Nationalism, belonging, globalization and the 'ethics of care'

By Nira Yuval-Davis

Endowing migrant domestic workers with citizenship on the basis of a feminist 'ethics of care', has been suggested as an alleviation of their current situation. However, concepts of formal citizenship does not take account of the way that other and less formal forms of citizenship give access to different types of resources, nor to the multi-layered character of belonging. Rather, the adoption of an 'ethics of care' by women facilitate the smooth working of globalised neo-liberalism.

The focus of this exploratory paper is on the relationship between constructions of nationalism and belonging and the feminist 'ethics of care'. I explore this as an illustration of some of the problematics that arises in the interrelationships between the political, the economic and the emotional in contemporary neo-liberal globalized world as well as a link between feminist and political theory.

In his 16th century book 'Utopia' Thomas More speaks on one certain kind of inhabitants of that utopian society:

Another type of slave is the working-class foreigner who, rather than live in wretched poverty at home, volunteers for slavery in Utopia. Such people are treated with respect and with almost as much kindness as Utopia citizens, except that they're made to work harder, because they're used to it. If they want to leave the country, which doesn't often happen, they're perfectly free to do so,

and receive a small gratuity. (More quoted in Tronto 2005, 131)

Joan Tronto is using this quote from More as a description of the social, economic and political situation of contemporary migrant domestic workers. Tronto, one of the main feminist scholars who are promoting 'ethics of care' as the alternative feminist ethics to that of liberal ethics, believes that the solution to their situation is to give them citizenship in the countries in which they work.

Although such a solution is often a necessary step and might help to alleviate some of the most horrendous aspects of the lives of these workers, it is doubtful whether it touches all, or even most of the issues involved. The situation highlighted in this quotation by More relates to some of the complex features of contemporary politics of belonging and changing the legal state of these migrants might be a necessary but definitely not sufficient condition to resolve their situation.

CITIZENSHIP AND BELONGING

Tronto's recommendation raises some of the more general issues about the construction of national collectivities, the relationship between citizenship and belonging to a nation as well as the relationship between the suggested citizenship of the workers in the country where they work and their country of origin in which usually their families continue to live.

Nationalist ideologies usually include an immutable relationship, which is sometime called 'the holy trinity' of people, state and territory (e.g. Yuval-Davis & Stoetzler 2002; Yuval-Davis 2003). There is an automatic assumption that the boundaries of the civil society overlap the boundaries of the nation who lives in the 'homeland' territory, controlled by the nation-state.

This mythical relationship has never been completely true. There were always members of the civil society who were not members of the dominant national collectivity, they were members of 'the nation' who lived outside the state, and often there were disputes and contestations where the real borders' pass between one homeland and another. And this relates to the minority of national and ethnic collectivities in the world that were not ruled by other states and empires and in times before the contemporary 'age of migration', to use Castles and Miller's terminology (Castles & Miller 2003).

Tronto suggests citizenship as a solution to the situation of migrant domestic workers. And indeed, citizenship might give these women some legal rights and minimum wage that otherwise they would not have. Formal citizenship can bestow not only civil, political and social rights but what I've called elsewhere, spatial rights (Yuval-Davis 1999). They are defined by the right to enter the territorial space of a state, and once entered the right to stay there as long as one wants – in other words, the right to plan a future and not to be afraid every day of the knock on the door and the order of deportation. Spatial rights also involve the spatial freedom to move in the country and from one employer to another – as migrant workers often, especially domestic care workers, depend on their employers for the right to stay legally in the country – an enslavement that has caused a lot of abuse and suffering.

However, as members of racialized minorities in Britain and elsewhere know, formal citizenship does not equate the Marshallian definition of citizenship which defined it as 'full membership in the community, with its rights and obligations' (Marshall 1950). The Norman Tibbet 'cricket test'[1] (see Yuval-Davis, Anthias & Kofman, 2005) which has been mirrored by some of Blunkett's (2002) writing on football, makes very clear the differentiation between formal citizenship and belonging to the national collectivity. Moreover, in the

days of 'global war on terrorism', the milder exclusionary discourse of multiculturalism and tolerance (Weymess 2006) has been replaced by 'clash of civilizations' discourse that essentializes 'the other' as long as s/he is not prepared to completely assimilate.

This assimilation is not only – or even mainly – cultural. It is about loyalty and belonging. The cricket test constructs belonging as a zero-sum game – you're either one of us or you're the enemy, as president Bush likes to state. More and more states, including Britain, have passed laws that enable them to take away not only people's permit to stay in a country but also their citizenship, even if there were born and grew up in the country, as long as they also have another citizenship [so as not to break some of the international human rights covenants that forbid making people stateless]. Even if no formal act of withdrawal of citizenship takes place, often states, let alone societies, sharply differentiate between those who belong and those who do not. An illustration of this principle took place during the western evacuations from Lebanon in the summer of 2006, in which those who had western citizenship but also a Lebanese one were not, at least initially, evacuated.

For this reason, Tronto's suggestion to solve the hardships in the lives of the migrant care workers by endowing them formal citizenship falls far short from tackling in any serious way their situation. However, her suggestion recognizes the fact that social and cultural citizenship and belonging of most people on the globe today is not a zero-sum game but is actually multi-layered, including local, ethnic, national, religious, regional, cross- and supra-national collectivities – and this is true of people of hegemonic majorities and not just of racialized minorities and migrant populations. These multi-layered citizenships and belonging affect and construct each other and dictate access to a variety of social, economic and political resources. This has been recognized by Wendy Sarvasy & Patrizia Longo (2004) who embedded the citizenship status as suggested by Tronto in a more complex multi-layered citizenship structure in which such citizenship is a necessary facet of an anti-colonial world citizenship. Unfortunately, however, they anchored their suggestion in a critical use of the Kantian notion of 'hospitality'. Hospitality, like the notion of tolerance mentioned above, assumes pre-given boundaries of belonging that guests, like tolerated minorities, cannot transgress.

In order to analyse these complex issues, my work shifted from focusing on notions of citizenship to work on belonging and the politics of belonging (e.g. Yuval-Davis 2003, Yuval-Davis 2006).

Belonging is about emotional attachment, about feeling 'at home' and, as Michael Ignatieff points out (Ignatieff 2001), about feeling 'safe'. Belonging tends to be naturalized and become articulated and politicised only when it is threatened in some way. The politics of belonging comprises specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging in particular ways to particular collectivities that are, at the same time, themselves being constructed by these projects in very particular ways. The politics of belonging encompass the participatory dimension of citizenship and the identificatory dimension of individual and collective identities but crucially also assume and promote particular emotions of attachment, solidarity, loyalty and often love to one or more of the triad components of people, state and territory. As Adrian Favell said (Favell 1999) the politics of belonging is all about 'the dirty work of boundary maintenance' – of who is in and who is out – and at best it relates only partially to the status of formal citizenship.

The politics of belonging is, therefore, where the sociology of power and the sociology of emotions get together. As more and more people who study politics and so-

cieties, let alone nationalism, recognize, the theorization of the relationship of the emotional and the political needs to be at the heart of this scholarship. Some political theorists assume emotional bonding as the normative principle of the relationships between people (or, rather – citizens) and their national community (e.g. Oldfield 1990, Etzioni 1993, Avineri & Shalit 1992). Some feminist scholars, however, put 'ethics of care' at the heart of their alternative vision of all social, economic and political relations. It is for this reason that it might be useful to study their approach to the issue and to evaluate their potential contribution to this field of study.

CARE AND THE 'ETHICS OF CARE'

Feminists have made important contribution to the study of social and political relations in general and nationalism in particular. In my own work (e.g. Yuval-Davis 1989; Yuval-Davis 1997) I have pointed out some of the major gendered dimensions of nationalisms and nations. Women are constructed in ambivalent ways in nationalist discourse. On the one hand they are members of the nation as all others, but on the other hand they are constructed and controlled in specific ways as symbols of the nations, its biological and cultural reproducers as well as border guards of the symbolic boundaries of the nation. However, the large number of feminists who have been working on issues of care and 'ethics of care' have not usually referred in their work to issues of nationalism, although a growing number has started in recent years to look at issues of globalisation and even international relations. (e.g. Held 2005, Hochschild 2003, Robinson 1999, Tronto 2005)

When examining the feminist literature on care, there seem to be some inherent problematics and paradoxes in the approach.

The main problematic is that there is an ambiguity in the notion of 'care' and the 'ethics of care' as to whether 'care' means 'to take care of', i.e. the instrumental task of caring, on the one hand, and/or 'to care about', i.e. the emotional investment of caring for someone, on the other hand. The two meanings are connected in the sense that caring work assumes a certain emotional regime of labour (Soundings 2001) and that emotional attachments involve performativities and practices as well as narratives, but they cannot be reduced to each other. This ambiguity is of central importance in relation to the great body of feminists and others who study care workers, although some of these writings (e.g. Tronto 1992, Leria 1994) carefully distinguish between the different components – emotional, cognitive and practical, of care work. However, I would argue that this is an important distinction that is not made clear enough in all the recent debates on social cohesion and integration (a point which is beyond the scope of this paper but which I hope to be able to expand at some future time).

In this paper, however, I want to examine two related paradoxes. One paradox relates to the fact that care ethics is constructed – by both neo-liberals and by their opponents, especially feminists – as the anti-thesis of neo-liberal ethics which sees in the pursuit of self interest the proper mode of human behaviour. And yet – care work (either institutional or domestic) has come to be pivotal to the functioning of local as well as global economy in which workers often have to be available 24 hours, 7 days a week and no space is made available to their and their families' care needs (Hochschild 2003).

The second paradox relates to the fact that the 'ethics of care' has been developed by feminists such as Giligan (1982), Ruddick (1989) and others, as a feminine mode of viewing the world. And yet, nationalism and all other identity projects of politics of belonging, often considered as masculinist,

if not actually patriarchal, are dependent upon particular kinds of ethics of care.

These two paradoxes have their own social, political and economic dynamics and yet interrelating them can highlight for us some of the impasses of contemporary 'glocal' lives.

CARE AND GLOBALISATION

Neo-liberal ethics consider the pursuit of self interest, more or less within the strictures of law, not only as legitimate and natural [hence the popularity of the theme of the 'selfish gene' (Dawkins 1976)] but also as the best regulator, not only of the 'free market's supply and demand but also of social order as a whole. As a recent series of programmes produced by Adam Curtis for the BBC have shown (2007), neo-liberal ethics and understanding of social relations, have been constructed by the discourse of rational choice developed by computer simulation games during the cold war period and sanctioned by the mathematical equations of Nash (1951), whose dictum that everyone has to be suspicious of everyone all the time was constructed, as he now admits, during the time he was suffering from paranoid schizophrenia…

Minimalist state; denial of the 'public good', definitely of 'public interest'; maximizing profit – these are the dictates of this extreme form of capitalism in action.

When Marx and Engels tried to theorize the working of capitalism, as motivated by profits extracted from the surplus value of productive labour, there has been one kind of labour that resisted incorporation into the paradigm – that of reproductive labour. When Marxist feminists in the 70's and 80's tried to analyze domestic labour in a way which would fit and explain women's oppression, they failed as well (e.g. Molineux 1979, Fahybrycesa & Vuorela 1984). The domestic labour debate is one of the glorious impasses of feminist literature.

It can be argued that care work is the form of reproductive labour that has defied to a great extent attempts to incorporate it into the neo-liberal globalized model of the economy, and yet it is pivotal for its sustainability.

Saraceno (1997), Hochschild (2003), Tronto (2005) and others, have pointed out the emergence of what they call 'the care gap' and the resulting 'global chains of care'. 2nd wave feminism – and the needs of the economy allowed women fuller and more equal access to the workplace. This removed women, at least partially, from their role as primary carers of nuclear families. At the same time the nature of work itself changed and as Harvey (1990) pointed out, globalized, 'restless capitalism' under conditions of space/time compression, has created demands of more physical availability of service-oriented workers (the infamous 24/7). The establishment of the practice of flexitime, especially for women workers, did not mean the reduction of work but rather more work from different spaces. This created, as Tronto points out (Tronto 2005, 130) 'a huge gap in the care work that they used to do (especially for women but also for men)'. The care worker crisis has created a commodification of care work of 'pink collar ghetto' with less attractive work conditions.

There were not enough local women attracted to these jobs, hence 'the care drain' of care workers, skilled and unskilled, from the Third World.

The micro chip, communication and transportation revolutions have meant that most of the productive work with unattractive work conditions [or, in order to defeat organized workers demands for more attractive work conditions), could be exported. This is one of the reasons that the relative success of labour movements in curtailing the power of capitalists via resistance and organizing which resulted in the establishment of welfare states in which citizens became entitled to social as well as political

and civil rights, could become subverted, and the power of multinational corporations could not be upheld by specific nations states.

However, not all labour demands can be exported – although certain sectors of the service industry as well as that of the industrial labour could be exported – e.g. call centres, health tourism etc – reproductive and other kinds of care work have much greater spatial constraints. No virtual presence can replace cleaners, nannies, carers for the elderly and the disabled – at homes and in institutions – as well as the more skilled labour of nurses, doctors, teachers.

Care work does not only have specific spatial constraints, it usually also demands a specific emotional regime which is very different to that of other sectors in the labour market. To carry out care work, the workers have to care – or, at least, to perform their work as if they care. Often caring – as in the case of migrant nannies who have left their own children to the care of relatives or care workers from an even less priviledged parts of their countries or the globe – is the only thing that makes their work bearable. However, even if this is not the case, and the women have migrated as a way of escaping bondage of traditional gender relations (Sorensen 2005), it is the emotional regime of these jobs which is crucial. Often, in attempts to regulate the labour market and especially to make it more attractive to local workers, there are attempts to professionalize, at least the more skilled care jobs (Dahl 2004). However, as is often reported, this results with either the transfer (usually partial and inefficient) of care duties – e.g. when the cleaners rather than the nurses in hospitals are the ones on whom the patients depend on the caring aspects of their stay, or the creation of new kinds of 'care gaps' altogether. Hanne Marlene Dahl also points out that the attempts to professionalize care work are often accompanied by a counter discourse of 'New Public Management' that

articulates care giving as simple, manual function and therefore de-professionalizes care giving work.

This is not surprising, as caring for others is the opposite of neo-liberal ethics which does not recognize and are cynical about notions such as 'public good' or 'public interest'. Feminists have developed 'ethics of care' as an ideological and moral alternative to this. Moreover, in the work of feminist scholars like Gilligan (1982) and Ruddick (1989), care, if not 'innate' in women, is part of their universal construction. Others, like Joan Tronto (1992) and Fiona Robinson (1999), have constructed the 'ethics of care' as a feminist, rather than as a feminine, ideology. However, given the above, it can be argued that the adoption of 'ethics of care' by women, especially those who work in the care sector, facilitate and oil, rather than obstruct and resist, the smooth working of globalized neo-liberalism.

Food for thought…

CARING AND BELONGING

As mentioned above, caring, as constructed by feminists who developed the 'ethics of care' is often seen by them as a specific feminine characteristic. I would argue, however, that when analyzing various political projects of belonging, especially nationalism, caring and the ethics of care (although very different from the usual feminist version of it), while deeply gendered, are constructed as constituting the heart of collectivity membership and are at the heart of modern masculinities.

The probably obvious, and yet groundbreaking at its time, element in Benedict Anderson's theory of nationalism in his book Imagined Communities (1983) has been a recognition that nationalism, although modern and correlative of the age of enlightenment, is not based on rationality. Like other 'modernist' theorists of nationalism (e.g. Althusser 1971, Gellner

1983, Hobsbawm 1990), Anderson linked the rise of nationalism to a particular stage of the rise of industrialisation and capitalism (print capitalism in his case), and saw it as replacing religion. In this respect he was wrong, as we can see that most contemporary nationalist ideologies incorporate, rather than fully replace, religious belonging. However, he was right to emphasize the passion at the base of the nationalist sentiment in which, like religious or familial attachment, there is no actual rational reason and self interest involved.

There can be no clearer sign that men care about their nations than their traditional readiness to perform the ultimate citizenship duty – to sacrifice their lives for the sake of the nation.

As Cynthia Enloe (1990) pointed out, fighting for the nation was often constructed as fighting for the sake of 'womenandchildren' as one word. More concretely, it has been shown that men care not only for the abstract notion of home and homeland but for the other men in their unit with whom they are fighting. One of the main worries of including women in combat military unit has been the worries of the commanders that their presence will disturb the male bonding which is at the heart of military performance. On their side, women as carers are not only the biological and cultural reproducers of the nation, but are also the men's 'helpmates' – their roles in the formal and informal labour market has usually been defined according to the range of duties demanded from the men, fulfilling, in addition to their traditional reproductive duties, all the tasks the men left when called to fulfil national duties in times of war and other crises (Yuval-Davis 1985, 1997).

Caring, in its different gendered forms, therefore, has been at the heart of the performativity, a well as narratives of national belonging.

Nowadays, in many states, serving in the military is not any more a male citizenship duty. Just when women started to be allowed to join the military formally in a more equitable manner, the military was transformed from a national duty into a form of career, like other agents of national external and internal security which are gradually being privatised as part of the growing domination of neo-liberal market forces. This is also a time in which in these states, women usually bear less children and the national population as a whole start to age.

This is also the time in which women come to participate in higher and higher percentages in the national labour market, just when, due to neo-liberal globalized economy demands, the nature of service work itself changes and becomes more demanding. This is the time when the 'care gap' appears, not only in the domestic sphere, but in the national sphere as well and when the growing dependence on migrant and immigrant workers in various sectors of the economy but especially the care one, raise issues of racialized boundaries of the nation and the various inclusionary and exclusionary political projects of belonging.

However, maybe even more importantly, this is the time in which in many countries the percentage of citizens who vote in the elections falls beyond any previous known rate of the population. Further, on the one hand, neo-liberal morality of the 'selfish gene' seems to be celebrating at the same time as growing global social movements concerned with war, poverty and global warming transcend borders and boundaries, sharing common human values rather than ethnic and national belonging.

GLOBAL CARING

The complexity of contemporary globalized world, the time/space compression, the development of non, cross and supranational political communities and multilayered belonging/s have brought about

greater cosmopolitan discourses of human, rather than just citizenship, rights and duties. They have strengthened the sphere of rule of international law while at the same time endowed probably unprecedented powers to non-state multinational corporations.

There is an on-going debate whether, under these conditions, emotions of attachment and caring for the nation, especially in the West, have been weakened, remained constant or become more specific and/or localised (eg Delanty 1995, Savage & al. 2004). Cosmopolitanism – this time, however, formulated in more 'rooted' (Cohen 1992), vernacular (Bhabha 2002), visceral (Nava 2007) and situa-ted (Vieten 2007) ways, has become a fashionable label to encompass international, transnational and global social movements and networks. However, at the same time, we see the rise of ethnic and religious fundamentalist movements and others which Manuel Castells (1997) has called 'defensive identity communities' throughout the world. Not since the time of the rise of fascism in the 1930's, have there been so many and so strong extreme right wing movements and parties.

I would argue, however, that these defensive identity political projects of belonging, however, are not motivated, primarily, by love and care for their ethnic, and national communities but are ruled by another strong emotion, that of fear. The same conditions that have given rise to globalized multi-layered belonging/s, have also created conditions of deep insecurity and existential crisis of meaning in many people's lives. People are not sure what work they would do, where they would live and with whom, under the conditions of late modernity. This is when they start to feel insecure, unsafe and uncared for and desperately search for fixed, if not primordial identities, belonging and meanings. The so called 'structural adjustment' demanded by international financial agencies, the dis-

mantling of the welfare state and the privatisation of more and more agencies that used to be controlled by the public sector, has hastened this process.

The 'care gap', then, is not just a question that relate to individuals, families or communities, but lies at the heart of the local and global rise of ethnic and religious strife. It affects us all, but especially the countries of the South in which most of the population, as Zygmunt Bauman (2004) has argued convincingly, constitute no more than 'human waste'. As we have seen in recent G-8 summits, a cosmopolitan anti-poverty movement which promotes a global ethics of care [which demands 'make poverty history'] can achieve very little if there is no accompanying political and economic power and structures to achieve this.

Therefore, the most urgent political, as well as theoretical task is to develop a way of analysing the interrelationships of the cultural, political, economic and the emotional (Ahmed, 2004) rather than continuing to compartmentalize them when attempting to understand the crucial issues of the day.

NOTES

1. Norman Tebbit, a minister in Margaret Thatcher's government, claimed that if people who are citizens of Britian, born and educated there, cheer the national cricket teams of the countries from which their parents came from, eg Bangladesh and Pakistan, they don't 'really' belong to the British nationa.

REFERENCES

· Ahmed, Sara (2004): *The cultural politics of Emotions.* Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

· Althusser, Louis (1971): *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays.* New Left Review, London.

· Anderson, Benedict (1983): *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* Verso, London.

· Avineri, Shlomo & De-Shalit, Avner-(eds.) (1992): *Communitarianism & Individualism.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

· Bauman, Zygmunt (2004): *Wasted Lives.* Polity Press, Cambridge.

· Bhabha, Homi K. (2002): in Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha, Carol A. Breckenridge & Dipesh Chakrabarty: *Cosmopolitanism.* Duke University Press, Durham.

· Blunkett, David (2002): *Secure Borders, Safe Haven.* White paper, Home Office.

· Castells, Manuel (1997): *The Power of Identity.* Blackwell, Oxford.

· Castles, Stephen & Miller, Mark J. (2003): *The Age of Migration.* Macmillan, Basingstoke.

· Cohen, Michael (1992): "Rooted cosmopolitanism", in *Dissent* (Fall).

· Curtis, Adam (2007): *The Trap*, a 3-part documentary series, BBC2, April.

· Dahl, H. M. (2004). "A View from the Inside: Recognition and Redistribution in the Nordic Welfare State from a Gender Perspective", in *Acta Sociologica*, 2004/4.

· Dawkins, Richard (1976): *The selfish gene.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

· Delanty, G. (1995): *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality.* Macmillan, Basingstoke.

· Enloe, Cynthia (1990): "Womenandchildren: making feminist sense of the Persian Gulf Crisis", in *The Village Voice*, 25 September.

· Etzioni, Amitai (1993): *The Spirit of Community.* Crown Publishers, New York.

· Fahybrycesa, Deborah & Vuorerla, Ulla (1984): "Outside the domestic labour debate", in *Review of radical political economics* 1984/2-3.

· Favell, Adrian (1999): "To belong or not to belong: the postnational question", in Andrew Geddes & Adrian Favell (eds) (2002): *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe.* Ashgate, Aldershot.

· Gellner, Ernest (1983): *Nations and Nationalism.* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

· Giligan, Carol (1982): *In a different voice.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

· Harvey, David (1990): *The condition of post modernity.* Blackwell, NY.

· Held, Virginia (2005): *The Ethics of Care.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

· Hobsbawm, Eric (1990): *Nations and natonalism since 1780.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

· Hochschild, Arlie Russell (2003): *The commercialization of intimate life: notes from home and work.* University of California Press, Berkley.

· Ignatief, Michael (2001): *Human Rights as Politics and idolatry.* Princeton University press, Princeton.

· Marshall, T. H. (1950): *Citizenship and Social Class.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

· Nash, John F. (1951): "Non cooperative games", in *The annals of mathematics* 1951/2.

· Nava, Mica (2007): *Visceral cosmopolitanism.* Berg, London.

· Oldfield, Adrian, (1990): *Citizenship and community: civic republicanism and the modern world.* Routledge, London.

· Robinson, Fiona (1999): *Globalizing care: ethics, feminist theory and international relations.* Westview press, Boulder.

· Ruddick, Sara (1989): M*aternal thinking.* The Women's press, London.

· Saraceno, Chiara (1997): "Family, market and community", *Social Policy Studies*, no. 21, OECD, Paris.

· Sarvasy, Wendy & Longo, Patrizia. (2004): "Kant's World Citizenship and Filipina Migrant Domestic Workers", in *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 2004/3.

· Savage, Michael; Bagnall, Gaynor & Longhurst, Brian (2004): *Globalization and belonging.* Sage, London.

· Sorensen, Ninna Nyberg (2005): "Narratives of longing, belonging and caring in the Dominican diaspora", in Jean Besson & Karen Fog Olwig (eds): *Caribbean narratives.* Macmillan, London.

· Soundings (2001): special issue on *Regimes of Emotion.* Issue 20, Autumn

· Tronto, Joan (1992): *Moral boundaries.* Routledge, New York.

· Tronto, Joan (2005): "Care as the work of citizens: a modest proposal", in Marilyn Friedman (ed): *Women and citizenship.* Oxford university press, Oxford.

· Vieten, Ulrike (2007): *Situated Cosmopolitanisms*, PhD dissertation at the University of East London, London.

· Yuval-Davis, Nira (1985): "Front and Rear: Sexual Divisions of Labour in the Israeli Military", in *Feminist Studies* 1985/3.

· Yuval-Davis, Nira & Anthias, Floya (eds) (1989): *Woman-Nation-State.* Macmillan, London.

· Yuval-Davis, Nira (1997): *Gender and Nation.* Sage, London.
· Yuval-Davis, Nira (1999): "The spaced-out citizen: Collectivity, Territoriality and the Gendered Construction of Difference", in E. Inis, (ed.): *Rights to the City: Citizenship, Democracy and Cities in a Global Age.* Routledge, London.
· Yuval-Davis, Nira & Stoetzler, Marcel (2002): "Imagined Borders and Boundaries: A Gendered Gaze", in *European Journal of Women's Studies,* August.
· Yuval-Davis, Nira; Anthias, Floya & Kofman, Eleonore (2005): "Secure Borders – White Haven: The White paper and the gendered politics of migration and belonging", in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2005/3.
· Yuval-Davis, Nira (2003): "Belonging: from the Indigene to the Diasporic", in Umut Ozkirimli (ed.): *Nationalism and its futures.* Macmillan, Basingstoke.
· Yuval-Davis, Nira (2006): "Belonging and the politics of belonging", in P*atterns of Prejudice* 2006/3.

Nira Yuval-Davis
Professor and Graduate Course Director in Gender, Sexualities and Ethnic Studies
University of East London