to recognize the cultural dimensions of citizenship consists in analyzing both "how these key-categories—citizenship and culture—are being constituted anew (and in this process transformed) in the practices of their everyday lives by particular people(s) in particular times and places" (Oussourroff and Toren 2005: 209) and the profoundly political nature of "culture":

> Culture is political because meanings are constitutive of processes that, explicitly or implicitly, aim at redefining social power. This means that when movements deploy alternative conceptions of woman, nature, race, economy, democracy or citizenship, that destabilize dominant cultural representations, they enact a "cultural politics." [Alvarez et al. 1998:7]

Anthropological research, taking citizenship as the "point of entry" for its analysis, thus shows the extreme versatility of the concept and the uses to which it can be put. But considering models of citizenship at work, the issue is also that of the researchers' localization. A closer and comparative reading of research on citizenship underscores a constant risk in our analysis: that of succeeding only partly to get rid of these famous "models," the strength of which can sometimes result in taking a singular version of citizenship (its conception, its role) for its general definition. To put it differently, we have to be wary of building our own critical analysis on a specific, historically and socially situated conception of citizenship.[6]

A recent article by Ong (1999) on "Asian liberalism" is an interesting example of such a confusion. Ong wants to dismantle the "shock of civilisation" discourse that opposes Western individualism to the collective ethos and holism of Asian societies. By analyzing the model of citizenship proposed by Asian Tiger states (notably Malaysia and Singapore), she shows that far from reflecting timeless "Asian values," their model is perfectly adapted to contemporary conditions of economic globalization and produces citizens with qualities and claims different from those produced in the West, but not less modern for that. While Ong's will to go beyond mechanistic culturalist explanations is very relevant, she nevertheless reproduces, to a certain extent, a far too binary cleavage when she contrasts the model of citizenship found among Asian Tiger States in which public policies (education, training, housing, employment) are endowed with an important pedagogical role, with a "Western model" she describes as one in which individual rights and freedoms are totally paramount. This is problematic, on the one hand, because the latter, strictly liberal, model is only one among many circulating nowadays in Western societies and, on the other hand, because the central pedagogic role of the protective state has also been noted in quite similar terms elsewhere concerning other historical periods (in France for instance). Thus Ong argues that "more than in the West, the liberal Asian state plays a pedagogic role in educating the public as to the ethico-political meaning of citizenship. Expertise in social and human sciences is being deployed to provide a 'certain style of reasoning'" (Ong 1999:58). It is difficult not to compare such a conclusion with that made by Déloye (1994) in his analysis of the conflict over the "law on Godless schools" in France in 1882. By trying to produce an individual–citizen who agrees to be governed and who is able to discipline his own acts and passions ("to favour both the government of the self and voluntary submission to a government now elected through universal franchise"), the republican moralists of early 20th century were clearly working toward, according to Déloye, a governmentality strategy as defined by Foucault: "the aim for the Republic's pedagogues was to bring about the type of rationality that is intrinsic to a democratic government: citizens' self-discipline" (Déloye 1994:27, Author's translation).

Thus, it seems that the "pedagogic role" of the state is not more important in Asia than in Europe, as shown by the way schools became, in early 20th-century France, central arenas for training citizens adapted to the political conceptions of the republic of the time. The issue is not just, as a strictly evolutionist view would have it, one of a simple "time shift"; one is confronted here, as Ong rightly underscores, with an effect of the challenges states are confronted with and of the goals they are seeking to achieve. "In other words, while the welfare state developed as a way to deal with class conflict, the post-developmental strategy of middle-range Asian economies seeks to produce technically proficient and socially unified citizens attractive to capital" (Ong 1999:65). Similarly, republican moralists were leading a "state project of promoting an encompassing national and civil identity" serving their political project (Déloye 1994:28).

Confronted with the complex and often strongly normative topic of citizenship, it is especially necessary to take into account, but also to render explicit, our own "localizations" (Gupta and Ferguson 1999): not only the position we occupy in geographical, social or cultural terms, but also the position we choose in the debate on our research topic itself. As with any anthropology of the contemporary, the anthropology of citizenship processes requires that one "detach and relocate oneself far enough from the norms and categories of thought that give security and meaning to one's own society's moral universe" (Shore and Wright 1997:17).

Reversing the Approach

Taking full account of the cultural dimensions of citizenship, in Rosaldo's sense, is, as shown above, an essential dimension of an anthropological approach to citizenship; but this approach should not be limited to such dimensions. Issues raised by citizenship, not only as a theory but also as an imperfect social and political form, are also issues of political subjectivation and individualization. To

study citizenship from an anthropological point of view thus also allows us to further the discussion of a fundamental dimension of contemporary political reconfigurations: how do individuals, groups and states relate to each other and what are the social conditions under which these relations develop?

Whether one considers processes linked to globalization, such as the growing number of cross-cutting links between states, social movements, international institutions and NGOs (as well as a number of philanthropic and other foundations, see Pandolfi and Abélès 2002) or the progressive emergence of new relations to politics, together with or distinct from more "classical" ones, the categories that were used to define politics and its analysis are largely called into question. Frequently based on a reference to unity (one state, one territory, but also a citizen abstracted from his social, economic and cultural conditions, see Leca 1991), these categories face the growing challenge of plurality, both in terms of identifications and of scales (local, regional, national and transnational). Among such contemporary changes, some are of more direct importance for citizenship studies: the questioning of the unity of the "citizen tie" (one could only be a full citizen in a single state; for a critical analysis of this view, see Basch et al. 1994) but also of the unity of citizens' practices (too often reduced to the electoral realm). Indeed modes of articulation between individuals and collectives in political relations are the sites of remarkable contemporary evolutions (see inter alia Ion and Péroni 1997; Corcuff et al. 2005); and the notion of citizenship concentrates, in a particularly clear manner, the tension between individualization and belonging (Leca 1991; Marie 1997).

If it is not limited to non-Western societies, anthropology is no doubt particularly well-equipped to grasp and analyze contemporary transformations of politics and of citizenship practices and representations for the double reason that it has long questioned the universality and transferability of Western political categories (Werbner 1998; Bénéï 2005) and that is has consequently multiplied efforts to grasp alternative modalities to conceive of, debate and organize these categories. Thus, by submitting a number of dominant categories ("public space," "civil society," "state," "individual" and also "citizenship") to such a "distanced gaze," anthropologists can more clearly contribute to a renewed reflection on contemporary forms of politics found in a variety of situations, contexts and localities.

Following Werbner, when she considers "that Enlightenment ideas about universal citizenship are not so much false, but everywhere inserted in a social field of heterogeneous, partly overlapping and conflicting narratives and practices" (1998:3), anthropological approaches to citizenship can modify certain classical terms of the citizenship debate—especially concerning its cultural neutrality or universality—so as to understand citizenships in the plural and uncover, behind the diversity of its implementation processes, its "homeomorphic equivalents" (E. Le Roy, personal communication). As Abélès notes, and this holds particularly true for citizenship,

> the clarity and seeming distinction of categories at work in the political field obscures the question of their adequacy...Thus the need to proceed in the reverse and to build concepts from an analytical approach; basic categories being, right from the beginning, considered intuitive and essentially insufficient and theoretically unsatisfying. [Abélès 1990:132, Author's translation]

The "Manufacture" of Citizenship

Beyond the diversity of approaches and of debates on the very notion of citizenship, what unites contributions to this thematic section is a shared willingness to grasp empirically processes through which citizenship is "manufactured," be it in the multiple interactions between states and social movements or between individuals and groups within a society. Beyond the variety of contexts, a series of similar questions traverses these contributions.

We begin with the crucial question contemporary common sense tends to evade: is the local level a "naturally" democratic level? The development of multiple initiatives in support of "democracy of propinquity" in Europe, but more generally throughout the world, tends to confuse social proximities with spatial ones (Massey 2004), and propinquity with conviviality, without submitting such conflations to a critical gaze; and to grant local mobilizations quasi-natural democratic qualities (for a critical view, see Gupta and Ferguson 1999 or more particularly Ferguson 2004). Meanwhile, is one still within the realm of "participation" when the reference is to an apolitical, affective local community, abstracted from ideological conflicts? What happens when the space left vacant by former types of urban movements ends up being entirely occupied by populist and xenophobic discourses so that the local becomes a strictly "ethnically pure" place? Relations between democracy and populism are often ambiguous as Dematteo and Coman show. Dematteo analyzes the "hijacking" of direct democracy procedures by Northern League elected representatives in northern Italy, who exploit fears and resentments in deprived neighbourhoods to popularize their partisan options and lend weight to the idea that a faithful representation of citizens by the elites is a fraud. As for Coman, she shows that far from

being yet another sign of the revival of ethnicities in Eastern Europe, the ethnicization by Romanian local authorities of public squares in Cluj-Napoca is better analyzed as a strategy for re-conquering legitimizing patrimonies. Paradoxically enough, such an ethnicization of space then has depoliticizing effects, since it induces an almost complete lack of discussion and controversy about the life of the city.

Such questions can then be linked to a more global one concerning the extent to which contemporary forms of government of human beings can integrate and incorporate alterity. Does the liberal state's capacity to incorporate have limits? What happens when promoting cultural alterity threatens systems of statuses, places and strengths, as is the case with the Wiradjuri Macdonald worked with? How does this state react when strategies of (social and spatial) contentions of otherness cannot be used? It is then the importance of both spatial dimensions and forms of territorialization of citizenship practices that is underscored, as Poche (1992) rightfully stresses when he evokes the extent to which recognition can rely on "sharing the topos." But what is also at stake is sharing, or more precisely re-constituting, a common public space. That is what Balibar suggests when he considers, contrary to social contract theorists, that it is

> impossible to imagine that constituting (the public sphere) can be done by making a clean sweep of "collective identities" and belongings, whether it is forced, fictitious or historically acquired...Everybody, including "indigenous," must at least symbolically bring into play their acquired, inherited from the past, civic identity, and rebuild it alongside others. This does not mean the past does not exist or is useless, it means it is not an inheritance, that it confers no birthright, that there are no "first occupiers" of the civic territory. [2001:211-212, Author's translation]

Highlighting different and competing "models" of citizenship then permits one to measure the complexity of their relations. Thus the importance given to individual responsibility can be found in liberal visions of citizenship as well as in Leaguist discourses and among Wiradjuri: under what conditions does "to be responsible towards one's own" (MacDonald this issue) mean emancipation or the development of selfishness? In his analysis of social movements about and around District Six Museum in Cape Town, Beyers explores modes of construction and articulation between "community" as a form of collective identity and agency as a form of citizen struggle. He also questions the complex issue of the links between "identity(ies)" and citizenship, and suggests, following Isin and Wood (1999) that citizenship is not opposed to identity as universalism would oppose particularism, but bears historically specific relations with processes of collective identification. As such, it manifests a complex dialectic between subjectification and collective membership. One is again confronted, in specific form, with the central discussion mentioned above concerning the links between identification and subjectification, between individualization and membership.

What then distinguishes an anthropological approach to citizenship from other more classical approaches is precisely the emphasis on the imperfect and unfinished, on the fluidity of boundaries, more than on the a priori delimitation of an enclosed definition from which (deviations from) the norm could be measured. Like Werbner, when she defines citizenship as "an unstable political and juridical form" (1998:4), Balibar argues that "to speak of imperfect citizenship...is not only to suggest that citizenship is a defective, adjustable, improvable institution, it is rather to suggest that citizenship is more a practice and a process than a stable form. It is always in the making" (2001:210-211, Author's translation).

The aim is thus to try to grasp the political stakes of citizenship. Are these "to homogenize the culture of those who belong to a nation-state" (Déloye 2000:209), or to develop "the capacity to expose disputes and formulate anew the question of rights and exclusion" (Rancière 2000:63)? The question is not about making room for different cultures, but about taking charge of such relations of power and domination, since what allows us to "make society" (and to "make culture") is not what we agree about, but what we disagree about (Eder 2001). In Rancière's terms, to work on citizenship as a process necessarily involves working "in its margins" as spaces where it is constituted and produced; these margins are "the spaces of practical confrontation with the different forms of exclusion, a confrontation that always constitutes the founding moment of citizenship" (Rancière 1998:117).

Catherine Neveu, LAIOS (CNRS-EHESS), MSH, 54 Bd Raspail, 75270 Paris, Cedex 6, France. E-mail: catneveu@numericable.fr

Notes

1 Apart from the authors presented here, papers were also given by Sylvie Fortin (University of Montreal), Mary Hancock (University of California), Bernard Kalaora (Laios, Paris), Florence Piron (University of Laval) and Sophie Wahnich (Laios, Paris). C. Beyers' paper was added afterwards.

2 I use "manufacture," following Bénéï (2005), to suggest the double meaning of being both a standardized and con-

formist production process and a space for invention and appropriation.

3 While it would take a longer development to explain this scarcity, one can nevertheless attribute it to the extremely strong normative weight this notion has in a certain French political culture (see Neveu 2005). Research, especially on African societies, nevertheless partly balances this situation (see among others Holder 2004), but anthropological research in France on citizenship is still extremely rare.

4 While these two notions are often confused (both in discussion and practice), they should nevertheless be clearly distinguished (see Neveu 2005).

5 One is talking here of the exclusion of legal citizens, since the Latinos with whom Rosaldo was engaged, as well as the youth with whom I worked in Roubaix, are legally citizens, or even nationals, of their respective societies. One can see here that the question of citizenship is far from being deduced or reduced to its sole statutory dimension. The notion of "cultural citizenship" has met with a certain success in the U.S., although it refers to quite varied and sometimes confused meanings (see especially Ong 1996 and Rosaldo 1999).

6 Or, we should at least know about them and render them explicit.

References

Abélès, Marc
1990 Anthropologie de l'Etat. Paris: Petite Bibliothèque Payot.

Alvarez, Sonia E., Evelina Dagnino and Arturo Escobar
1998 Introduction: The Cultural and the Political in Latin American Social Movements. *In* Cultures of Politics, Politics of Culture. Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements. Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino and Arturo Escobar, eds. Pp. 1-29. Boulder: Westview Press.

Balibar, Etienne
2001 Vers la citoyenneté imparfaite. *In* Nous, citoyens d'Europe? Les frontières, l'État, le peuple. Etienne Balibar, ed. Pp. 206-215. Paris: La Découverte.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick-Schiller and Cristina Szanton-Blanc
1994 Nations Unbound. Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States. Langhorn: Gordon and Breach.

Bénéï, Véronique
2005 Introduction: Manufacturing Citizenship: Confronting Public Spheres and Education in Contemporary Worlds. *In* Manufacturing Citizenship. Education and Citizenship in Europe, South Asia and China. Véronique Bénéï, ed. Pp. 1-34. London: Routledge.

Corcuff, Philippe, Jacques Ion and François de Singly
2005 Politiques de l'individualisme. Entre sociologie et philosophie. Paris: Textuel.

Déloye, Yves
1994 Ecole et citoyenneté. L'individualisme républicain de Jules Ferry à Vichy : controverses. Paris: Presses de la FNSP.
2000 Explorer le concept de citoyenneté européenne. Une approche socio-historique. Yearbook of European Studies 14:197-219.

Eder, Klaus
2001 Integration through Culture? The Paradox of the Search for a European Identity. *In* European Citizenship between National Legacies and Postnational Projects. Klaus Eder and Bernhard Giesen, eds. Pp. 222-244. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, James
2004 Power Topographies. *In* A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics. David Nugent and Joan Vincent, eds. Pp. 383-399. London: Blackwell.

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson
1999 [1997] Culture, Power, Place: Ethnography at the End of an Era. *In* Culture, Power, Place. Explorations in Critical Anthropology. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, eds. Pp. 1-29. Durham: Duke University Press.

Holder, Gilles
2004 La cité comme statut politique. Places publiques, pratiques d'assemblée et citoyenneté au Mali. Journal des Africanistes 74(1-2):56-95.

Ion, Jacques, and Michel Peroni, eds.
1997 Engagement public et exposition de la personne. La Tour d'Aigues:Editions de l'Aube.

Isin, Engin, and Patricia K. Wood
1999 Citizenship and Identity. London: Sage.

Leca, Jean
1991 Individualisme et citoyenneté. *In* Sur l'individualisme. Pierre Birnbaum and Jean Leca, eds. Pp. 159-209. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Marie, Alain
1997 Du sujet communautaire au sujet individuel. Une lecture anthropologique de la réalité africaine contemporaine. *In* L'Afrique des individus. Alain Marie, ed. Pp. 53-110. Paris: Karthala.

Massey, Doreen
2004 Geographies of responsibility. Geografiska Annaler 86(1):5-18.

Neveu, Catherine
1998 "Nous" illégitimes et "je" indicibles. Tensions du collectif et de l'individuel dans des pratiques et représentations de la citoyenneté à Roubaix. *In* Espace public et engagement politique. Enjeux et logiques de la citoyenneté locale. Catherine Neveu, ed. Pp. 225-256. Paris: L'Harmattan, Collection Logiques Politiques.
2003 Citoyenneté et Espace public. Habitants, jeunes et citoyens dans une ville du Nord. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
2005 Anthropologie de la citoyenneté, document de synthèse pour l'Habilitation à Diriger les Recherches. Aix-en-Provence:Université de Provence, December.

Nic Craith, Màiréad
2004 Culture and Citizenship in Europe: Questions for Anthropologists. Social Anthropology 12(4):289-300.

Ong, Aihwa
1996 Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making. Current Anthropology 37(5):737-762.
1999 Clash of Civilizations or Asian Liberalism? An Anthropology of the State and Citizenship. *In* Anthropological Theory Today. Henrietta L. Moore, ed. Pp. 48-72. London: Polity Press.

Ousourroff, Alexandra, and Toren Christina
2005 Discussion: Anthropology and Citizenship. Social Anthropology 13(2):207-209.
Pandolfi, Mariella, and Marc Abélès
2002 Présentation. Politiques jeux d'espace. Anthropologie et Sociétés 26(1):5-9.
Poche, Bernard
1992 Citoyenneté et représentation de l'appartenance. Espaces et Sociétés 68(1):14-34.
Rancière, Jacques
1998 Aux bords du politique. Paris: Folio-Essais.
2000 Citoyenneté, culture et politique. *In* Mondialisation, citoyenneté et multiculturalisme. Mikhael Elbaz and Denise Helly, eds. Pp. 55-68. Paris: L'Harmattan–Presses Universitaires de Laval.
Rosaldo, Renato
1999 Cultural Citizenship, Inequality and Multiculturalism. *In* Race, Identity and Citizenship. A Reader. Rodolfo D. Torres, Louis F. Miron and Jonathan X. Inda, eds. Pp. 253-261. Oxford: Blackwell.
Shore, Cris, and Wright, Susan
1997 Policy: A New Field of Anthropology. *In* Anthropology of Policy. Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power. Cris Shore and Susan Wright, eds. Pp. 3-39. London: Routledge, Collection EASA.
Werbner, Pnina
1998 Exoticising Citizenship: Anthropology and the New Citizenship Debate. Canberra Anthropology 21(2):1-27.